

ID	Do you agree with the proposal to close the Physical Disabilities (PD) SRP provision at Coteford Infant School?	Do you think these proposed changes will disadvantage any residents in Coteford or Hillingdon?	If you answered 'No' or 'Don't know', please tell us why	If you answered 'Yes' or 'Don't know', please tell us why	The following questions are about you and are optional. Are you completing this questionnaire as:	How many children under the age of 18 live in your household?	Which school(s) does your child(ren) currently attend?	If you would like to provide any comments on the proposals please use the text box below.
1	No	Yes	My daughter is currently at Coteford and was refused a SRP which meant that her care that she was entitled to was stripped from her. I have been informed that even an SALT team hasn't even been to see her at school to assess her and that is just unacceptable. My daughter has a disability therefore she is entitled to the right care whilst she is in school and isn't getting that.	The children with needs with have a neglect of care due to not having the SRP	A parent/carer/guardian	3	Coteford infant school and Newtham infant and junior school	I think it's absolutely disgusting that this is being even considered to be shut when children who have needs have a right to the correct care. It is a complete neglect of care from the LA all because they want to save some money. Why do children with disabilities have to suffer due to cost when they already suffer enough already? I am appalled that this has even been considered when I'm more than sure there are other budgets that wouldn't affect half as many children and young adults as much as this will do. I have fought from the start for my daughter to have the SRP and it's a right I shouldn't have to battle when I have the battle everyday caring for my child with a disability that she cannot help having.
2	No	Yes	I just don't know of any similar provision in the area. It is one of things that always get spoken of Coteford. I do understand however the funding pressures that may lead to this decision.	Reasons stated above	Other	2	Bishop Ramsay	
3	Yes	No			Other	0	0	
4	No	Yes	Resource is already stretched as it is, funding isn't sufficient as it is, how is the school meant to fund the equipment and professional staff to help with the existing children that need the support if this is cut? We should be asking for more funds, not less just because there's a dip in the population.	All children at Coteford will be impacted. Children with special needs will need more time from teachers and TAs, not fully trained but expected to manage and support them whilst children with no needs get less focus on their continued learning because our teachers do not have 8 arms and 8 legs to do it all. We should be asking for MORE budget. How this proposal makes sense is beyond me.	A parent/carer/guardian	1	Coteford infant	This proposal is appalling. I see no plans and clear roadmaps to showcase to the school how they would be supported and how everything will stay the same if funding is removed. It seems like a decision has been made and you're just going through the consultation because you legally are obliged. Decisions already made, with minimal thought or care for the future of our country. It really is all about the bottom line figure for greedy individuals. Shame on you.
5	No	Yes	This is needed by the community, I know many children who have benefited from this provision.		A local resident	2		
6	Yes	No			Prefer not to say	1	The Willows	I do not feel they have the experience to support children with any additional needs
7	No	Yes	Why take it away from those children who made need if they have special needs or physical disabilities it's not wright every main stream should cater for children with additional needs disabilities	Many families will sure with their children children will suffer as there isn't enough sen provision so with it being added to mainstream school will help children with additional needs have just as much wright to be given the education they need as mainstream children	Prefer not to say	1	N/a	Please think about how these children will suffer long term and the affect of their mental health
8	Yes	No			A local resident	2	queensmead and newtham	
9	No	Yes	Children with physical difficulties and EHCP need to be given the proper support and as far as I am aware there is no other unit like this in the borough.	see above comments	Other	0	none	just that we task enough provision in the LA for our special needs children.
10	No	Yes	It will put increased financial pressure on the school which is already extremely underfunded for the level of sen attending coteford both srp and non srp (hpcp children) resulting impacting the school massively financially It will may not have impact on current srp children if the councils stands by the promises they have made to parents although this is questionable and parents need written confirmation of this. However it massively effects future children who attend coteford who have physical needs including access to therapists, equipment, staffing, the council can say there is no impact but there are financial impacts to the school and their ability to meet these childrens needs without adequate funding. One example maybe the schools need to reduce staff, creating a further burden on class teachers and support staff that already have an extremely high number of sen pupils compared to other schools, this will have a knock on effect to other pupils education. It is very clear that correct protocols have not been followed and the decision has already been made and the consultation is a formality tick box exercise. I honestly think this is part of a wider plan. Staff have evidence that parents were already told their child would not get a srp place at coteford months before the school community were made aware of possible srp closure. This is proof in itself that the decision has already been made and this is what angers and upsets parents and staff. It raises the question what the sen team are telling parents how many parents have they previously told that coteford no longer have an srp so their child won't get an srp and to go elsewhere? And therefore supporting the council's narrative of lack demand The school knows of one parent that was specifically told this. It seems the council are being very dishonest in how they are getting their evidence to support this. This should be explored in more detail.	It will disadvantage the physically disabled children and families in our community. They will no longer receive access to the therapists they need, and funding for equipment and staff not having srp funding will impact all of this putting the school in further financial difficulty than it is already in. This will then further impact the wider school community and the education staff are able to provide.	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Coteford	
11	No	Yes	Concerns around funding for the school and the impact on mainstream children due to having next to no budget.	The children of Coteford Infant School will have further stretched teaching	A parent/carer/guardian	1	Coteford Infant School	Teachers are already stretched. Removing the SRP budget would disadvantage the children as well as the staff
12	No	Yes	No I disagree with the proposal. As a parent of a child at coteford infant school who is in receipt of SRP provision I think the decision will have a detrimental effect on his physical development	Those children with physical disability will have less opportunities to be in the correct environment for their educational and complex health needs	A parent/carer/guardian	3	Coteford Infant School, Whitehall Junior School	The proposals should be reconsidered as the alternative options have not been appropriately assessed in meeting needs and expectations
13	No	Yes	Coteford is one of the few schools where children with physical disabilities are able to learn alongside their peers. It is a really special place, with skilled teachers and a completely accessible building. We need more inclusion, not less!	Physical disabilities should not be a barrier to joining mainstream education. The benefit of inclusive education is felt by all the children - those with disabilities and those who grow up believing that inclusion is normal. My kids do not have physical disabilities, but are used to having friends who are, and in seeing them as equals, which is how it should be.	A parent/carer/guardian	3	Coteford Juniors	
14	No	Yes	There is a still a need for this, we have many disabled children within the school. Schools are already struggling before losing this.		A parent/carer/guardian	2	Coteford Juniors	
15	No	Yes	This is will directly have a negative impact children's access to much needed support. Adding the pressure of waiting time to families already dealing with difficulties and loss of capacity strains a child to have a safe learning environment	It will add to hassle and stress travel time of families that do want this provision as they will not want to send children to Coteford. This will increase traffic on road at peak times on already crowded roads during school runs. All of this will affect environment and climate	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Coteford and Sacred Heart	The more you reduce important touchpoints and support for children needing this support, the more pressure you will add on the NHS and wait time and school staff.
16	No	Yes	There's a lot of children that depend on it being open. There's not enough special needs schools & the schools that are open have massive waiting lists	Of course it's a disadvantage. What will the families do that rely on it?	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Coteford infants & coteford juniors	
17	No	Yes	The children affected will go into NHS system for therapies which don't happen as often and the services are overstretched. This negatively impacts teachers as they have to pick up the therapies and conduct them during school times. This impacts ALL children in the classes and their progress.	The children affected will go into NHS system for therapies which don't happen as often and the services are overstretched. This negatively impacts teachers as they have to pick up the therapies and conduct them during school times. This impacts ALL children in the classes and their progress.	A staff member	1		
18	No	Yes	Having taught there I can wholeheartedly say that it would be a terrible decision. The provision is so unique and allows true inclusion which benefits all children in the school	There's nowhere else like it for these children	Other	2	Highwood Primary School	This would be a huge mistake
19	No	Yes	It will negatively impact all children attending the school	Removal of SRP provisions can only be a bad thing and goes against EDI principles	Other	0		
20	No	Yes	Srp could be repurposed to support differens sen needs	Children with sen needs are struggling to be placed in effective provision due to limited sen school placements	A local resident	0	NA	
21	No	Yes	Although the birth rate has dropped significantly there is still a need for specialist provisions for children. The mainstream schools, even with reasonable adjustments and the ordinarily available provision, cannot cope with meeting the needs of all children without extra funding and this is not something that is likely to happen.	Children and families who need the extra support will not have all of their needs met. This puts those children at a disadvantage to others their age. It also adds extra pressure to school staff who have to ensure all children's needs are met without any additional support from the borough.	Other	1		
22	No	Yes	This is a ridiculous plan - the demand has not diminished! We need these specialist provisions in the borough. Closing the SRP at Coteford would be detrimental to the whole community.	Disabled children and their families. Where else will this provision come from?	A local resident	2	Warrender	
23	No	Yes	This benefits children who use it and the broader community of children and families as well	This disadvantages kids, families, the teachers and administrators involved	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Glebe	Our community works best with robust support for those most in need. Cutting these services is an embarrassment, these supports should be the last things to go
24	No	Yes	It would be disrupted to children currently benefitting and put more stress on already over stretched departments.	Yes it will have a negative effect on children currently using this service and also mean future children will not get the support they need in a timely manner.	A parent/carer/guardian	1	Coteford infant school	

25	No	Yes	Having facilities for children in this mainstream school is key to the right support getting to children in the most appropriate way, in the easiest way for them	The NHS service at CITS is already overstretched and rationed for patients. Busy parents have to travel to Hayes and Uxbridge for their children to be seen. Schools are told OT and Physio isn't needed, but when parents self refer it's found there "is" a need. The support school, parents, and children receive will be reduced. The council are trying to save money rather than act on behalf of vulnerable residents in need of support at a critical time in their lives.	A parent/carer/guardian	1	Coteford Juniors	Fight to support the children in your schools rather than taking away much needed services.
26	No	Yes	There are not enough of these provisions locally as it is - why reduce it even further?	It will disadvantage local children who require additional assistance	A local resident	2	St John fisher	
27	No	Yes	Coteford has over 40 years success of helping and supporting children. If it is removed we will lose a fundamental support system for some of most vulnerable children.	We need to maintain our support network for children in the Borough. Cut back on other things like funding hotels for those who have never paid a penny into our system and invest it in the future of our borough.	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Newnham	Stop removing all the specialist support for our young children in the borough I cut back on funding in other areas and maintain the good things our borough has
28	No	Yes	My friends daughter is hearing impaired and uses the srp as well as her it allows other students of the school the ability to attend a mainstream school whilst meeting the needs of the disabled child	The young children that rely on the srp will be left to struggle in mainstream or need to find alternative schools and have to make new friends which could have a huge impact on a disabled child	A local resident	2	Harefield academy & SSW	
29	No	Yes	Children across the borough are crying out for provisions such as this and there is not enough as it is without closing this one at Coteford.	Children from across the entire borough use the provision at Coteford.	A local resident	2	Newnham infant and nursery school	Working in an infant school myself within the borough, I know of several students who have left my setting to take up places at Coteford due to the SRP. These were children who struggled to access mainstream education due to disabilities that the SRP at Coteford are equipped to handle. Taking away this valuable resource will be devastating to the children who currently use it and to those who could benefit in the future. The current numbers are not a reflection of need as they are currently not allowed to take on anymore applications for whatever reason decided by local government. I only wish there were more provisions such as this one available to the ever increasing need of the children we now see in mainstream school who have struggled to get a place at specialist schools due to lack of space.
30	No	No	I believe this is a required service that the school provides at an above adequate standard and takes a burden of the NHS.		A parent/carer/guardian	2	Coteford infant school	
31	No	Yes			A local resident	2		
32	No	Yes	As a teacher in the borough there is a lack of specialist provision for our children with SEND. Schools are being told that mainstream is the only place for pupils with complex SEND. The therapists that you send to schools are barely out of university (again a cost saving for you) and are. It yet equipped with the necessary skills and so it's down to the schools SENDCO to plug the gaps with inadequate funding. It is clearly a cost saving measure by the LA send department and the reason listed is an easy way out for you. How do you sleep at night?	What about the kids? As a teacher in the borough there is a lack of specialist provision for our children with SEND. Schools are being told that mainstream is the only place for pupils with complex SEND. The therapists that you send to schools are barely out of university (again a cost saving for you) and are. It yet equipped with the necessary skills and so it's down to the schools SENDCO to plug the gaps with inadequate funding. It is clearly a cost saving measure by the LA send department and the reason listed is an easy way out for you. How do you sleep at night?	A local resident	0	Not applicable	Shame on you!
33	No	Yes			A parent/carer/guardian	3	Coteford infant Coteford junior St Joan of arc	
34	No	Yes	It's essential that children with physical difficulties have a specialist provision that really understands their needs within the context of mainstream schooling	Children with physical disabilities	A local resident	2	Secondaries in Northwood and Rickmansworth	
35	No	Yes			A parent/carer/guardian	2	Coteford	I see many problems with the proposed plan. Firstly, families made long term plans and even moved to the area for their kids to be able to attend Coteford. Where are these kids supposed to go now? Secondly, by moving all the kids currently in SRP to the other classes, you will decrease the level of education our kids currently getting (I assume you are not planning to increase the number of teachers or assistants in the class). Lastly, I think the change will alter the culture in Coteford. I am very happy knowing that kids with physical disabilities going to Coteford. It educates my kids that physical disabilities are part of life, increases their empathy and knowledge about disabilities and any particular needs their friends with disabilities might have. Closing the SRP means that there won't be any new students with disabilities, hence altering the culture.
