Appendix 4: Langley and Appletree Stage 1 Pre-Publication Consultation responses.

Section 1: Stage 1 Pre-Publication Consultation responses - Formal submission from Langley First School

Section 2: Stage 1 Pre-Publication Consultation responses - Formal responses to free text questions.

North Tyneside Council

ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL FOR CONSULTATION ON THE FUTURE OF LANGLEY FIRST SCHOOL AND APPLETREE GARDENS FIRST SCHOOL

Reversal of Original Plan:
Langley as lead school on current Appletree Gardens site

Date 10th November 2025

Introduction

This alternative proposal responds to the North Tyneside Council's consultation on merging Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School, as outlined in the North Tyneside Councils "Guide to proposed merger" (October 2025).

While we support the Council's aim to address surplus places and financial challenges in the North East Planning Area (NEPA) by reducing First School places by 60 to align with a 390-place cap across the three- tier system, we propose a different approach.

Instead of closing Langley First School and expanding Appletree Gardens, we recommend the reverse of this to be considered:

- Merge Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School,
- Close Appletree Gardens First School,
- The merged school would retain the original Langley First School Department for Education school number and governing body
- Accommodate the combined pupils on the old Appletree Gardens First School site

This would involve moving the entire operation of Langley First School to the Appletree Gardens site.
It is hoped the merged school would have a new identity and new ethos, set by staff, pupils and the school community, to serve local children now and in the years to come.

This would

This approach addresses concerns about low parental uptake and ensures long-term educational and financial stability.

Proposal

With what is discussed within the introduction in mind, the proposal seeks to:

- **Merge Appletree Gardens First School and Langley First School -** Move pupils from Langley First School to Appletree Gardens First School

- **Increase admissions** of Langley First school to accommodate pupils from both schools.

- **Prescribed Alteration** – Move the entire operation of the school from Langley First School site to the Appletree Gardens site (DfE Guidance & Regulations 2013)Under Regulation 5 (1) (a) and schedule 2 (14) of the School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013

Note: The pupil merger and school relocation to the Appletree site would legally be two stage process, however in the real world scenario these stages would happen simultaneously.

- Use the Langley First Primary school site to **expand Woodlawn Special School**

Rational

Parental Preference

The Council's data highlights significant differences in parental preference:

- Langley First School: Over 75% of families in its catchment choose Langley, with only ~25% opting for other schools (January 2025 census, options appraisal).
- Appletree Gardens First School: Less than 50% of catchment families choose it, with over half selecting alternatives.

This disparity raises a critical concern: Without fundamental change, the merged school on Appletree's site risks inheriting its lower popularity, potentially leading families in its larger catchment (44 homes per planned place vs. Langley's 40) to continue choosing other schools.

Projections for 2026–2028 show both schools facing deficits—both Langley and Appletree are facing current budget challenges that are expected to increase in the future, driven by low pupil numbers reducing funding. A standard merger retaining Appletree's identity may not reverse this trend, as it doesn't fully capitalise on Langley's strong ethos, values, and staff appeal, which drive its higher parental choice

This would create a school more attractive to families across both catchments, increasing enrolment and aligning with the Council's goal of 390 places per year group while supporting transitions to Middle and High Schools in the three-tier system.

Numbers of children in the combined school:
Langley would be providing more children to this merged school:

Current Year Group	Appletree Gardens	Langley First
Reception	30	45
Year 1	41	53
Year 2	55	60
Total	126	158

A greater amount of children would be provided by Langley- who would benefit from having the majority of their familiar teachers and support staff.

In a combined new school, assuming 60 children per year group in Reception and Year 1, this would represent 40% of the school population.

Comparison of Absence Data

Absence data reflects pupil engagement and school stability, critical for a successful merger.
For 2023/2024, Appletree Gardens First School reported an overall absence rate of 5.5%, matching the England state-funded schools average and slightly above North Tyneside's 5.4%.

Its persistent absence rate was 15%, above England's 14.6% and North Tyneside's 13.7%,

In contrast, Langley First School's persistent absence rate was 5.9%, significantly lower than Appletree's (15.9%), England's, and North Tyneside's averages, suggesting stronger pupil engagement and family commitment, likely linked to its higher parental preference.