36	No	Yes	All children should have the right to learn no matter their circumstances.	Some people need support than others to learn.	Other	2	Cannon lane	
37	No	Yes	The SRO has been at coteford over 40years and benefits so many	It's brilliant for all who need it	A local resident	2	Cannon lane	I don't agree with the closure of the SRP at coteford
38	No	Yes	Surely this is needed.		A local resident	None		
39	No	Yes	This is a crucial provision to offer equal opportunities and inclusion of students with physical disabilities.		A parent/carer/guardian	2	Coteford infant school	
40	No	Yes	Kids with disabilities need special attention and would disrupt a typical classroom. This will be detrimental to all kids.	Some families have moved closer to the school to be able to attend these specialised classes. Removing this facility may force them to move out again to seek it elsewhere.	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Coteford infant school	
41	No	Yes	It's important that children with physical disabilities have the correct funding and access to the right care needs in addition to what is provided in a main stream classroom.	Children in Hillingdon might have to travel a lot further outside the borough to get the adequate care for their needs. This puts pressure on families that have other school age children trying to get them to and from school.	Prefer not to say	3	Coteford infant school Northwood school	The lack of consultation before the proposal closure has been poor and staff and parents feel like they have been blindsided by the decisions that are being made by the council without the needs of these children being taken into consideration first.
42	No	Yes			A parent/carer/guardian	2	Coteford infant and coteford juniors	
43	No	Yes			A parent/carer/guardian	2	Coteford infant and coteford juniors	
44	No	Yes	I have a child with disabilities that attended Coteford Infants from 2019-2022 and is now at the Juniors. I specifically chose Coteford infants because of its SRP which the school has had for 40 years. You will be making life for parents and children with needs even more miserable than it is. You will be directly impacting families like me. How could you even consider such a ridiculous proposal, bringing more disadvantage to the already disadvantaged.	Coteford infants is widely travelled to from all over the Hillingdon Borough because of its SRP. I myself travelled from Uxbridge daily to take my child to this specific school because of my daughters needs. To take it away you will be impacting 100's of Hillingdon Families unnecessarily and unjustly. Disgrace.	A parent/carer/guardian	1	Coteford Junior	KEEP COTEFORD INFANTS SRP. YOU HAVE NO REASON TO TAKE IT AWAY. DISGRACE. THINK IF YOUR CHILDREN NEEDED ITS SRP SERVICES.
45	No	Yes	Just another example of reducing funding to those most vulnerable. As a money saving exercise.	Any physically disabled children who need support and those who will receive less support down to more pressure put on staff to fulfil ehcp interventions.	Prefer not to say	1	Coteford juniors	
46	No	Yes	The school already good up funds provided by an SRP place to ensure needs are met. Reliance on unreliable nhs therapy services, particularly with a shortage of OT and physios, will directly impact these children. The school does not have sufficient staff to carry out all therapy and if made to do so, without the funding of additional staff, it will be at the detriment to the education of the wider cohort.	Where will parents consider for students who are academically able but require a higher level of physical therapy? This simply won't be provided by an understaffed nhs or understaffed school	A local resident	2	Meadow high school Coteford junior school	Please not that the wide school community is expressly unhappy with this potential decision and sees it as detrimental to the inclusive ethos of the school community.
47	No	Yes	It is a necessary resource		A local resident	1	Vyners	
48	No	Yes	Coteford infant has been at the centre of Physical Disabilities SRP provision for decades and its role in shaping life of Hillingdon children with PD or others is primordial!	Many children in the borough benefit from the PD SRP provision and would have an immense impact if this school would lose its provision.	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Coteford infant	
49	Yes	No			Prefer not to say	1		The staff and school is NOT equipped to support these children
50	Yes	No	Because it is needed despite the LA saying it is not. You have turned children and families away due to this proposal. These children have a right to be educated within a mainstream school that is equipped to support them. Coteford is that school. It's all on one level and purpose built building that suit the needs of SRP children and has been successfully doing this for the last 40 years. Rather than the alternative of schools being funded to make reasonable adjustments to accommodate these children. Now that is a waste of tax payers money right there! You are trying to fix something that isn't broken. Why don't you support Coteford infants school instead of trying to diminish it. This can't be the only option you are picking on this school for some reason. There is an ulterior motive to all this I'm sure of it. Why don't you support the school to be another sort of SEN provision then? This school does what it does very well and serves its local community and further a field. It is highly regarded in the SEN world and the staff are some of the most dedicated you will find. They fight for those children like they are their own.		A staff member	0		
51	No	Yes	As children should have equal rights and opportunities in main stream schools and have the support to help them through their education	As children would have to travel further away to be able to gain education	A local resident	1	Coteford Junior School	
52	No	Yes	it is very helpful for the families accessing this provision and I feel more families could benefit from it	It will add more to an already backed up NHS service	A local resident	2	oak wood & Malorees junior school	
53	No	Yes			A parent/carer/guardian	3	Coteford	
54	No	Yes	A lot of children need this and rely on it	A lot of children rely on this	A parent/carer/guardian	4	Coteford infant school and Coteford Junior School	

55	No	Yes	Because it is going to cause catastrophic repercussions. It is essential that it remains open. Lots of children are going to suffer and there will be a huge knock on effect.	Because this is going to impact on everybody involved in a negative way.	A parent/carer/guardian	3		Coteford Juniors
56	No	Yes	Closing the SRP will directly impact both the children who use the SRP therapies as well as the children who do not. The funding the SRP children currently receive supports quality therapies delivered directly to the children. Without this funding they will be transferred to the local NHS system which is already an overstretched and underfunded service. Without this vital funding we have concerns on the impact this will have on the school staff to take up, coordinate and ensure this is delivered suitably. The time taken will affect the whole school as well as smaller teaching groups. The SRP has been at Coteford for over 40 years and will be negatively impacting the inclusive ethos of our school. The LA argues that Coteford's SRP does not meet their new definition of a "traditional" SRP, despite our long history of success, including helping children like Paralympian * * * * *. They also claim that integrating these children into mainstream schools without proper funding or resources will provide adequate support. The LA states that demand for the SRP has decreased, but we know that families have been told the SRP is no longer accepting admissions, which may explain the drop in numbers. We believe that the LA's proposal has been made without proper consideration of the needs of all our children. Closing the SRP without a fully supportive system in place will harm the inclusive environment we have worked so hard to build.		A parent/carer/guardian	2		Coteford Infant School and Haydon
57	No	Yes			A parent/carer/guardian	2		Coteford
58	No	Yes	It's an advantage to those the need/require the services as well as support to all staff working within a school setting. As a parent, we need local support	---	A parent/carer/guardian	2		NA
59	No	Yes			A parent/carer/guardian	2		Coteford infant and junior
60	Yes	Yes			A parent/carer/guardian	3		Coteford infant
61	No	Yes	Children need this school more than ever at the moment.	Because they need this school for their children	A parent/carer/guardian	2		Whitehead junior school/Haydon school
62	No	Yes	This has always been a wonderful school of children with extra needs.	Where are these children expected to go to school. Travel is not always an option	Other	None		Not applicable
63	No	Yes	As a qualified SENCO and working in the nursery next door, I have worked with children who have gone to Coteford school and other schools that have SRPs. I know how important and beneficial it is for children with SEND to have access to this	Less intake of children especially those with physical disabilities	Other	0		N/A
64	No	Yes	The community needs these centres to aid in children's development and make them feel equal part of society. They deserve an education and social development		A parent/carer/guardian	1		N/A
65	No	Yes	I know there is a need for this provision	Because our children with disabilities will be unable to access local schools	A parent/carer/guardian	2		Coteford
66	No	Yes	I believe the children in receipt of the provision will not have their needs met by NHS provision which has long waiting lists and is understaffed and under resourced. It will be a gross disservice to our disabled children.	Local disabled children will lose out as the NHS cannot replace the interventions received; they will be subject to assessment and waiting lists plus additional travel costs to a new centre.	A parent/carer/guardian			
67	No	Yes		Makes no sense monetarily or educationally.	A local resident			
68	No	Yes	It's a valued resource that is needed for young children	The children that are currently being supported at Coteford will need to have support elsewhere in the borough creating longer waiting list for everyone	A local resident			
69	No	Yes	We don't have adequate provision across the borough to keep children with physical disabilities in mainstream schools. I know the school and seen the wonderful way children are integrated. If these children were in special needs schools it can hold them back in adulthood. It also helps mainstream children learn tolerance and kindness towards children with different needs.	See last answer	A local resident	0		NA I used to be a teacher and I helped at Coteford when my daughter taught there.
70	No	Yes	The school provides quality and safe service		A local resident	0		
71	No	Yes	It's a great resource which enables integration of disabled pupils alongside non disabled.	It will disadvantage the most vulnerable disabled children	A local resident	0		My child attended coteford, as a disabled parent I have seen the amazing work such funding enables
72	No	Yes	Valuable resource in the Borough & would put even more pressure on mainstream schools	May have to travel further to a school where needs can be met and have a long wait for NHS	A local resident	0		
73	No	Yes	Coteford is an incredible inclusive school where all of my children have been very happy. Closing the SRP will directly impact the children who use the therapies etc.	I know of many families who specifically travel to Coteford because of the excellent reputation the school has for supporting children with physical disabilities. This will be a great loss.	A parent/carer/guardian	3		Coteford Infant, Coteford Junior, Bishop Ramsey
74	No	Yes	As they offer massive support and receive great success	Children will have to wait to get the support they need.	A local resident	4		Queensmead
75	No	Yes	It has proven previously to have been a great support for children with special needs and should be there for future generations	Think that answer is obvious!	A local resident	2		N/a Please keep this school and department open for future generations
76	No	Yes	Children with complex physical disabilities need additional one-on-one support which an ordinary mainstream school without specialist provision would never be able to provide on an ordinary budget! How can the council take away this vital funding that has provided countless children over the last 40 years with an opportunity to be integrated within a mainstream school while still having their significant physical disabilities supported (is beyond me)! This is a crime against families with disabled children! My children are not disabled but they went to Coteford and benefited so much from having a disabled class mate in every single year of their primary schooling. Taking this vital funding will be to the detriment to all other children in the school too and not only to disabled children who have already been dealt a hard blow by their life opportunities.	I know of many families who specifically travel to Coteford because of the excellent reputation the school has for supporting children with physical disabilities. This will be a great loss. Coteford has provided fantastic education for large numbers of severely disabled children over many years thanks to this additional funding.	A local resident	2		Bishop Ramsey
77	No	Yes	I can see without the provision being able to successfully and purposely support, guide and teach children that are already at Coteford will be a struggle. Typical child will also suffer as LSAs and teaching staff will have to spend more time providing care without outside agency help to the same extent. It also means future pupils who would of been accepted will have one less school in the borough available to them. 40 years of providing education for those with physical disabilities and all of a sudden decide it's unnecessary. What on Earth?	See above	A staff member	1		Previously Coteford inf, now Warrender As a teaching staff member I value the guidance from outside agencies and training we receive to help with those children who require more attention and help. How are we expected to meet their needs if provision is removed?
78	No	Yes	Children with physical difficulties will not get the therapy needed and will be passed back to the NHS - many of these children will struggle in a mainstream classroom without the specialist support they currently get.	Longer waiting lists for children, less provision for children with needs	A local resident	None		None My son was a pupil at Coteford and I personally knew children who were supported by the SRP there. I am also a SENCO at a school in a different borough and know how stretched schools already are in providing support within a mainstream classroom. This proposal is little more than a money saving venture and does not put the needs of the borough's children first.
79	No	Yes	Everyone the needs that extra help should have it	The children that needs that extra help will suffer	Other	3		Whitehall My eldest son went to coteford for nursery and he needed the extra help but didn't really get it as he is autistic.
80	No	Yes			A local resident			
81	No	Yes	'should have their needs met in mainstream schools with reasonable adjustments,' Should but they won't! Childrens needs are not being put first in this case. We know how hard it is to get specialist help and interventions and closing SRP provision would be taking that away from the children. Disgraceful.		A parent/carer/guardian			
82	Yes	No			A staff member	1		
83	No	Yes	Because my son benefited from it	Because coteford is experienced in special needs and there will be more children who would gain from their experience	Other	1		My son goes to meadow high and my daughter goes to queens mead both are former coteford students My son is a former coteford student he has special needs, coteford was recommended by portage when he was younger he became a student at coteford and they supported him all the way through coteford infants and the juniors he is now ** if it was not for their early intervention he would not be where he is now coteford are highly experienced for future students that need the extra support in their lives .
84	No	Yes	Because there are a lot of children that need that help and benefit from it	They won't get the help they need at coteford	A parent/carer/guardian	2		Coteford infant and coteford junior school
85	No	Yes	Any closure of provisions for disabled children is always going to have a negative impact on the children that need it most.	Because you will inconvenience so many people.	A parent/carer/guardian	3		Coteford infants and Haydon
86	No	Yes	The school has a wealth of practical resources including specialised toilets, space, no stairs anywhere, room for physio, specially built playground equipment for all children to access, areas for equipment storage by classrooms, not to mention all the expertise built up amongst staff, which is a tremendous resource to have in the borough. To lose this is extremely short sighted.	To have a school where so much knowledge and resources are located means that the children who are more local to Coteford can attend more conveniently. When all children start school, it is a time when parents want a lot of support and reassurance, and to have a local school nearby to answer questions and provide solutions. Now add to that the concerns when a child with physical disabilities starts their educational journey. These parents and children are already disadvantaged, having to fight for any help and medical support they need. At a time when schools are contracting, and classes remaining are fuller, PD children with all their equipment will be harder to find room for in already full classes.	A parent/carer/guardian	0		They both attended Coteford infants Please think about future children who could benefit from having a local school with all the resources that Coteford infants is able to provide. These are very little children whose parents want them to be nearby. To lose this brilliant local resource with the build up of knowledge and resources is short sighted at best.

87	No	Yes	Because this is one of the main reasons students chose to attend this school. It has everything they need in one place but also allows them to safely and fairly learn alongside their able-bodied peers. It is needed and losing it within the borough would be the wrong thing to do. There is already a great shortage of places in specialist schools so don't close help that allows students to be in mainstream.	Because students will have to travel further to different schools that can better meet their needs. This is likely to be a great cost to the borough as they will have to fund the school place elsewhere and the transport to get there.	Prefer not to say	1		Cedar Park	I think that the bigger picture needs to be looked at here. We are not just talking about closing this but then having to get those that need it now and in the future to go elsewhere for either there full schooling or there additional treatments/etc that will then mean less time in the classroom or worse having to go outside of the borough. Thus meaning that the borough is likely to end up footing the schooling bill and transport bill for their entire school life or the parents do until the fight hard enough to get the borough to pay out. This is a great provision and should stay open. If you want it used more then publish that it is there to the local people.
88	No	Yes	There already isn't enough srps in the borough and more children are in need of support This will have a devastating impact on the children affected and their families	More families and children will struggle without the support of professionals	A local resident	4		Ruslip Gardens primary & Harefield academy	
89	No	Yes	because it will have a huge impact on the children that use the service as well as on the already overstretched NHS	Impact on NHS services	A local resident	2		Bourne Primary	
90	Don't know	Yes	For young people with a physical disability where with adequate provision their needs can be met within a main stream classroom I agree, however I am concerned there are young people who would present with a primary need of a physical disability but have other complexities, such as learning difficulties, autism and behavioural needs where their needs would not be met within a mainstream environment but there is no	Need sufficient primary send places for young people in the moderate learning needs range with complexities. Hedgewood is no longer able to accommodate these young people as they serve a more significant and severe cohort, so these young peoples needs are not being met in primary, causing more to need specialist provision at secondary or more significant input than would have been required if they were given sufficient support in an appropriate primary setting. Loss of an SRP will reduce further the number of additional resources places when there is not enough and will cause more young people to be supported without adequate support.	Other	0	N/A		I'm a SEND professional working in the borough.
91	No	Yes	As a parent of a child in coteford infant school I think this proposal is awful due to coteford's inclusion of all children and abilities they are a caring, nurturing and understanding setting and alot of parents will send their children to this setting for those very reasons.			2		Coteford junior school and Haydon high	
92	No	Yes	It is invaluable to students that need it. They would struggle to get the support elsewhere.	Students that need the SRP and their families	A local resident	2	BWI		
93	No	Yes	Removing the SRP from Coteford will put children with physical disabilities at a disadvantage as these children require regular specialist physio and occupational therapy intervention alongside their mainstream education. The specialist equipment that these children require also needs to be available. Coteford has always provided specialist help and equipment to children- without the SRP there would be limited access to mainstream specialist help for children in the borough. I previously worked at Coteford infants as a physio therapy assistant and was able to provide specialist therapy sessions and support to children and teaching staff to meet the varied needs of the children within the school. Having this wonderful facility available within a mainstream school meant that children with physical needs had access to first class support and services within the school and that there was less need for children to miss valuable time from school to attend to their additional needs. Having a mainstream school with this additional facility where children can also identify with other children with physical needs means that children can feel part of a nurturing and inclusive environment rather than struggling within a mainstream system without appropriate equipment or specialist support. I do not feel mainstream schools would have the necessary skills and knowledge base to support these children and that general teaching staff and assistants would be put under extra strain to do so. If this SRP is removed the only real alternative to ensure physical needs are catered for is for these children to attend specialist schools where places are limited and underfunded and this would be denying children with physical difficulties access to mainstream education and full inclusion.	Removing the choice of attending a mainstream school with specialist provision for children with physical difficulties is a massive disadvantage to children and families in the Borough for the reasons stated above. This is discrimination and purely about money and budgets and is a disgrace. Everything at Coteford has been set up to provide support - why take away provision that is very much needed by families. Children with disabilities should have all options open to them - removing the SRP is limiting children's outcomes in life- they need the option of a positive inclusive environment in which to undertake their education where all their needs can be catered for in a specialist way.	Other	N/A	N/A		As a former member of staff at Coteford Infants - I was shocked to read of your proposals. In my time working as a physio assistant at Coteford Infants I worked with many children and families who were able to benefit from the SRP Provision. I was able to provide the necessary link between the children teaching staff and NHS therapists to ensure that the children attending the school received all the help that they needed to ensure that they could reach their full potential educationally and physically. Having also worked in other mainstream schools (without SRP) within the borough as a teaching assistant I do not believe that mainstream schools have the correct facilities, equipment, knowledge or training to provide the same level of care to these children. Attending a mainstream school without SRP also means that children feel more isolated and aware of their differences. At Coteford where there is provision for more children with physical needs children can identify with other children with similar difficulties and the school as a whole provides a happy, inclusive learning environment where all children can benefit and learn from this inclusive ethos.
94	No	Yes	Because this SRP has been part of the school & the community for 40 years, parents know & trust the school & the staff therefore know that there special needs child will be getting the best education & care from previous results. Putting these children into mainstream schools does not work, no matter how much you try to put a round peg into a square hole to suit your own narrative. It never worked before & it won't work now, stop using our children as your pawns in your political game!!!	It will disadvantage all children!!!	A parent/carer/guardian	1		Na	
95	No	Yes		The families that need these provisions are in Hillingdon and need them to support their children and the wider community as a whole.	Other	1		Na	
96	No	Yes	The provisions are still desperately needed by children in the community and it would be terrible for them to close.		A parent/carer/guardian	2		Coteford infants	
97	No	Yes	There are children there who need the service	No access to students who depend on the service	Other	1		Coteford	
98	No	Yes	Children with additional needs are struggling more and more in mainstream as the council makes more and more cuts to us. So taking a unit away where people are trained and have areas for children to go to have more focus learning is awful. Schools are struggling to meet the needs as more SEN children are going in to mainstream with alot less funding so to take away a unit that specialises will not meet the needs for children with additional needs. Some children with SEN can find the classroom overwhlming which can lead to other issues. They also need breaks to do other therapies, speech and language daily, physio therapy, occupational therapy, social skills etc	There is less places for SEN children to go with support and specialist trained people. They will not get the support and attention they need. There is a unit for a reason. There is less children as you said because Hillingdon council are not giving out ehcp when needed or giving the bare minimum which won't meet the needs of the children.	A local resident	0			
99	No	Yes	Children will suffer, nhs services already patchy, teachers already overstretched	Will disadvantage children with physical disabilities	A staff member	0	n/a		
100	No	Yes	This is a vital provision that affects every child in the school	This will affect all children who attend the school and may cause some children to move to a different school	A parent/carer/guardian	1		Coteford infant school	
101	No	Yes	Because this is the only school in the area which provide a true inclusion for disabled children, not an inclusion illusion which other schools provide by placing disabled children in a separate areas or classes. Our children deserve to be fully included in the life of the school, not segregated by being placed into separate units.	Because the most vulnerable part of population- disabled children will not get the care they need and their needs will not be met.	A parent/carer/guardian	1		Coteford infant school	The LA created the barrier for children to access the SRP themselves and now they are claiming that there is no demand. In fact it is so incredibly hard to get a proper and timely needs assessment in Hillingdon and even harder to get a proper EHCP. Most EHCPs are worth no more than paper they are written on. Children with a variety of conditions (including neurological and developmental) need access to a SRP catering for their physical Co morbidities but the LA denies those children access to it.
102	No	Yes	Because it is clearly a needed and beneficial resource to the school	It will cause those children to have less access to necessary help	Other	2			
103	Yes	No			A parent/carer/guardian	2			
104	No	Yes	The SRP is needed at Coteford infants. The need for the services at the school is much greater than reported. Many children are deliberately not added to the SEN register to fudge the figures.	The borough does not have enough suitable settings to accommodate the need for SEN /SRP support.	A parent/carer/guardian	2		Coteford jnr	
105	No	Yes	Children that need it would be losing additional support	Children that need additional support won't be getting it.	Other	2			
106	No	Yes	There are already not enough schools that provide support for disabilities of all kinds. Coteford is well known as an inclusive and supportive school in the borough.	A change of this nature will affect many young children with disabilities, there are not enough supportive schools currently, removing one would be taking a step backwards when it comes to recognition, inclusion and support.	A parent/carer/guardian	2		Coteford & Haydon	Please reconsider this proposal
107	No	Yes	This will be a huge detriment to the school, the wider community and most importantly the children who need it the most.	There is not adequate replacement services available through the NHS which is currently on its knees. Children will fall through the gaps, you're closing something that works fine.	A parent/carer/guardian	1		Coteford infant school	
108	No	Yes	It helps a lot of kids and parents.	They will not have help	A parent/carer/guardian	2		Coteford infant school	
109	No	Yes	There are a lot of children who benefit from the physical disabilities SRP provision at Coteford, without it I'm sure they will struggle. Removing the SRP will remove their access to support and likely increase the pressure on teachers and existing resources. This in turn will reduce teacher and resources capacity for both children needing the SRP but also children who do not.	All children accessing the SRP provision who are Hillingdon residents will be disadvantaged as specific support for them is being removed.	A parent/carer/guardian	2			It seems that the removal of this provision is an unsubstantiated attempt to cut costs and save money but it does so at the crucial cost of children and their families lives, which will not just impact them now but has the potential for lifelong implications. Childhood support should always be a priority but particularly for children with disabilities. Invest in the support of their education not reduce support to achieve a stream of revenue.
110	No	Yes		Children need specific help so shouldn't been in mainstream school	A local resident	0			Because you are trying to save money doesn't mean you can make children suffer
111	No	Yes	Because all these children and their families deserve this place.		A local resident	1		Sacred Heart	
112	No	Yes	Children need specialist support that small schools like coteford can provide to allow them to succeed	The children will but get the support they require to meet their needs	A local resident	1		Oakwood high	
113	No	Yes	How can these children integrate into under resourced mainstream where their needs are unlikely to be met?	This will place more demand on already under resourced mainstream schools and other strained resources which will no doubt need to be utilised when parents of SEN children challenge mainstream suitability	A parent/carer/guardian	3		Special school	
114	Don't know	Yes	The SRP provision is part of the community and is an important part of the provision of specialist education for young people in Hillingdon. The children taught within the SRP cannot be catered for within mainstream education and to deny the support provided in the SRP is to deny their human rights to an appropriate education.	This will seriously impact on the children (and their families) attending the SRP and those that wish to attend in future. Without specialist provision and appropriate funding they will not achieve positive outcomes.	Other	0	None		This provision is absolutely necessary
115	No	Yes	Our children need SRPs. There are a few SEN schools and getting admissions there is tough. Plus for children who can access mainstream as well as SRP is better option. Smaller setting for moderate disabled children. Please dont do this.	Its difficult to get ehcp first of all its a stressful journey to get one. These kids have got into srp because they have ehcp. Dont let all the work of parents got to a waste.	A parent/carer/guardian	2		Deanesfield	
116	No	Yes	We need places like this. Want children with special needs to feel included	Of course what happens with these children	A local resident	none			
117	No	Yes	There are parents and children who benefit massively from the resources and support available. Closing it would be detrimental to their physical health.	Many residents use this service and support and it will be detrimental to their health without the support	A local resident	4			
118	No	Yes	Coteford have done and always will do amazing work for children with additional needs and disabilities. By removing this funding children will be at a disadvantage in their school life just when they need the most support	See answer above!!	A parent/carer/guardian	2			
119	No	Yes			A local resident	0			
120	No	Yes	Valuable service to those in the community that need it	Reduces options for families who have special needs	Prefer not to say	1			
121	No	Yes	Withdrawing support from the local community	Stripping opportunities for the children.	Prefer not to say	1		Holy Rood Catholic Primary School	
122	No	Yes	All abilities should be able to access all forms of activity	I think that any form of exercise is good for mental health	A parent/carer/guardian	1		Northwood School	

123	No	Yes	Children with disabilities miss out on so many things, yet another thing taken away from them	Having a class for disabilities is important, it helps to feel accepted. Why do you think we have paralympics?	A local resident	2	Grangewood and Pentland	
124	No	Yes	Really necessary for our community and our children	Losing families living in this area	A parent/carer/guardian	1	Coteford Junior School	
125	No	Yes	Because I have special needs as well	Don't know	A local resident	0	N/A	
126	No	Yes	Why remove something that all helps children of all abilities	I would be devastated if my son was affected. He loves this Provision and encourages all sorts of new skills	A parent/carer/guardian	2		Why are funds always cut for children that need it most! It's outrageous!
127	No	Yes	Specialist provision provides a lifeline for children and families. They school is geared up to provide for the needs of the children who attend in a way other provisions will not	The needs of the children and families will not be addressed	Other	1	colnbrook school	
128	No	Yes	I am a tennis coach with GetSet4Tennis, working with Coteford Infant School. In my role I coach hundreds of children a week, with at mainstream and special needs schools. I see the growth both physically and mentally of children that benefit from SRP provisions at many schools in Hillingdon. Coteford Infants School is no different. This would be a huge loss for the school, and the children and families affected.	There is potential for many Hillingdon residents to move their children to a school in a different area, in order to benefit from SRP. It could also discourage new residents from moving into the area.	Other	0		
129	No	Yes	Not all schools are wheelchair accessible or have the facilities for psychotherapists to attend and support with treatment plans which often happen in SRPs	Disabled students would have to leave school to access treatments rather then specialists coming to them, not all mainstream schools can adapt and adjust to physically disabled students	A local resident			
130	No	Yes	It is a lifeline for disabled children.	The children it is meant to help	A local resident	1	Glebe	
131	No	Yes	The obvious reason, where are the Physically Disabled supposed to go ? There are no other venues available to use.	Obvious reason again, where else will they go. What future will they have without help now ?	A local resident	n/a	n/a	What have the above questions got to do with this appalling shut down ?
132	No	Yes	I am rate payer and I expect my rates are for schools like this and not spent on unimportant things .	because often parents with children that the school looks after need the support that a school like this gives them	A local resident	none	n/a	There are others ways that that the money can be saved , and I said before my council tax is for keeping schools and departments open . How many children and families has this helped over the last 40 years everyone is saying the children of today need more help so it doesnt seem right to closing this facility . It seems to me that someone somewhere has earmarked money to a project and the money is not there .