Absence data is a critical indicator of pupil engagement and school effectiveness, particularly under Ofsted's renewed inspection framework which has been recently broadened to include grading of 'attendance and behaviour'

If schools are now being evaluated in this area, a strong leadership team with robust absence policies would be essential to guide the school effectively.

Less Sensitive to Falling Births

In the most recent 2 previous years of higher birth rates, 2020 reception and 2023 reception intakes, Appletree was the only NEPA first school with surplus spaces in admissions, 14 and 6 respectively. For the 2 lowest birth rate years, 2024 and 2025 intake Appletree had the largest portion of surplus places in admissions against PAN, 32% and 45% respectively

Appletree is statistically shown to be the NEPA first school most sensitive to falling birth rates, with the current NEPA birth indicating a requirement of 135 children to attend from outside of NEPA (at the reduced 390 NEPA PAN) they will be most at risk of being under-subscribed and susceptible to falling into deficit.

We measured how much each school's intake "swings" when local births change (elasticity).

Modelled with both schools still open.

- Appletree: Elasticity of ~2.05. A 10% drop in births causes a ~20% drop in its intake.
- Langley: Elasticity of ~0.80. A 10% drop in births causes only an ~8% drop in its intake.

Stress-Test Results (Recent 6 Years)

Langley First School, November 2025

If we stress-test a further 10% dip in births:

- Langley (starting at 87% full) would drop to ~81%. This is low but still a viable and sustainable number.
- Appletree (starting at 73% full) would drop to ~61%. This is clearly unsustainable and would put the school back into surplus.

The findings would suggest that Langley is materially less exposed to falling births and holds its baseline utilisation better.

It is the safer long-term anchor.

Parent Choice

Data from 223 respondents to the Langley First School Parent Survey indicates that 88% of respondents did not select Appletree as any of their preferred choices when originally applying for a school place. This suggests that Appletree's current ethos and reputation do not strongly align with the preferences of the Langley community. By contrast, Langley First School has established a well-regarded culture and leadership model that are trusted and valued by local families. Adopting Langley's ethos and leadership approach within a merged school would therefore be likely to enhance community confidence and increase the number of families choosing the school as a preferred option in future admissions rounds. The current proposal by the council does not appear to take any of the points above into account.

Additional - Delay Proposal

This proposal can be implemented in line with the council time frame, it is near identical to the council proposal however:

The Problem with the merging in 2027

A major concern has been highlighted in the council proposal, this is the "bulge" cohorts.

- **Current Proposal (2027/28 Merger):** This concentrates the two largest cohorts onto the Appletree site, pushing the on-roll number to **~407**.
- This potential requires converting non-teaching and specialist spaces (libraries, intervention rooms) into 17 class bases. This may place immense pressure on shared areas (halls, dining, outdoor space) that cannot be expanded. It also has an impact on wraparound provision which is heavily utilised currently at the Langley site.
- This "fuller" phase is brief. Projections show the roll falling from **~407 to under 300** within four years as smaller cohorts feed through.
- The current proposal builds a larger footprint that quickly becomes under-used, creating structural inefficiency and higher running costs.

An alternative is to delay until 2029

If the merger were delayed by two years to 2029, the two largest cohorts would have progressed to middle school.

Langley First School, November 2025

- The total roll in 2029 would be a much more manageable **~323-325 pupils**.

This *could* even be accommodated in the current Langley building.

- This would leave only one year group requiring a "bulge" class (the Y4s at ~83 pupils), which could be managed as three classes under 30.

Delaying the amalgamation is not about avoiding change, it's about managing this bulge effectively.

We strongly urge the council to delay the process.

(Note: Delaying by only *one* year to 2028 does not solve the issue, as it still leaves a roll of 360 and two very large cohorts, including one at 98 pupils.)

Benefits

- Enhanced Parental Appeal: Consolidated operation under Langley's ethos boosts Appletree's uptake from <50% to >75%, reducing 14% surplus and mitigating deficits.