133	No	Yes	Because the kids with PD need support and integrate in normal schools.		A parent/carer/guardian	1	Coteford infant school	
134	No	Yes	We need schools to have extra support for are children and to stop closing vital facilities needed.	Means less recourses which is vital for the area as it continues to grow at a rapid pace	A local resident	0	0	
135	No	Yes	You shouldn't be closing down anything to do with disabilities period...	Closing down any disability support will impact the people of the area that use it...	A local resident	No	None	
136	No	Yes			A parent/carer/guardian	2		
137	No	Yes	Children with additional needs find it hard enough to access mainstream then to take away the support they need will make it extremely hard for them which may lead them to having to go to an SEN school.	It will effect the children and parents of children who are there or looking to go there with additional needs. There isn't any spaces in SEN schools in the area. Which means the children would have to go out of borough to have their needs met at a different school. Or they will go to a mainstream school with no SRP which means their needs will not be met.	A local resident			It will put more pressure on the local authorities to close this as more and more children are being diagnosed and with out these facilities the children with need more hours of 1-1 or go out of the area which will cost even more money to do so.
138	No	Yes	PD SRP are playing an important role to adaptation for children with PD.	It will take a time.	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Coteford infant school	
139	No	Yes	The class room is generally overcrowded and the teachers need all the help they can get. I feel that if you go ahead with this plan a lot of children will suffer with accessing the curriculum because of their needs	There is already a system in place which works well there is no guarantee that if you change it it will have the same effect	A local resident	None	NA	The system in place at the moment was obviously needed and that was why I implemented it do not think that things have changed that much but you need to close that system down
140	No	Yes	It provides key support to those who need it the most.	As mentioned above, it hinders those who need the support most.	Other	2		
141	No	Yes	Concerned about financial impact and extent to children's needs will be met.	Reduced local support for children with physical needs	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Coteford Infant and Coteford Junior	
142	No	Yes	It's very important for children with disabilities to be a part of typical school and feel included. Therefore, for this to happen they need 1:1 support.	The number of children who need support in school are growing rapidly	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Norman Gate School and Oakridge Infant School	
143	No	Yes	The number of SEND children is increasing. I cannot understand why Hillingdon believes that the unit will no longer be needed	This reduces the facilities available to the parents and children of Hillingdon	A local resident	0	N/A	
144	No	Yes	Hillingdon needs this facility, it's grossly underfunded at present but this is a lovely place and countless children have thrived here. It's also good for the mainstream pupils to be aware of those with extra needed	The children currently have a wonderful place to learn and grow, with the benefit of playing and learning alongside mainstream pupils	A local resident	1	Bishop Ramsey	Closing this unit is a money based decision, and is not in the best interests of local children or their families
145	No	Yes	Because everything is being cut from sen	Yes of course they will parents need places at schools like this for these children with needs	Other	None now	Used to attend ladybanks	I went to Coteford myself many yrs ago it has always been a mainstream school with provision for children disabilities. We need more SEN schools and places not to constantly cut them there is far more children now coming through with needs.
146	No	Yes	Limited provisions that cater to children with additional needs		A parent/carer/guardian	1		
147	No	Yes	Children who are currently attending the school who have physical disabilities will be affected negatively. Children with physical disabilities in the local borough will not have a local school to attend. They are already having to deal with living life with a disability but not having a school local to them that can provide this extra support they need will affect all future children who are looking to join the school.	As per my comment above disabled children will no longer be able to attend a school which is local to them. All children should be entitled to attend a school local to them and this should apply to disabled children too. They should be able to attend a school that offers the support they need in the local borough and not be discriminated against.	A parent/carer/guardian			
148	No	Yes	As a disabled young woman myself, and having read about the service the SRP provides, I can confidently say that these accommodations really do help both disabled, neurodiverse, neurotypical and able-bodied people. By having a safe space to learn and grow people like me can flourish. Without such an environment, many of us fall through the cracks and struggle to assimilate into school and society in general. Closing the SRP would be truly detrimental to the lives of many students, parents, and staff who care about their community.	See the above response.	A local resident	3		I do not wish to provide this information.
149	No	Yes	Because it will have a detrimental affect on the children with special educational needs that have thrived with the current provision	There are many residents with children who rely on these services to feel as though they fit in with society.	A parent/carer/guardian	2		
150	No	No	It is a vital resource		A local resident	1		
151	No	Yes	In a world where where we should be inclusive, it feels discriminatory to exclude these children with PD. Currently I think it is wonderful that these children are integrated in mainstream schools.	It will disadvantage every child who attends the school not just those with PD	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Coteford infants	
152	No	Don't know	Have all stakeholders and users been consulted?	I won't know until it's clear whether all users have been consulted	A local resident	None	None	See above
153	No	Yes	Essential service that is needed in the local area to support kids with special needs to stay in mainstream school.	Essential service that is needed in the local area to support kids with special needs to stay in mainstream school.	A local resident	2	Newnham	
154	No	Yes	Because it really helps children who have those difficulties. My daughter went to Coteford, she was recommended to go there by the Child development centre at Hillingdon hospital, yes it was a long time ago but Coteford is a wonderful school and it such beautiful able to continue to help children who have physical disabilities. Also if any children in catchment area go to Coteford then will have to change to another school and this causes distress to the child and also the family	Because changing a school is upsetting for a child, especially those with disabilities. When my daughter went to Coteford the lay out of the school was easy as it was all one floor and also her peer group was so accepting of her disability.	A parent/carer/guardian	2		
155	No	Yes	Because you are putting vulnerable children at risk for a thoughtless cost-cutting exercise masquerading itself as an inclusion strategy.	You will remove local provision, further stressing the wider provision out there.	Other	0		
156	No	Yes	SRP has been in Coteford for over 40 years	Children who have SRP or EHCP Funding. All children in the Borough	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Coteford Infant School	
157	No	Yes	In this time of equality for all, and making way to integrate whilst supporting those with physical disabilities into a welcoming society, it completely counter-productive, and uncaring to withdraw such support. In 2012, the Paralympics brought to the world's attention, the capabilities of those who lived with disability, this is generally made possible for those who live with disability due to extra support they receive. Take this away, and you are condemning many to a life of less quality. Personally, I could not live my life, knowing I was reducing the quality of that of others, especially those whose lives are, and will be more challenging than my own.	Those children who receive support will have their current AND FUTURE life quality reduced: simply put: WHY SHOULD THIS HAPPEN TO THEM? Have they not already enough to contend with? I lived with a disabled family member for several years. So much is already denied to those with physical disability. We could not even go out, if there was not a sufficient hoisting toilet. This is the reality for the physically disabled.	A local resident	None	N/A	
158	No	Yes	Valuable resource with the continuity to the junior school also important. Huge value to both the children with PD and able bodied and other neurodivergent children . The ethos of Coteford infants AND juniors is unique and is something the borough should be proud of and show other boroughs how it's done	Yes children in borough who would benefit from the unique ethos , culture and provision of this school will undoubtedly suffer as a result and their families alongside them. In the same way the learning environment and acceptance of all is a great benefit to families of able bodied children	A local resident	None now but had 3 children through Coteford infants and juniors in the past	None now but had 3 children through Coteford infants and juniors in the past	Have had 3 children through the school and at one time was a Governor for children with Special Needs at the junior school and so I know how vital and special the PD SRP at Coteford Infants and Junior schools are. Coteford should be as flagship and something other schools can aim for
159	No	Yes	It is important that the provision remains in place to safeguard the future development of all pupils who will access the school. Currently other means of access are stretched which will disadvantage children	Children who are residents in Hillingdon will be disadvantaged	A local resident	1		None as currently a baby but we access Coteford children's centre
160	No	Yes	Kids need every help that they can get.	Where would the children get the help.	Prefer not to say	2		
161	No	Yes	Because it is not a choice a lot of children get to be at a specialist school & it should be. Not only did my child make friends for life from our time at coteford . When she became a teenager those same friends with disability helped her have a peer group & social life. It made an extra community as disabled kids 99% of the time have a hard time at secondary school. NOT ALL DISABLED KIDS GET THE CHOICE TO LIVE A LONG LIFE SO A SAFE CARRING SCHOOL WITH SPECIALIST TEACHERS IS THE KINDEST & SAFEST OPTION. This is just another cost cutting exercise caused by the greedy last government. Maybe stop paying the local councillor who's chosen to have a 3 month holiday at our expense.	Disabled children there siblings & families	A local resident	None	None	Stealing from the most vulnerable in our society because our local Tony council has squandered our children's future disgusting. You should be ashamed of yourself David Simmons
162	No	Yes			A local resident	2		

163	No	Yes	I have benefited from it	You're taking a great school with a reputation and trying to change it for no reason	Other	0	N/A	Don't do it
164	No	Yes	This is a much needed provision and will disadvantage those with physical disabilities by not being available. I am strongly opposed to this and it should not go ahead. They need this resource and it should not be denied them.	If the provision is closed to those that need it then they will have less access and for some this will result in no access so it is obvious it should not be closed. They need the provision and that it is why it was provided in the first place. I can see no advantage to closing it for the children who need it and it will only disadvantage them so it should remain accessible.	A local resident	N/A	N/A	
165	No	Yes	I hear a lot from the parents of children with disabilities that it is extremely hard to find support for their children. My own son went to Coteford school and it was a really valuable experience to see children with different needs and learn how to communicate with them on a daily basis. Teachers at Coteford are really a great team - highly professional and very caring. The lack of funding might discourage them in their very demanding work	Families with children with disabilities will certainly be affected	A parent/carer/guardian	2	St Clement Danes	
166	No	Yes	From what I understand the the SRP service provided by Coteford is not yet replicated anywhere else yet. Therefore, it would be a loss of a valuable provision for those children who would benefit immensely from it.	As stated above.	A local resident	0	N/a	
167	No	Yes	Any lessening of the existing provisions will be damaging for the future of the children. There are many different forms of physical disabilities that damage a child's future. If any educational cuts are to be made, it should be starting at a secondary level.	The NHS is already at breaking point, so kicking the can down the road will only cost taxpayers and hurt children through the delays.	A local resident	0	0	We are fortunate that our child, whilst in school, did not have significant physical injury, but some friends including a wheelchair fencing Paralympian had no choice as children. I would hate to see British and Hillington children further impaired by lack of provisions.
168	No	Yes	Mainstream schools do not have the space or facilities to accommodate students with physical needs. Many of them have more than one floor and do not have lifts. School life would become restrictive and unenjoyable and that is just not fair on those students who need lots of effort, time, love and care.	As above	Other	0	N/a	
169	No	Yes	Don't stop children/people getting UK medals and improving their work being just because they have a disability to start!	There are people with physical disabilities in every borough	A local resident	None	None	
170	No	Yes	I worked for many years at Coteford Junior School and witnessed first hand the appreciation of the many parents whose children benefited from the SRP of both Coteford schools - and crucially, from the caring ethos which prevailed due to this special provision. Our children would not bat an eyelid as a walker or a wheelchair and the atmosphere was healthy inclusive. This is not the case in all schools - so many do not want to deal with the issues that come with a child with a physical disability and children are sidelined and made to feel different. Over and over parents told us that their previous school had encouraged them to move to Coteford - they did not want to deal with additional support/physio/interventions, and SATS results can be affected by the learning issues that often come in tandem with physical disabilities. Basically, schools would say that they couldn't meet the child's needs. "Wouldn't meet their needs is what our staff believed". This needs to be addressed with schools as a priority before closing the SRP. I feel so sorry for these parents. Their life is a constant fight for their children and this is one more blow.	See previous	Other	0		
171	No	Yes	Mainstream cannot cope with these children's needs. I'm a retired secondary teacher. I know. Staff and buildings adaptation will cost more.	As above.	A local resident	None		I've lived in Hillington since 1980s...always proud of how this borough managed to update/keep our libraries open etc. For our community. What's happening? The new council leader?!
172	No	Yes			A parent/carer/guardian	2		
173	No	Yes	the provision has proved to be effective, positive and rewarding to the community, let it continue.	as above.	A local resident	n/a	n/a	cut provisions for illegal immigrants and maintain all support for local residents that have/do contribute to the community.
174	No	Yes	It's a disgrace to remove this from our local area	We need to give our most vulnerable the same advances as all others	A local resident	0		
175	No	Yes	Facilities for children with physical disabilities should be provided in mainstream school	It will take this provision away from children that need it	A local resident	0		
176	No	Yes	Coteford has a long and excellent track record of supporting children with special needs. The considerable expertise and resources already in place would fall by the wayside. If the plan is to promote inclusive education in all schools, significant funds need to be available to develop the needed training, staffing and facilities. Ad hoc funding and poorly conceived will not fill the gaps currently met by specialist centres such as Coteford.	Where will children with special needs go? - either to an over-subscribed central service that is likely to be challenging for local parents to reach - or to schools with inadequate resources to support their needs, leading to even more demands on local teachers and a poorer level of education for all.	Other	0	N/A	Public consultation is supposed to be that - a consultation rather than a dissemination of a decision. Coteford's SRP is being closed on the basis of a concerted definition of a SRP that simply overrides Coteford's 40 year history of supporting local children and the expertise of its SEN teaching staff. What does a "traditional SRP" even mean? The suggestion is that there will be no change in care plan and the support outlined in the EHCP - but there has been no clear response as to how the plan will be met following the SRP's closure. As a former pupil of the school and having grown up in the area I am appalled at the council's decision.
177	No	Yes	I think its disgusting the LA are trying to remove critical funding, which will affect children's education.	As I SEN parent myself, I have fought every step of the way to get my daughter the help she needs and deserves. To keep removing the funding for children's education is terrible.	A local resident	1	harlyn primary school	
178	No	Yes	It's been in our community for 40 years. It's an option for parents. It's known for its outstanding quality professional teaching. Closing the SRP before you've rolled out the 5-year strategy makes absolutely no sense!	This school sets the standard for inclusion matters. Realistically, you should be taking tips from this school. And	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Coteford	I'm incredibly disappointed with a lack of support this school has realistically had from Hillington council.