- Ofsted Attendance Alignment: Langley's strategies (5.9% persistent absence) improves Appletree's (15%) performance, meeting Ofsted criteria.

- Educational and Financial Stability: Single-site efficiency addresses deficit and financial issues, supporting 390 place cap.

- Minimal Disruption: Merger plus will preserve identities during transfer through a 'firm commitment' by Langley First School leadership

- SEND Support: Langley site repurposed for Woodlawn as proposed

- Familiarity: A fairer solution for both parents and children, enabling a smoother transition between schools through involvement of familiar staff.

- Reduce sensitivity to falling birth rates

Comparison with Council's Proposal

- The Council's closure-based merger risks perpetuating Appletree's attendance and lower uptake. Our Merger plus preserves Langley's strengths, achieves identical site consolidation under Regulations 2013, and aligns with Education Act 2002 and Ofsted criteria.

Supporting Data

- Financials: provided in the merger proposals documents provided by the local authority .
- Absence: Appletree (15%); Langley (5.9%). Taken from **compare school service .gov .**
- Parent Choice: Taken from L**angley First School Parent Survey** indicates
- Sensitivity to Falling Births – P**rovided by Andrew Charlton modelling** using data available to the public.

- **Delay** is based on the modelled pupil projections.

All data can be sent separately if requested.

Langley First School, November 2025

This proposal creates a thriving single-site First School, supporting NEPA's children, the three-tier system, and Ofsted's attendance criteria. It also follows precedent in another strategic review proposal where the lead school moves to take over the other school's site (Forest Hall to Ivy Road) due to better educational performance data. Whereas this is not necessarily relevant with Langley/Appletree, as both schools are graded by Ofsted to be Good, the data provided demonstrates the key metric of better attendance figures at Langley First, alongside the parental choice.

ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL FOR CONSULTATION ON THE FUTURE OF LANGLEY FIRST SCHOOL AND APPLETREE GARDENS FIRST SCHOOL

MERGER PLUS

West Monkseaton First School (Example)

Date 10th November 2025

Introduction

This alternative proposal responds to the North Tyneside Council's consultation on merging Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School, as outlined in the North Tyneside Councils "Guide to proposed merger" (October 2025).

While we support the Council's aim to address surplus places and financial challenges in the North East Planning Area (NEPA) by reducing First School places by 60 to align with a 390-place cap across the three- tier system, we propose a different approach.

Instead of closing Langley First School and expanding Appletree Gardens, we recommend merging Appletree Gardens with Langley First School, moving the entire operation of Langley First School to the Appletree Gardens site.

Langley First School would agree to a 'Firm Commitment' to adopt the best of both schools on the Appletree Gardens site, as permitted under the Department for Education (DfE) guidance, "*Opening and closing maintained schools*" (October 2024).

This approach leverages the strengths of both schools to create a more desirable institution while addressing concerns about low parental uptake and ensuring long-term educational and financial stability.

This proposal has been written five weeks into the consultation period. At this stage, Appletree leadership has been reluctant to engage in dialogue with Langley First School. This approach appears not to put the children of Langley first and fails to inspire confidence that the interests of the children are at the forefront of Appletree leadership agenda.

Proposal

With what is discussed within the introduction in mind, the proposal seeks to:

- **Merge Appletree Gardens First School and Langley First School -** Move pupils from Appletree Gardens First School to Langley First School

- **Increase admissions** at Langley First school to accommodate pupils from both schools.

- **Prescribed Alteration** – Move the entire operation of the school from Langley First School site to the Appletree Gardens site (DfE Guidance & Regulations 2013)Under Regulation 5 (1) (a) and schedule 2 (14) of the School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013

Note: The pupil merger and school relocation to the Appletree site would legally be two stage process, however in the real world scenario these stages would happen simultaneously.

- Use the Langley First Primary school site to **expand Woodlawn Special School**

- Langley First School will agree to a '**Firm Commitment**' including but not exclusive to the following conditions:
-
    - A change of school name: Example —West Monkseaton First School
    - A staff consolidation between Langley and Appletree gardens
    - A change of uniform
    - A change of governance
    - A new ethos which incorporates the best of both schools

Rational

The Council's data highlights significant differences in parental preference:

- Langley First School: Over 75% of families in its catchment choose it, with only ~25% opting for other schools (January 2025 census, options appraisal).
- Appletree Gardens First School: Less than 50% of catchment families choose it, with over half selecting alternatives.

This disparity raises a critical concern: Without fundamental change, the merged school on Appletree's site risks inheriting its lower popularity, potentially leading families in its larger catchment (44 homes per planned place vs. Langley's 40) to continue choosing other schools.

Projections for 2026–2028 show both schools facing deficits—both Langley and Appletree are facing current budget challenges that are expected to increase in the future, driven by low pupil numbers reducing funding. A standard merger retaining Appletree's identity may not reverse this trend, as it doesn't fully capitalise on Langley's stronger ethos, values, and staff appeal, which drive its higher parental choice

We propose combining the best elements of both— Langley's community trust and educational reputation with Appletree's larger facilities. This could create a school more attractive to families across both catchments, increasing enrolment and aligning with the Council's goal of 390 places per year group while supporting transitions to Middle and High Schools in the three-tier system.

Comparison of Absence Data

Absence data reflects pupil engagement and school stability, critical for a successful merger.
For 2023/2024, Appletree Gardens First School reported an overall absence rate of 5.5%, matching the England state-funded schools average and slightly above North Tyneside's 5.4%.

Its persistent absence rate was 15%, above England's 14.6% and North Tyneside's 13.7%,

In contrast, Langley First School's persistent absence rate was 5.9%, significantly lower than Appletree's, England's, and North Tyneside's averages, suggesting stronger pupil engagement and family commitment, likely linked to its higher parental preference.

Absence data is a critical indicator of pupil engagement and school effectiveness, particularly under Ofsted's updated inspection framework which has been recently broadened to include grading of 'attendance and behaviour'

If schools are now being evaluated in this area, a strong leadership team with robust absence policies would be essential to guide the school effectively.

Less Sensitive to Falling Births

In the most recent 2 previous years of higher birth rates, 2020 reception and 2023 reception intakes, Appletree was the only NEPA first school with surplus spaces in admissions, 14 and 6 respectively. For the 2 lowest birth rate years, 2024 and 2025 intake Appletree had the largest portion of surplus places in admissions against PAN, 32% and 45% respectively

Appletree is statistically shown to be the NEPA first school most sensitive to falling birth rates, with the current NEPA birth indicating a requirement of 135 children to attend from outside of NEPA (at the reduced 390 NEPA PAN) they will be most at risk of being under-subscribed and susceptible to falling into deficit.

We measured how much each school's intake "swings" when local births change (elasticity).

Modelled with both schools still open.

- Appletree: Elasticity of ~2.05. A 10% drop in births causes a ~20% drop in its intake.
- Langley: Elasticity of ~0.80. A 10% drop in births causes only an ~8% drop in its intake.

Stress-Test Results (Recent 6 Years)

If we stress-test a further 10% dip in births:

- Langley (starting at 87% full) would drop to ~81%. This is low but still a viable and sustainable number.
- Appletree (starting at 73% full) would drop to ~61%. This is clearly unsustainable and would put the school back into surplus.

The findings would suggest that Langley is materially less exposed to falling births and holds its baseline utilisation better.

It is the safer long-term anchor.

Parent Choice

Data from 223 respondents to the Langley First School Parent Survey indicates that 88% of respondents did not select Appletree as any of their preferred choices when originally applying for a school place. This suggests that Appletree's current ethos and reputation do not strongly align with the preferences of the Langley community. By contrast, Langley First School has established a well-regarded culture and leadership model that are trusted and valued by local families. Adopting Langley's ethos and leadership approach within a merged school would therefore be likely to enhance community confidence and increase the number of families choosing the school as a preferred option in future admissions rounds. The current proposal by the council does not appear to take any of the points above into account.