179	No	Yes			A parent/carer/guardian	0		
180	No	Yes	My daughter attended Coteford Infant & Junior Schools. She gained a lot of understanding of children that had disabilities. It has served her well in dealing with ALL people who have disabilities.	Will disadvantage ALL children in the immediate area with disabilities who would want to interact with ALL children of their age. Don't put these children in 'boxes' they deserve better. JUST LEAVE THE KIDS ALONE!!	A local resident	None		Left school a long time ago but was a pupil at Coteford Infants & Coteford Junior Schools. Both caring schools
181	No	Yes	This school is a valuable asset for handicapped people.	Persons needing assistance will not get it or have to travel far a field	A local resident	None	Not Applicable	As 4
182	No	Yes	This School is fully equipped and ready for physically disabled children. I'm absolutely mystified as to why you would want to shut something like that down. Seems like a great waste of money and resources. Keep physically disabled children at the school. Some of us parents purposefully picked this school because we wanted to raise the next generation of kind conscientious caring children. Taking it away since rushed and not well thought out at all.	Because it's served our community for 40 years. It would be a great loss to the area	A parent/carer/guardian	1	Coteford	The LA has forgotten about this school it simply doesn't get the recognition it deserves.
183	No	Yes	This is an essential service that is needed by the community. Not accepting new patients, and then erroneously stating the service is no longer used/needed is a criminal manipulation of facts.	No access to services will be a massive setback to already marginalised disabled children and young people.	A parent/carer/guardian	1	St JOA	There are no valid proposals worthy of comment. Taking away a proficient amazing service without good reason.
184	No	No	I don't not believe there is adequate support for special needs children in the hillington borough	I have a special needs grandson who's parents have had to move out of the borough in order to provide for their son	A local resident	None	None	
185	No	Yes			Other	0		
186	No	Yes	With special needs schools at such a rarity, the last thing Hillington council should be doing is closing one.		Other	0	0	
187	No	Yes	Why do you want to discriminate against children who need the Physical Disabilities SRP? What happened to equality for all?	Children who need the SRP as they have physical disabilities. Where will they be able to access the support you need if you remove it. Give ALL children a chance.	A local resident	0	0	
188	No	Yes	SRPs are crucial to ensure inclusivity to those who are not able bodied in a mainstream setting. To remove the SRP from Coteford would be a travesty	No SRP at Coteford - where would a parent send their physically disabled child on the side of the Borough? Coteford has always been known for its inclusivity.	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Meadow	
189	No	Yes	As a previous Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator in a Hillington Primary School, I visited many 'Special' Schools and connected with the staff there. There was so much expertise in these schools, and I used much of the knowledge I obtained to pass on to the staff in my school, and to help my pupils who had Special Educational Needs. I personally saw how detrimental it was to close these 'Special' Schools in the pretence that 'all children are equal'. Children, like adults, are not equal; some need more attention or a different way of learning from others. When a 'Special School' is closed, not only do the pupils there suffer, but the expertise of the staff is lost forever, and teachers in the mainstream schools do not have the experts to learn from.	As above. Neither the pupils nor the 'mainstream' staff will gain from the expertise of the staff of this very special Hillington school.	A local resident	None		My children have all left school, but as a keen educationalist, past parent and grandparent, I still take a lot of interest in the local schools.
190	No	Yes	There are children with PD needing school access	I know parents who would not get their educational needs met after the closure	A local resident	1	Sacred Heart	
191	No	Yes	The facilities and additional resources that are available at Coteford are unlike those available in any other mainstream school. Taking these away from Coteford is ridiculous	You have an amazing school that has done such a fantastic job in the past educating children with special needs alongside other children why would you take that away? Absolute madness	A local resident	2	Field End infant school	
192	No	Yes						
193	No	Yes	Specific support for students should be in place	Children need the specific support that this proposal will take away.	A parent/carer/guardian	1		Not yet at school
194	No	Yes	Whilst the children are taught in classes alongside their peers for at least 80% of the day they also access rooms that form part of the specialist provision or unit at other times (e.g physiotherapy room/ occupational therapy room, sen teaching support room for individual programs that take place in small group or individual sessions, speech and language therapy sessions in special areas, specialist equipment in the playground and 5 sluice rooms for medical procedures and changing including hoists. All of these form part of the unit and would be closed if the SRP was closed. The decision to manage the unit by fully integrating children for the majority of their time was made over 30 years ago and at every review during that time supported and praised by the LA. The SRP has achieved national recognition as a center of excellence. It was used as a resource for other schools to help them become more inclusive. Closing the SRP will lose this valuable Hillington resource. The LA must share some accountability if the resource is currently under utilized	Choice will be reduced for children with physical disabilities. Expertise will be lost. There will be an additional financial burden if resources have to be uniquely provided in every school when they could be shared more cost efficiently if there is a hub that is well supported and well used. Of course parents need to see the benefit of a hub and the additional resources that can be provided in a hub. Coteford already is a purpose built school on one level with integrated disabled toilets and handrails throughout etc	A local resident	1	I am a grandparent of 2 children under 8	I fully appreciate that the SRP is not viable with very low numbers but believe that this can and should be turned around. The LA and school leaders working together could re-establish the center of excellence that the children of the borough and parents deserve.
195	No	Yes	All children should have the right to education with the right support	People will need to find other places for their children to be schooled	Prefer not to say			

196	No	Yes	I think it is important that children are able to access the regular therapies provided by the provision and whilst in an ideal world that would take place in any school, the reality is that therapeutic services provided in one place for a number of children are more cost effective and reliable. Staff are also highly experienced and able to provide the care that children need and can support one another. It also provides a supportive network for parents who have an understanding of the particular demands placed on them through caring for children with physical disabilities.	Parents of children with physical disabilities value the reassurance of their child being at a school where staff are highly trained and experienced in looking after children with physical disabilities.	Other	0	n/a	
197	No	Yes	Where else are these families and children supposed to go? Travel unfeasibly long journeys or struggle at ill-equipped schools for their needs. Living with a disability is difficult enough, don't get these children off to a bad start deliberately.	For the same reasons above	Other	1		
198	No	Yes	I like how children and parents are given an opportunity to be able to attend school which provides such good quality of learning. I mean the school contributed to raise two para Olympians, what an achievement this is! Also if parents with disabled children live close to school then it may be extra hard for them to commute to news school. Coteford school isn't big and that's why children are doing better there.	Well yes, maybe disadvantage parents who will need to travel further to drop their children off to different school.	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Sacred Heart primary school	
199	No	Yes	Children with all kinds of disabilities should be able to have easy access around school and do not deserve to struggle.	Read 2	Prefer not to say	0	N/A	Make access easy for all children
200	No	Yes	I strongly disagree. Why take away a provision away from disabled children so that they suffer and won't be able to access their right to education?	The proposed plan will significantly disadvantage disabled children and their families. Taking away this provision means denying disabled children the right to education.	A local resident	2		
201	No	Yes			A local resident	None		
202	No	Yes	Very unfair to children that need special help.	as above	A local resident	1	Private Nursery	
203	No	Yes	It doesn't cater to the parents who are in need of this and will further disadvantage children with physical disabilities	In the long run, these children might not be given the proper care they deserve.	A local resident	1		
204	No	Yes	Physically disabled children need one and one and catered support for them. They can't receive this in mainstream schools as there are too many kids.		A local resident	2	In Harrow	
205	No	Yes	It provides support not only to students but to parents and their siblings	Disadvantage children receiving the education they need and deserve	Other	1	N/a	
206	No	Yes	Children in the local area need the support		A local resident	2		
207	No	Yes	I feel the SRP is beneficial for children with physical needs as well as those without. The school has a wide range of staff with experience in supporting children with physical needs which is not the case in other schools were they may have only one child. The children with additional physical needs also benefit from being with other children with similar challenges both emotionally and physically ie. Not being singled out and having opportunities to work with children with similar levels of need as well as children without physical disabilities. The school is adapted to meet the needs of children in wheelchairs, access, changing and toilet facilities, space. Therapy provision is more accessible within the school as an SRP.	It will disadvantage the children with physical needs and their families who want their child to attend a mainstream school but also want their child to have peers who also have similar challenges. This supports the child's well being and also provides support for parents who would feel less isolated.	A staff member	None	None	I have concerns that the children's needs will not be met adequately in other mainstream schools in terms of accessing the school environment fully, having full access to the curriculum and having the same level of staff expertise and therapy the children need.
208	No	Yes	Children of all shapes and sizes should always be given the support infrastructures they need to access mainstream education. Regardless of whether they need a wheelchair, a walker, scribes or teaching assistants in class. I speak as a former student at Coteford who, having spent the early years of my childhood in and out of hospital, was welcomed into the school with open arms. Following an extended period of time in hospital, the provisions enabled my parents to send me to school in the knowledge that I would be safe, strengthened by the community around me, encouraged and not belittled, and most importantly they knew I could have the same access to a full life just as any of my peers. We as disabled people have just the same right to a fulfilling education as anyone else and we should never be denied this because we have differences in how our bodies behave and look. The beauty of the Specialist Resource Provisions is that it is expressly integrated into the school, disabled students and moreover disabled people, are often forcibly alienated and isolated by the society we live in. This often starts in infancy. Children as they grow will make comments out of ignorance, teachers will often have little or no training when it comes to help us keep up in class and so we sometimes are left behind. Coteford infant school was the complete inverse of that. My teachers and TAs learned about how my disability put up roadblocks for me, they sought out explanations as to when best to take my medication and their enthusiasm made me feel as though I was welcomed to be there. Ready to explore the world with curiosity and a playfulness that all children have. We were not just put in a remote building and forgotten about. Killing the integrated provision will mean the confidence of families and the children themselves will wither and die from within, it will fracture classrooms and leave disabled students without the staff vital for their development as human beings. This can and should never be allowed to happen to disabled children in the 21st century.	It will take away the opportunity for disabled children in northwest London to access mainstream and public education. It will force families to either: homeschool children - which we know means that education becomes more expensive due to the cost of having to find private tutors and courses to teach their kids at home whilst the parents have to go and work. Or it means that these children would have to be bussed or driven to specialist schools away from the local area which again increases costs. In this case parents would have to take more time to drive their kids to these schools or the local council more money to fund tasks to pick them up. If we think back to my response to the previous question, disabled children are often isolated and 'othered' by society. We are publicly shamed and shown to be different, our differences are rarely talked about in schools. It was bad 20 years ago and it sadly has not improved much since. How do you think those impressionable kids feel being sent to a 'special school'? To essentially be told that they are not good enough to be in 'normal school' with children who look exactly like them, talk exactly like them, and with whom they share similar interests like them except for these physical differences. Much like taking food away from the starving, taking away disability provisions from disabled people means depriving them of another part of their humanity. These provisions help us become the best versions of ourselves, I have an Undergraduate Degree in History as well as a Masters Degree in International Relations. This is just my story but countless others have had their lives blossom as a result of the provisions at Coteford Infant School. For god sake you have world renowned athletes who have	Other	I don't have any children		
209	No	Yes	This is a ridiculous question, this facility provides services to vulnerable people who need the support that only specialist centres can provide. People who've attended have gone on to do amazing things, I'm personally familiar with some of them. I've seen counsils toss aside vital services like this before when will it end?	This is a vital service for the community, its continued operation is a vital service for this community.				
210	No	Yes	I worked at Coteford for more than 11 years. The SRP is an integral part of the school and it serves the community very well.	These families of SEN children love the atmosphere and welcoming nature that the school has worked so hard to establish. The expert TAs have developed such food skills to support them.	A local resident	2		
211	No	Yes	Because saying "There is an expectation that children with physical disabilities should have their needs met in mainstream schools with reasonable adjustments" is grossly negligent considering that the (PD) SRP is one of those reasonable adjustments. I am speaking as a PD person myself.	Cutting funds destined towards disabled children will show a lack of empathy that the whole country will be ashamed of.	Prefer not to say	n/a	n/a	
212	No	Yes	Coteford are an absolute must for disabled children and has done immense good for the community, closing the PD SRP would be another removal of provisions for individuals who are already starting off on the back foot.	Disabled children are everywhere, why on earth would we remove resources from them that support them and help them in getting on like everyone else?	Other	0	N/A	Councils in this country must stop taking resources from those already at a significant disadvantage. They will NOT receive the same benefit in standard schools with 'reasonable adjustments', there is ample evidence going against this.
213	No	Yes						
214	No	Yes	Coteford has a long history of providing this important service, and that should not be endangered by withholding funding.	It is an important service that should not be denied to residents while there is no acceptable alternative service available across the borough as a whole.				
215	No	Yes	Schools and places of Education to support ALL learners, despite disability are a necessary and important part of the EDI for ongoing stability of learning and living environments.	Schools and places of Education to support ALL learners, despite disability are a necessary and important part of the EDI for ongoing stability of learning and living environments.	A local resident	0		
216	No	Yes	You have not shown a specific detailed alternative 'ready to go' solution with better than existing facilities within an equally accessible location	Without clarity and of the alternative beyond the general 'mainstream' solution, it's unclear that the families concerned will not be disadvantaged	A local resident	2	Harefield Junior School	
217	No	Don't know	It has bought out the best in these people and have thrived due to the resources, I know that in mainstream schools successes like this will be much difficult to reach	From what point does the funds get taken from? Will it affect any other funding elsewhere?	A local resident	1	None	
218	No	Yes	These services are desperately needed and this will affect countless children in our borough. This is shocking that the council is trying to withdraw these services.	The children affected are also residents! They will grow and will most likely continue to live here. They need services like these to continue to grow into independent individuals.	A local resident	3	Warrender	
219	No	Yes	Required to support local children	Not enough provisions	A local resident	2	Glebe	
220	No	Yes	As a former parent of a child at Coteford I know that the children and parents supported by this resource value it highly, and that there are parents trying to access the resource for their children who have been informed they are unable to, yet the information put by Hillingdon is that there is a decline in need. It concerns me that an extremely valuable and effective resource could be lost potentially due to misinformation and flawed statistics.	Resources such as these are rare, they allow more children with disabilities who would otherwise require special education to fully access mainstream effectively, and the value of the SRP is felt by the whole school community as it creates not only specific support for the children but also a wider ethos of respect, support and adaptation around disability. I have seen how the SRPs positively affect the culture of both the infant and Junior schools in creating a highly informed and effective approach to SEN as a whole. Having an SRP also allows disabled children to have a community of children with similar struggles within the wider mainstream community. It is very well saying that disabled children can be accommodated in a mainstream environment, but there is the risk of being the only disabled child which can also feel isolating for both the child and the family, having an SRP creates a supportive community which is desperately important.	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Formerly Coteford	
221	No	Yes	There are not enough SEN settings in the trough to cater for the needs of the young people who need them. Closing one provision puts added stress onto an already broken system	As above	Other	2	Grangewood and Maryln	
222	No	Yes	The school needs the SRP provision		A parent/carer/guardian	2	Coteford	
223	No	Yes	The children that attend Coteford infants need specialist provision to be able to access the curriculum. Without this support those children are going to suffer greatly and will not achieve the same as their peers which is not fair.	The children using these facilities are Hillingdon residents too, they deserve the best start in life.	A parent/carer/guardian	1	Coteford infant school	I'm the parent of a child attending Coteford and a local resident. I also teach at a school in Hillingdon. Money needs to be spent supporting our most vulnerable children.