Additional - Delay Proposal

This proposal can be implemented in line with the council time frame, it is near identical to the council proposal however:

The Problem with the merging in 2027

A major concern has been highlighted in the council proposal, this is the "bulge" cohorts.

- **Current Proposal (2027/28 Merger):** This concentrates the two largest cohorts onto the Appletree site, pushing the on-roll number to **~407**.
- This potential requires converting non-teaching and specialist spaces (libraries, intervention rooms) into 17 class bases. This may place immense pressure on shared areas (halls, dining, outdoor space) that cannot be expanded. It also has an impact on wraparound provision which is heavily utilised currently at the Langley site.
- This "fuller" phase is brief. Projections show the roll falling from **~407 to under 300** within four years as smaller cohorts feed through.
- The current proposal builds a larger footprint that quickly becomes under-used, creating structural inefficiency and higher running costs.

An alternative is to delay until 2029

If the merger were delayed by two years to 2029, the two largest cohorts would have progressed to middle school.

- The total roll in 2029 would be a much more manageable **~323-325 pupils**.

This *could* even be accommodated in the current Langley building.

- This would leave only one year group requiring a "bulge" class (the Y4s at ~83 pupils), which could be managed as three classes under 30.

Delaying the amalgamation is not about avoiding change, it's about managing this bulge effectively.

We strongly urge the council to delay the process.

(Note: Delaying by only *one* year to 2028 <u>does not solve the issue</u>, as it still leaves a roll of 360 and two very large cohorts, including one at 98 pupils.)

Benefits

- Enhanced Parental Appeal: Consolidated operation under Langley's ethos boosts Appletree's uptake from <50% to >75%, reducing 14% surplus and mitigating deficits.

- Ofsted Attendance Alignment: Langley's strategies (5.9% persistent absence) improves Appletree's (15%) performance, meeting Ofsted criteria.

- Educational and Financial Stability: Single-site efficiency addresses deficit and financial issues, supporting 390 place cap.

- Minimal Disruption: Merger plus will preserve identities during transfer through a 'firm committent' by Langley First School leadrership

- SEND Support: Langley site repurposed for Woodlawn as proposed

- Familiarity: A fairer solution for both parents and children, enabling a smoother transition between schools through involvement of familiar staff.

- Reduce sensitivity to falling birth rates

Comparison with Council's Proposal

- The Council's closure-based merger risks perpetuating Appletree's attendance and lower uptake. Our Merger plus preserves Langley's strengths, achieves identical site consolidation under Regulations 2013, and aligns with Education Act 2002 and Ofsted criteria.

Supporting Data

- Financials: provided in the merger proposals documents provided by the local authority .
- Absence: Appletree (15%); Langley (5.9%). Taken from **compare school service .gov .**
- Parent Choice: Taken from L**angley First School Parent Survey** indicates
- Sensitivity to Falling Births – P**rovided by Andrew Charlton modelling** using data available to the public.

- **Delay** is based on the modelled pupil projections.

All data can been sent separately if requested.

This hybrid proposal creates a thriving single-site First School, supporting NEPA's children, the three-tier system, and Ofsted's attendance criteria which seeks to build on the strengths of both schools.

ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL FOR CONSULTATION ON THE FUTURE OF LANGLEY FIRST SCHOOL

AND

APPLETREE GARDENS FIRST SCHOOL

AMALGAMATION

Date 10th November 2025

Introduction

This alternative proposal responds to the North Tyneside Council's consultation on merging Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School, as outlined in the North Tyneside Councils "Guide to proposed merger" (October 2025). While we support the Council's aim to address surplus places and financial challenges in the North East Planning Area (NEPA) by reducing First School places by 60 to align with a 390-place cap across the three- tier system, we propose a different approach.

Instead of closing Langley First School and expanding Appletree Gardens, we recommend closing both schools and establishing a new school on the Appletree Gardens site, as permitted under the Department for Education (DfE) guidance, "Opening and closing maintained schools" (October 2024).