224	No	Yes	It has a good reputation and these services are important.	It will be closing down a good unit, there aren't that many good units out there.	A local resident	2	Deansfield and Queensmead	
225	No	Yes	It's an important facility for inclusion.	Disabled children will lose access to education	A local resident	2		
226	No	Yes	Children really need it and the Coteford school is highly recommend for this	It's affect them	Other	1	Longfield	

227	No	Yes	A friend of mine attended and it helped him to realise his dreams. Why are you shutting down dreams?	Of course it would disadvantage residents. The government says it wants disabled people in work with but then shuts down institutions that help them realise opportunities in adulthood. How does that make sense?	Other	0	0	I think it is a ridiculous proposal.
228	No	Yes	These resources are important to empower and meet needs to be a fully inclusive world	Discriminate against disabled children	Other			
229	No	Yes	More facilities an opportunities are needed within the local area		A local resident	2		
230	No	Yes	CIS is highly skilled at this provision after years of expertise alongside integrating children with PDs into mainstream education. The wider school community benefits from this provision by virtue of the ethos of nurture and inclusion.	CIS and its linked junior school Coteford Junior are built on one level for ease of access with specialist rooms and facilities.	A local resident	0	n/a	
231	No	Yes	Any resource for disabled children that can encourage freedom and a sense of independence needs to be protected and celebrated not removed	It will make life harder than it already is for these kids and their families.	Other			
232	No	Yes			A local resident			
233	No	Yes	The proposal states: The SRP is not a traditional, additionally resourced learning space at Coteford Infant School, and therefore the closure is not a closure of a specific unit or classroom. All students who have SRP provision written in their Educational Health Care Plan (EHCP) for Coteford Infant School, access mainstream classes at all times. The SRP is described on documents as an "Integrated SRP" requiring pupils to have lessons in the mainstream with provision of space for therapies. No matter what it is called it needs to continue to run and funding needs to be increased and reconsidered not taken away. Whilst it is not a traditional SRP and the title SRP may be a misnomer it is a travesty that it has been funded in the same way as traditional SRP, because the costs attached to making good provision for pupils with PD, who also tend to have additional and complex needs, usually requiring support from at least three types of specialist therapists, plus expensive equipment, along with full time care and support, far exceed costs attached to other, more traditional SRPs. Over the course of the years this has had a detrimental impact upon the school's finances. However it is still undoubtedly specialist provision. We have been very privileged to be able to welcome pupils with PD and other complex needs but have only been able to create a culture, unlike other local schools, where inclusion lies at the heart of our provision, due to the expertise and consistency of the therapists that have been working with us for many years. This is similar to the way in which a special school may function. The school did not choose to function in this way. Once SRP is named on a child's EHCP the CNWL therapists will not be allocated to the pupil. Therefore, like many specialist provisions the school has had to secure their own therapists. However, without access to the consistency, expert advice, training, pre-admission planning provided by the therapists, Coteford will become like many other local schools, and we will be unable to meet needs of pupils with more complex difficulties.	•It will disadvantage pupils with PD. This has already been clearly demonstrated via a pupil with PD who has been refused access to the Coteford SRP on the grounds, as stated by the IBI, that the school is no longer admitting pupils to the SRP. If this is a true proposal and consultation, rather than a pre-determined decision, this should not have happened. This pupil has entered the school with a mainstream EHCP. So far the pupil has had no input from a speech and language therapist (SALT). Advice from occupational therapists (OT) has been conflicting leaving staff unsure. The school has had to consult SRP therapists to ensure training has been given to staff working with the pupil. This pupil is clearly disadvantaged in comparison to other pupils with PD who have access to SRP therapists. This is one pupil but one pupil matters and is the experience of the one pupil the future for others? I have no doubt that closure will disadvantage other pupils with PD in the same way. It would be a wonderful world if the CNWL therapy service could provide therapies with the same consistency, training and diligence as the SRP therapists. They cannot do this because the service is overstretched. There are recruitment issues. I have recently been informed by a senior officer from within the SALT service: "Unfortunately there is no spare capacity anywhere in the system." This does not bode well for the future of pupils with PD. •Last year 2 of our pupils with mainstream EHCPs had to ask Local authority to commission our private therapist – one for SALT and one for OT – because of the limited capacity within CNWL. So far this year none of our "mainstream" children have had any SALT due to capacity within CNWL. •The SRP is closed some pupils who may otherwise have attended Coteford. Obviously their needs won't be met	A staff member	0	na	The proposal states: The SRP is described on documents as an "Integrated SRP" requiring pupils to have lessons in the mainstream with provision of space for therapies. No matter what it is called it needs to continue to run and funding needs to be increased and reconsidered not taken away. It is a travesty that it has been funded in the same way as traditional SRP, because the costs attached to making good provision for pupils with PD, far exceed costs attached to other, more traditional SRPs. Over the course of the years this has had a detrimental impact upon the school's finances. It is still undoubtedly specialist provision. We have been very privileged to be able to welcome pupils with PD and other complex needs but have only been able to create a culture, unlike other local schools, where inclusion lies at the heart of our provision, due to the expertise and consistency of the therapists. This is similar to the way in which a special school may function. The school did not choose to function in this way. Without access to the consistency, expert advice, training, pre-admission planning provided by the therapists, Coteford will become like many other local schools, and we will be unable to meet needs of pupils with more complex difficulties. No change to the support outlined in any child's Educational Health Care Plan – not correct. One pupil, who was told there would be no admissions to SRP has already had to have support from our private therapists. The SRP therapists provide: essential Risk Assessments: Not a service provided by CNWL. Bespoke training at the beginning of the academic year – not provided by CNWL. Without this expertise the expertise and knowledge of the staff will diminish and Coteford, will become like other local schools and likely will end up stating we do not have the capacity or expertise to be able to meet needs. No change in any equipment – funded mainly by the school over the past years. With less funding our capacity to do this will be impacted. Other schools do not have access to equipment that Coteford already has in house. The equipment policy of the local authority, which requires schools to fund the first £1000 for any equipment is however a policy that will be challenged. The local authority has absolute and non-delegable duty to ensure that schools are able to use best endeavours to meet SENDs. Where is this £1000 to come from? What happens when the equipment costs £900? Without SRP funding the school will find it impossible to manage funding equipment. We will have to say we cannot meet needs. However SRP funding needs to be increased to a realistic level to reflect actual costs of therapies, equipment and support. No change to the plan for any child - there will be a change in the school's capacity to deliver planned
234	No	Yes	There are not enough schools who provide this essential service to young children		A local resident	None		I am commenting as a grandparent
235	No	Yes	Much needed	So obvious				
236	No	Yes	This is an extremely important provision for the disability community where vital resources like physiotherapy etc. are on site so that the student doesn't have to miss their education by having to go to these services outside the school	This is an extremely important provision for the disability community where vital resources like physiotherapy etc. are on site so that the student doesn't have to miss their education by having to go to these services outside the school	A local resident	None		I also feel that if you go ahead with this, you will be putting more pressure on the NHS because the children will have to rely on outside agencies, transport costs and chaperones to fulfil these tasks, while at the same time, the children will be missing vital learning opportunities.
237	No	Yes	Equality ... these children deserve all the help they can get	Parents are the losers alongside the children ...all Hillingdon residents	A local resident	None		Not applicable
238	No	Yes	All children deserve a start in life, whether disabled or not.	Disabled children will be disadvantaged. They should be given the same advantages as able bodied children.	A local resident	0	N/A	I hope it is not closed & disabled children are able to reach their full potential in life.
239	No	Yes	It's very important to integrate and include as many children with disabilities into mainstream schooling and activities as possible. My partially sighted son (now 7yrs old and attending the Royal Academy of Music) benefitted greatly from being able to attend mainstream schooling since he had a SEND at his previous school	These cuts/changes will cause more disabled children to be excluded from mainstream school and activities and their families to feel more anxious and desperate about their child's social emotional and physical welfare.	A local resident	None		My child is at RAM music conservatoire. Please do everything in your power to keep the SRP available and do not close the PD. These resources are a lifeline for disabled children and their families.
240	No	Yes	This will impact the children entitled to srp places the provision that is provided. The SRP is such a available provision funding should be increased for such high quality provision not reduced. Many previous pupils who have had srp places at coteford credit the school as having a huge impact on their education and life. Many praising the inclusion of being able to attend mainstream at Coteford instead of a special school.	All the children who should access the srp who have physical disabilities, they will not have access to the specialist they need. The idea that NHS will pick up the workload is crazy as currently the NHS can't manage to fulfil seeing children with an ehcp due to staffing let alone add more children to workload. Other schools that have to make costly adjustments, ramps lifts? and the children who go to these schools because the budget will be affected. Staff will not get pre-admission training, consistent support. Children may be delayed in starting their education due to lack of staff training e.g. physio /risk assessments	A staff member	2	Coteford	Its stated that no change to the support outlined in any child's Educational Health Care Plan however with srp funding being removed this will certainly have a huge impact. NHS cannot meet demand of children with EHCP at Coteford it would increase their workload, e.g. some children with EHCP have not been seen for 8 months due to NHS staff shortage of therapists Its also stated no change in any equipment – how is school meant to afford specialist chairs, tables, wheelchairs with funding being removed? I feel the council have pushed to close the srp and have put the plans in motion over a year ago telling families we no longer have an srp at Coteford this has then supported the councils narrative that the reason for closure is demand. The whole process doesn't feel honest and feels like correct procedures haven't been followed the decision had already been made and the consultation followed a year later it feels dishonest and disappointing
241	No	Yes	I work at Coteford and children that need provision to flourish within the school.	Schools will not be able to provide for children and saying that these provisions will be provided by the NHS just try to get physio is a waiting list.	A staff member	none	NA	
242	No	Yes	It is outrageous to close it!		A local resident	0		
243	No	Yes	There are many physically or slightly mentally challenged children that benefit from mainstream schools and this opportunity should not be withdrawn for them.	I have been impacted by a grandchild who has been rejected from mainstream schools and had there been these facilities then the early intervention would have helped him. Residents who have children with a disability, other children who attend Coteford that are at the school to promote inclusivity and not abism	A local resident	0	0	Please help children, after all they are the future!
244	No	Yes	Because it provides such a wonderful opportunity for children with a physical disability to get the extra help they need as well as spending time alongside their peers in a mainstream school, for so many children this is a vital provision to help them build confidence in their own abilities whilst having the stability and support that they need from the provision; something that is not possible in other mainstream schools. This is a real asset to Hillingdon and it would be horrendous to lose it		A local resident	2		Newsham
245	No	Yes	The closure of a Physical Disabilities Specialist Resource Provision (PD SRP) creates clear challenges for the pupils who depend on it. These children will lose access to the specialised support, therapies, and tailored resources necessary for their physical and educational needs. This disruption in services, alongside the transition to a new school or mainstream setting, will likely have a negative impact on their learning and emotional well-being. The loss of a familiar environment and support network will inevitably cause anxiety for the children, particularly those who thrive on routine and stability. For parents and families, the closure will create significant difficulties in securing alternative provisions that offer the same level of care. Families will face increased travel times and costs as they seek out other schools, which may be limited or oversubscribed. Parents will have justified concerns that their child's specific needs will not be adequately met in a new setting, which could affect the child's progress and access to appropriate educational support. Educationally, the integration of children with physical disabilities into mainstream classrooms will present serious challenges. Mainstream teachers, who may lack the necessary specialised training, will struggle to support these pupils effectively without additional resources or guidance. This shift will likely strain existing classroom resources and negatively affect the learning experience for all students. The absence of the SRP's dedicated facilities and expertise will create significant gaps in the quality of support provided to children with disabilities. Staffing issues will also arise from the closure. The SRP's specialised staff, including teaching assistants and therapists, will face either redeployment or redundancy. This will lead to the loss of valuable expertise, making it harder for the school to support children with physical disabilities in the future. Additionally, staff who have built strong relationships with the children will experience a decrease in morale as they witness the dismantling of essential services. The legal and community implications of closing the PD SRP are also substantial. The school must comply with its legal obligations under the Equality Act, ensuring that reasonable adjustments are still provided for disabled pupils. Failure to do so could result in legal challenges. Furthermore, the decision to close the SRP will likely cause public concern about the school's commitment to inclusive education, and the local community may view it as a reduction in essential support for children with disabilities. The financial impact, while possibly justified by cost-saving measures, will be scrutinised in terms of its long-term effect on service quality and educational outcomes.	See response to Q2.	A parent/carer/guardian	2		Whiteheath, Haydon.

246	No	Yes	The SRP needs to stay, it is a valuable provision, and funding needs to be increased not taken away.	Children with PD Their families – parents who want skilled staff to work with their children who have PD Other schools that have to make costly adjustments, and the children who go to these schools because the budget will be affected. Special schools: Coteford will not be able to provide if skilled and consistent therapists are removed and some children will go to specialist provision, this will impact on places available in special schools.	A staff member	1		
247	No	Yes						
248	No	Yes	The cuts to funding for SRP, under funding of students EHCP. How can the LA justify and yet keep chipping away at our schools funding? Our school support students to be included in every aspect of school life as it should be. Funding a child to a non LA owned school costs will be over £50,000+ per student! To why are students plans barely meet the min. (funding can go to level 10). Funding band increase needed for all. Costing for specialists equipment wheel chairs, walking / standing frames, training of staff, paying for professional OT, Physiotherapy, etc. All staff at Coteford care for every child and go up and beyond, but the LA is leaving the school in a disadvantage compared to other schools in the LA. Coteford works to the legal government frame works, SEN code of practice, Children and families act 2014 and Equality act 2010 to name a few. Yet please explain how and why so many other schools within the LA are allowed to discriminate against SEND children? illegal and wrong.	Coteford for over 40 years has always been known for its inclusivity. Having older siblings whom went to Coteford schools in the 80s one whom was ASD and back then they were the front runners in my brothers care. Staff are highly skilled, caring, trained for supporting children with complex needs in a main stream setting. Coteford is the heart of the local community. Coteford is a flagship school and in surrounding areas (other LAs, Herefordshire and Buckinghamshire) know the positive impact Coteford has to ensuring students reach their full potential and thrive in life.	A staff member	1	Meadows High school	My youngest child attended both the Coteford Schools and Accessed SRP due to hypermobility, low muscle tone, DCD let alone with his other complex SEND profile. My son Flourished at Coteford he was provided with all the right seating e.g. Healthfield chair, adjustable tables, daily physiotherapy sessions, staff whom were trained in children with complex needs. I am passionate about supporting children and young adults with complex medical or SEND profiles. Having an older sibling with needs and then both my own children with SEND and medical needs. My personal positive experiences of Coteford is the reason I returned to teaching at primary stage. We are the voice for those whom need to be heard. Please feel free to contact me if need further clarity on any issues I have raised.
249	No	Yes	Children with physical disabilities are entitled to a mainstream education which should include supporting them on sight with particularly areas of need like OT and physiotherapy support	There are already a massive shortage of specialists provisions why would you want to close such an important asset and already stretch system.	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Coteford	I think it would be disgusting to shut down such an important provision for the community. Specialist provisions are already so stretched and in high demand why would the local authority feel that it would be the right course of action to shut yet another one so that children who just have physical disability cannot enjoy mainstream education.
250	No	Yes	It's the only school in the borough with this kind of unit for physical disabilities and perfect for my son, starting reception in sep 25	This unit is perfect for my son and I know other kids in the same position, living in Hillington who would also would benefit from their child having the opportunity to go to this school	A parent/carer/guardian	Two	Whiteheath infant school	We should have more of these units in schools not less
251	No	Yes	It is vital that children get the help they need. My brother has cerebral palsy but that should not limit him from being treated like a normal child, but he does need help	My family live there and my younger brother goes to school there	Other		Whiteheath infant school	
252	No	Yes	Is it really fair on the children that WANT to learn and are able to learn but need the extra space and time be put put in a mainstream classroom that WILL NOT be able to provide that?!	Because yet again... SEND kids are pushed to the back of the pile, when there are SO many children that will become even better citizens of Hillington if they are given the chance while they are young!	A local resident	3		They are home educated because of a falling education system!
253	No	Yes	We need access to this kind of provision	Because we won't be able to send our family member here	A parent/carer/guardian	2	None	Save our school!
254	No	Yes	You should be making more special units like this one not taking it away. A large majority of disabled children just need an accessible environment to thrive in mainstream. Why would you want to deny them that right	As previously said closing this PD unit will make it harder for disabled children to thrive and have their needs met in a mainstream school.	A parent/carer/guardian	1	White heath infant school	Closing this provision would be a huge mistake and would disadvantage physically disabled children
255	No	Yes			A parent/carer/guardian	1		
256	No	Yes	There are many children who need this provision.	So many children will be missing out.	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Whiteheath Infants and St Clement Daves high school	
257	No	Yes	Removing the service currently provided will disadvantage the school and it's students	Yes all children with PD within the Borough and their parents	A parent/carer/guardian	2	N/a	None
258	No	Yes	Kids has physical disabilities but mainstream schools they need additional support during there school day		A local resident	3	Whiteheath infant and nursery school	
259	No	Yes	Because it is needed by so many children.	Because children with SEN need to be helped.	Other	2		
260	No	Yes			A parent/carer/guardian	1	Whiteheath	
261	No	Yes			A local resident	2	Whiteheath	
262	No	Yes			A local resident	2	Whiteheath	
263	No	Yes	Lots of severely disable kids need the service , they need the professional help and support ti be able to succeed . Also Coteford is strategically in between areas so lots of kids from ruslip, eastcote , pinner, northwood are relying on the services provided .	Lots of severely disable kids need the service , they need the professional help and support ti be able to succeed . Also Coteford is strategically in between areas so lots of kids from ruslip, eastcote , pinner, northwood are relying on the services provided .	A parent/carer/guardian	4	Coteford	
264	No	Yes	I think these facilities are so important and allow children with physical disabilities to integrate with children in a normal school environment.	This is a very good local school that allows children to have a normal education and to still receive the care they need.	A local resident	3		
265	No	Yes	This is a vital resource for children with additional needs at the school. It allows them to be in mainstream education and access the physical support they require.	Children with physical needs in Hillington will not be able to receive the support they require in school or for some within the local area.	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Whiteheath Infant School	
266	No	Yes	By shutting it down, you alienate and further obstruct children with PDs ability to participate in a fair educational environment. It currently serves to assist the needs of kids which is what you'd think would be at the forefront of your objectives but clearly less effort on the systems part is all that seems to matter if the thought of closing down this provision is even up for discussion.	From my understanding this is the only school in the area that has extra support for kids with physical disabilities, removing funding puts extra strain on this school and other schools to meet the needs of kids with physical disabilities who want to be mainstreamed schooled. They deserve the right to learn alongside their peers, whilst getting the treatment and support needed to do so.	Other	None	Whiteheath Infant School	Completing out of concern for a younger family member who would be facing the repercussions of this proposal being successful.
267	No	Yes	My son has hemiplegic cerebral palsy, this is the only school in the borough that has extra help for kids with physical disabilities. I want him in a mainstream school, as he is on par or excelling his peers in all aspects, except physical. However, he would need constant supervision outside and toilet assistance, he is very unstable, falls over a lot and cannot go to the toilet by himself.	This is the only school that has SRP for physical disabilities in the area. I personally know a number of children who have physical disabilities but want to go to a mainstream school. having access to extra support like physio and OT regularly would make a huge difference to their development. My son is one of these children	A parent/carer/guardian	2	My eldest goes to Whiteheath Infant School, my youngest is due to go to school Sep 25, and I was looking at Coteford for him because of the SRP unit	Therapy like Physio and OT make huge differences to my son's progress, I can see it after his sessions, however through the NHS he has limited appointments. To have access to these resources as part of his school day would make a huge difference to his development, whilst still allowing him to go to a mainstream school. This is the only unit like it in the borough, there should be more units like this, not have the only one removed.
268	No	Don't know	These type of service should never be allowed to be closed					
269	No	Yes			Prefer not to say		Whiteheath Infant and junior school	
270	No	Yes	Unfair they should miss out on education, money spent here for such facilities.	Have other children locally, this is great school great staff...	A local resident	3	Haydon	
271	No	Yes	There should be more facilities like this to support SEN children not less.		A local resident	1		
272	No	Yes	Only school in borough with this type of unit.	Only school in borough with this type of unit	A parent/carer/guardian	2	Whiteheath infants	
273	No	Yes	Because it's the only school with a physical disability in the borough	Only parent with a child with physical disabilities only who wants to send them to a main stream school won't b able to have the same opportunity	A local resident	None	None	I am a concerned grandparent and believe by removing funding it puts a strain on other schools
274	No	Yes	Coteford is a centre of excellence for supporting the children with special needs and they know what they are doing and are brilliant at it. Why break the system?	Children will miss out where else are they going to get the resources they need? Don't mess up children's futures they need this provision.	A local resident	None	None	I am a teacher who has visited this amazing school on a number of occasions. I see how amazing the staff are at supporting the children to reach their potential.

275	No	Yes	<p>I am writing in response to news that the provision of services for disabled children at Coteford infant school is to end.</p> <p>I was a pupil at Coteford in the 1980s and I am now **. I was not a disabled child and no longer live in the borough of Hillington. However, despite leaving the school 35 years ago, I have very strong fond memories of my time there and often still think and speak of my time there. I feel that we're all shaped by our early experiences and that was certainly true of my time at Coteford. In the nursery and infants at Coteford I was friends with both able bodied and physically disabled children and we all played together. Their therapies were carried out on the premises and the school suitable for their needs whilst operating as a "mainstream" school.</p> <p>It was hugely beneficial to me and my non disabled classmates to be on an equal footing and I truly believe it shaped me as a compassionate child with understanding and empathy for others.</p> <p>In adulthood, I have become disabled due to injury and know how access to both buildings and opportunities can be entwined. Whilst any school would have a legal obligation to make "reasonable adjustments" for disabled pupils this could still mean being taught in ground floor classrooms separate to those who can do stairs and this would be a step back when Coteford has provided a level playing field for disabled and non disabled pupils for over 40 years.</p> <p>I hope that this decision is overturned and it is realised that the money spent on this provision is an investment in ALL of the children's futures at Coteford (and not just the 4 or 7 children Hillington council think are benefitting) so that they too can look back fondly on having attended a school that demonstrated the importance of access and opportunity for all children.</p>	They will disadvantage all children attending	Other	0	N/A	<p>I am writing in response to news that the provision of services for disabled children at Coteford infant school is to end.</p> <p>I was a pupil at Coteford in the 1980s and I am now **. I was not a disabled child and no longer live in the borough of Hillington. However, despite leaving the school 35 years ago, I have very strong fond memories of my time there and often still think and speak of my time there. I feel that we're all shaped by our early experiences and that was certainly true of my time at Coteford. In the nursery and infants at Coteford I was friends with both able bodied and physically disabled children and we all played together. Their therapies were carried out on the premises and the school suitable for their needs whilst operating as a "mainstream" school.</p> <p>It was hugely beneficial to me and my non disabled classmates to be on an equal footing and I truly believe it shaped me as a compassionate child with understanding and empathy for others.</p> <p>In adulthood, I have become disabled due to injury and know how access to both buildings and opportunities can be entwined. Whilst any school would have a legal obligation to make "reasonable adjustments" for disabled pupils this could still mean being taught in ground floor classrooms separate to those who can do stairs and this would be a step back when Coteford has provided a level playing field for disabled and non disabled pupils for over 40 years.</p> <p>I hope that this decision is overturned and it is realised that the money spent on this provision is an investment in ALL of the children's futures at Coteford (and not just the 4 or 7 children Hillington council think are benefitting) so that they too can look back fondly on having attended a school that demonstrated the importance of access and opportunity for all children.</p>
276	No	Yes	I have known children who have attended and benefitted This is a valuable resource and many of these children can not be educated in the same way in a mainstream school	As above	A local resident	2	Vyners	
277	No	Yes	There should be provision for children with disabilities at the school	People will have to take their children with disabilities longer distances from where they live which can be very difficult for parents with families	A local resident	None	My children did attend Coteford & Hayden	
278	No	Yes	It's a shame as a parent with a child who has a disability it's a fantastic to have additionally at school	It will help to have it there as who needs to go there won't have to travel too far for appointments plus it helps out parents of pupils who go to coteford	A parent/carer/guardian	3	Harlyn Primary School	
279	No	Yes	The support Coteford offers to disabled children in the borough is imperative to withdraw it would impact so many children's lives	My daughter's disabled friend attends Coteford she is well supported in a mainstream setting to change her school would have a detrimental effect on her mental health and her socialising with peers	A parent/carer/guardian	2	St Swithun Wells and Harefield academy	
280	No	Yes	<p>•There will be significant gaps in children's provision should the SRP close. Base funding has already been cut, which already stretches the much-needed quality therapies the SRP children receive. Whilst we have been told by the LA that CNWL therapy services will pick up the shortfall, in reality, despite the LA telling the school that CNWL therapy services have achieved 100 per cent of their contacts (ref: online consultation 2.10.2024), this simply is not true. There is a huge gap in CNWL, demand is high, therapist numbers are low and the service is stretched. The SRP closure will add stress to this service. Unfortunately, there is no spare capacity anywhere in the system," a senior officer from the SALT service recently confirmed. EHCPs at the moment cannot be relied upon. Of all the EHCPs received for children in the past year, 100% have needed drastic changes to their drafts to include therapies. These fights to support children are already costly for the school. Evidence that EHCPs are not as supportive as they should be is also in the Ofsted's Area SEND inspection of Hillington Local area partnership report which states: "...many EHC plans are not useful. They do not give an accurate picture of the range of needs and provision of the children and young people who should be at the heart of the plan..." Closing the SRP whilst the borough is not ready to support children via the EHCP process risks children's learning, and therefore their futures.</p> <p>•Questions have been raised to whether the process to close the SRP is lawful. In February 2024, a parent was informed that Coteford SRP would no longer accept admissions—months before the consultation officially began. If this is genuinely an open process, why do we see actions being taken that suggest otherwise? The council says that demand will keep the SRP open, although it is evident that the LA has blocked entry to the SRP. So, without a fully transparent process, the consultation process feels like it is in name only. A more transparent process needs to be adhered to. A fully and truthful consultation process needs to take place before action towards closure happens.</p> <p>•Coteford's inclusion history should not be discarded. By closing the SRP, you are also closing the doors to 40 years of inclusion knowledge and experience that, instead of being shut down, needs to be used as an example to support other schools in developing their inclusion offer. The school has been awarded the Inclusion Quality Mark award and has a Flagship Status. This accolade has been earned through years of hard work and dedication to promoting and nurturing an inclusive environment. The LA's closure of the SRP and claim that "nothing will change" is an example of how out of touch the borough has become in realising the work of their schools.</p> <p>•Funding streams are not in place to support children already. SENCO forum 23.10.2024 SENCOs were told not to apply for ESE, EHCP top up funding is too low to warrant the correct support. Closing the SRP and funding will financial crush the school if they want to meet children's needs.</p>	<p>•Closing the SRP will disadvantage pupils with Physical Disabilities (PD), as already demonstrated by a recent case where a pupil with PD was denied access to Coteford's SRP. Her EHCP funding does not cover the support needed in the classroom. Which means there she has no access to private therapies. She has not been visited by a Speech therapist during her time at Coteford due to lack of availability. Closing the SRP has already disadvantaged her at a crucial time. The school has had to seek support from SRP therapists to ensure proper staff training to support this child. Closing the SRP will similarly disadvantage other PD pupils.</p> <p>•If the SRP closes, some pupils who would have attended Coteford may enrol in other schools, increasing the cost of making reasonable adjustments and placing additional strain on those schools. Whilst I fully support ensuring that children have the right to attend the school they desire, they should also have the option to go to a school to experience peers who may present with similar disabilities. Coteford offers this. Children are not othered or singled out. Without this option, parents may seek provisions out of the borough, which, I believe may be more costly for the LA.</p> <p>•Additionally, some children who would have gone to Coteford might end up in specialist provisions, which could reduce the availability of places for other children in need of specialist support and be costly to the LA.</p>	A staff member	1	West Herts College	<p>The focus on the LA's feedback appears to centre around 2 reasons for closing the SRP. 1.B is not a "traditional" SRP. The inclusion quality marks awarded time and time again to the school demonstrate that Coteford's SRP works. The definition of an SRP is not legislated to my knowledge. So why does it matter? We fight for children to be part of the whole school, whether it be to have the right equipment to enable children to take part physically, for therapists to work around the important times of the day so children don't miss out, or to support children to feel a sense of belonging within their class. Has the LA ever come to a sports day and watched our PD children run alongside their peers who thoughtfully consider their disability and do as much as they can including their friends? This is Coteford. Why end this?</p> <p>2.Demand is low. We know that there is work to be done. But we also know that the LA has not supported the school's SRP to flourish, by blocking entry to the SRP for a Reception child. That child has not had access to therapists this term due to overstretched CNWL therapists not being able to fulfil their caseload. She would have had these contacts by now, in her first few months of starting school. Children with PDs and their parents are looking around the school as I type. There is a demand, it just needs to be supported and not manipulated into a bigger agenda.</p> <p>I feel these are not valid and justified reasons for ending the stellar work Coteford has been undertaking for 40 years of delivering quality inclusion practices to the community.</p>
281	No	Yes	<p>Because the consultation has not been transparent.</p> <p>In reply to Clr O'Brien, who explains that the school would be able to access Exceptional funding and that no services will change due to the closure, here are my responses:</p> <p>Exceptional funding, from my understanding, is a funding stream that is granted if the % of SEND pupils with an EHCP is greater than the national average. For every child above the National average, the school is awarded £6k per child. We are an Infant school. Half of our school (Reception and Nursery) are usually the first point of contact families have with the Education system. It is very rare we have a child starting Nursery with an EHCP. Exceptional funding is awarded on the number of EHCPs in a school. Where most children we have with needs are on their starting journey and do not have one. To enable the best chances for these children, we need to invest lots of our time into starting that process for children. Exceptional funding does not help those children. Our SENCO was told at the SENCO forum only yesterday not to apply for another funding stream, Early Support Funding, as they are reevaluating the system. And there is a cap on how much Early Years inclusion funding is applied for. So our funding streams for these very vulnerable children, at particularly crucial times of their lives simply do not exist at the moment. Whilst these children are not affected by SRP funding, should the SRP close, then further resources will be taken away from these children to manage the SRP children. So instead of supporting a drastically under resourced process, we are removing more resources from it. As I'm sure you are aware, the equipment policy for the borough requires schools to fund the first £1k for the purchase of equipment for PD children. Lack of funding will almost make it impossible for schools to obtain the correct equipment.</p> <p>Secondly, your claim these funding changes will not impact the school.</p> <p>The school receives £6k base funding for each child in the SRP. At the moment it is a stretch for this funding to cover the therapist support. As you state "there will be no impact as above" are you confirming that the school will continue to receive the £6k base funding should the LA close the SRP? This is not clear from your statement that nothing will change.</p> <p>Regarding the delays in the CNWL service, we welcome input from the council to monitor the services as it is not fit for purpose at the moment. However, we would encourage that the service to be brought to a level which is adequate before children are transferred to this system. The system needs to be fixed before accepting more cases, not the other way around. I have a duty of care as a teacher to these children to protect their best interests, and it is not in their best interests to move them to a broken system.</p> <p>Lastly, regarding the coordination of these services, I would warmly invite you to come join me for a day in my life as a teacher to understand how</p>	Children with physical disabilities. They will go out of borough. They are an important part of our community.	A staff member		<p>I do thank the council for praising us on our work with PD children. This is the part of your email I do agree with. Coteford has a brilliant reputation, an alumni who is fully appreciative of the school and an inclusive ethos, built up over 40 years, that will not be ruined by the councils' careless and hurtful choice of language, such as "not a proper SRP", "not delivered in the right way", and disregard of the expertise which lives within Coteford as you seem to expect other schools can learn that through a child's EHC plan alone. I invite you here to see some of this in action.</p> <p>I shall end with a story (it's a true one): Last year, a little boy, who has a very rigid condition, is non-verbal, has a lot of anxiety to enter new contexts, very bright, but has extreme difficulties communicating. We made him the star of the Christmas Show. And he was wonderful. This is Coteford.</p>	

282	No	Yes	<p>Significant gaps in provision will arise if the SRP closes. Base funding has already been reduced, straining the essential therapies that SRP children rely on. While the LA has stated that CNWL therapy services will cover the shortfall, this claim does not reflect reality. CNWL is under enormous strain—demand is high, therapists are few, and the service is overstretched. Closing the SRP will only add further pressure to an already burdened system. As confirmed by a senior SALT officer, “there is no spare capacity anywhere in the system.” Furthermore, EHCPs cannot be fully relied upon at present. Every EHCP received by the school this year has required significant revisions to include necessary therapies, placing additional financial strain on the school. Ofsted’s Area SEND inspection of Hillingdon also highlighted this, noting that “...many EHC plans are not useful. They do not give an accurate picture of the range of needs and provision of the children and young people...” Closing the SRP, while the borough remains unprepared to adequately support children through the EHCP process, risks damaging their learning and futures.</p> <p>Lawfulness of the closure process has been questioned. In February 2024, a parent was told that Coteford’s SRP would no longer accept admissions—months before the consultation officially began. If the process is truly open and transparent, why have actions been taken that suggest otherwise? The council claims that demand will sustain the SRP, yet the LA has been actively blocking admissions. Without transparency, the consultation process appears to be a formality rather than a genuine inquiry. A fully transparent and truthful consultation must occur before any further action toward closure is taken.</p> <p>Coteford’s inclusion legacy should not be overlooked. Closing the SRP would mean closing the door on 40 years of expertise in inclusive education. Instead of being dismantled, Coteford’s experience should be leveraged to help other schools develop their own inclusive practices. The school has earned both the Inclusion Quality Mark and Flagship Status through years of dedication to fostering an inclusive environment. The LA’s claim that “nothing will change” if the SRP closes demonstrates a lack of understanding of the depth of Coteford’s work. Shutting down the SRP is a disservice not just to the school, but to the entire borough’s commitment to inclusion.</p> <p>Lack of funding streams further complicates the situation. At the SENCO forum on 23.10.2024, SENCOs were advised not to apply for ESF funding, and EHCP top-up funding is too low to provide the necessary support. Closing the SRP, without adequate funding alternatives, will place an unsustainable financial burden on the school as it tries to meet the needs of its students.</p>	<p>Closing the SRP will significantly disadvantage pupils with Physical Disabilities (PD), as seen in a recent case where a child with PD was denied access to Coteford’s SRP. Her EHCP funding does not cover the in-class support she requires, meaning she has no access to essential private therapies. Due to a lack of availability, she has not received visits from a speech therapist during her time at Coteford. The decision to block her access to the SRP has already impacted her at a crucial stage. The school has had to rely on SRP therapists to train staff to properly support her, and closing the SRP will similarly affect other PD pupils.</p> <p>If the SRP closes, some children who would have attended Coteford may enroll in other schools, leading to increased costs for making reasonable adjustments and adding pressure to those schools. While I fully support the right of children to attend the school of their choice, they should also have the option to attend a school where they can interact with peers who have similar disabilities. Coteford provides this environment, where children are not isolated or treated differently. Without this option, some parents may seek provisions outside the borough, which could ultimately be more expensive for the LA.</p> <p>Additionally, some children who would have attended Coteford could end up in specialist provisions, potentially reducing the level of integration they experience.</p>	A staff member	1	Nursery
283	No	Yes		Other	0		
284	No	Yes	There are families in the area who still require this service	A parent/carer/guardian	2	As above	
285	No	Yes	My child accesses the SRP.	A parent/carer/guardian	3	Coteford	
286	No	Yes	It’s discrimination to prevent a child who is physically disabled to access their education in a mainstream setting	A staff member	2	Haydon	
287	No	Yes	I believe that all children are entitled to an equal education that may require an SRP provision. We at Coteford have that provision and therefore should continue to be able to provide those children who currently attend our school access to those provisions.	A staff member	none	NA	
288	No	Yes	<p>I have read, and been part of this consultation process and I do not believe it has been carried out fairly and transparently. I have evidence that proves that the LA have already made up their mind and closed the SRP and this consultation is wasting everyone’s time! I have emails stating to a parent who requested the SRP that “Coteford SRP are not open for admissions at the moment.” This was said on 15/2/24. Again this was repeated on 11/3/24 “as Coteford SRP are no longer taking admissions”. If this is a true consultation, why has this been stated on more than one occasion that the SRP is closed for admissions? Denying this child entry in this way has been done in a way that has diminished all confidence in the LA SEND team.</p> <p>When I attended the consultation meeting held early this month, the two reasons the Local Authority provided for the closure were lack of demand, and that Coteford’s SRP is not a traditional one. The first reason is actually one that I have never seen data or any evidence of. I have this week had enquiries about the SRP from a parent of a child who would 100% need that provision and therefore I do not believe that demand is not there. When told that the LA are closing the SRP this parent was distraught. She knows of many other families who would require this provision as her son has many friends with physical difficulties. As stated above, the parent of a child we currently have was told the SRP has already closed, how many other parents have been told this before even stepping foot through our doors? As you are aware, the demand for SRPs for other areas of need are high, so why take away one that is serving it’s purpose and serving it well?</p>	<p>We are aware of the demands the safety valve agreement must place on the council. This financial burden is clearly a motivation for closing the SRP.</p> <p>Parents have been told that the provision for their child will not change. This is COMPLETELY UNTRUE. Base funding has already been reduced, straining the essential therapies that SRP children rely on. Significant gaps in provision will arise if the SRP closes. As the person that would have to co-ordinate the therapists for these children I find this offensive to offer this as a reassurance.</p> <p>While the LA has stated that CNWL therapy services will cover the shortfall, this claim does not reflect reality. Currently we have a gap in service from our NHS SALT. I have been told that there is no capacity to replace here therefore all of the children not in the SRP have had no contact from a therapist for the last 8 weeks. How can the LA assure parents this will not happen to the children in the SRP when their provision moves over to NHS therapists? They cannot.</p> <p>Alongside the SALT there are also shortages of OT and physio therapists. I have spoken to those allocated to our school and they do not have capacity to take on more cases, so how can promises of “no change to provision” be made?</p> <p>At the SENCO forum on 23.10.2024, SENCOs were advised not to apply for ESF funding, and EHCP top-up funding is too low to provide the necessary support. Closing the SRP, without adequate funding alternatives, will place an unsustainable financial burden on the school as it tries to meet the needs of its students. The school currently has</p>	A staff member		<p>The “consultation” process has proven to be unlawful and unjust. The impact this would have on the pupils has not been measured and no alternative proposal has been given. When consulting a change, alternatives must be provided or you are taking something away without replacing it. How is this fair for those children that have had to fight their whole lives, literally? As an advocate for our SEND children I would advise the LA to come and meet our children you are affecting, those with SEND and those without. Because if you take away the SRP you take away the effective support and therefore these children will have limited options and many will go to special schools. By doing this, you take away everything we have strived to achieve in a fully inclusive school. You take away the experiences those children have of a mainstream school and the magic they bring to their peers.</p> <p>You need to see the children, families and community this will affect. The level of support we have received from the community and past pupils including a Gold medal Paralympian speaks volumes.</p>
289	No	Yes	<p>It is imperative that children with disabilities get an appropriate education, one which meets all their needs in order to prevent inaccessibility and academic failures. Removing a service already set up to support these children is outrageous and a decision I would not be able to sleep comfortably at night with.</p> <p>Many students have used the SRP and gone on to be rather successful, stating that without it they would not have been. Children already accessing the SRP will be forced to adapt to a change that is not even possible, and very debilitating and degrading, potentially traumatic.</p> <p>This decision needs re-consideration with immediate effect.</p>	Other	2	Barlow C of E Primary School	
290	No	Yes	<p>SRP provision should stay at Coteford. This is a specialist school with the best therapists, staff and one level facilities accommodating children with physical disabilities. The council says that people should choose their local school and they will adapt it. This is a lie the council has, as they admitted no budget for such work to be done or extra resources and training for the staff to implement this. Other schools which have two levels have no lifts, ramps etc... The council has purposely told parents the SRP is closed for next year and people cannot apply. So without consultation they’ve already blocked children attending. Then the council say the attendance is too low! I wonder why! Other schools are not able to facilitate children with physical disabilities and have been referred to the SRP provision at Coteford – where will future ones go?</p>	A parent/carer/guardian	1	Coteford	