"The local authority and/or governing body (depending on school category) can publish proposals to close 2, or more, schools and the local authority (or a proposer other than the local authority depending on category) can publish a proposal to open a new school. Where this is a presumption school, this will be subject to publication of a section 6A notice (see part 2 of this guidance). This will result in a new school number being issued."

This approach leverages the strengths of both schools, both currently rated as Ofsted Good, to establish a new school that combines the strengths of both schools, whilst addressing concerns about low parental uptake and ensuring long-term educational and financial stability.

This proposal seeks consent under Section 10 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 to establish a new maintained community primary school within Monkseaton.

While the default presumption under Section 6A (of the Education and Inspections Act 2006) favours Academies, we argue that a locally accountable maintained school better aligns with community needs, North Tyneside council North East Planning Area (NEPA) three tier system, parental

preferences and cost efficiencies. This route avoids the academy conversion complexities and ensures integration with existing local authority services.

With that in mind, if Section 10 fails (i.e., consent is denied by the Secretary of State), the proposal would still be valid under Section 6A, as the identified need for the school remains unmet and triggers the academy 'free school presumption process'. This ensures continuity, transforming the proposal into a competitive Academy/free school route without restarting from scratch.

The core elements—site identification, evidence of need, consultation data, and curriculum plans, etc. would be repurposed

The Council's data highlights significant differences in parental preference:

- **Langley First School**: Over 75% of families in its catchment choose it, with only ~25% op ng for other schools (January 2025 census, options appraisal).
- **Appletree Gardens First School**: Less than 50% of catchment families choose it, with over half selecting alternatives.

This disparity raises a critical concern: Without fundamental change, the merged school on Appletree's site risks inheriting its lower popularity, potentially leading families in its larger catchment (44 homes per planned place vs. Langley's 40) to continue choosing other schools.

Projections for 2026–2028 show both schools facing deficits—both Langley and Appletree are facing current budget challenges that are expected to increase in the future, driven by low pupil numbers reducing funding. A standard merger retaining Appletree's identity may not reverse this trend, as it doesn't fully capitalise on Langley's stronger ethos, values, and staff appeal, which drive its higher parental choice

By closing both schools and opening a new one, we propose combining the best elements of both—Langley's community trust and educational reputation with Appletree's larger facilities.

This could create a school more attractive to families across both catchments, increasing enrolment and aligning with the Council's goal of 390 places per year group while supporting transitions to Middle and High Schools in the three-tier system.

Comparison of Absence Data

Absence data reflects pupil engagement and school stability, critical for a successful merger. For 2023/2024, Appletree Gardens First School reported an overall absence rate of 5.5%, matching the England state-funded schools average and slightly above North Tyneside's 5.4%.

Its persistent absence rate was 15%, above England's 14.6% and North Tyneside's 13.7%,

In contrast, Langley First School's persistent absence rate was 5.9%, significantly lower than Appletree's, England's, and North Tyneside's averages, suggesting stronger pupil engagement and family commitment, likely ed to its higher parental preference.

Absence data is a critical indicator of pupil engagement and school effectiveness, particularly under Ofsted's updated inspection framework which has been recently broadened to include grading of 'attendance and behaviour'

If schools are now being evaluated in this area, a strong leadership team with robust absence policies would be essential to guide the school effectively.

Proposal

We propose that North Tyneside Council, with approval from the Secretary of State under the Education and Inspections Act 2006 (EIA 2006, sections 10), publish proposals to:

1. **Close both Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School**, following the statutory process for school closures (EIA sec on 15).

2. **Open a new First School on the Appletree Gardens site**, integrating the strongest aspects of both schools' ethos, staff, and practices to form a new identity with enhanced community appeal.

This aligns with DfE guidance: "The local authority and/or governing body (depending on school category) can publish proposals to close 2, or more, schools and the local authority (or a proposer other than the local authority depending on category) can publish a proposal to open a new school" ("Opening and closing maintained schools," 2024, p. 25).

Unlike the Council's plan (closing Langley and enlarging Appletree while retaining its DfE number), this creates a genuinely new entity with a new DfE number, fostering a genuine fresh start.

Benefits

- **Enhanced Parental Appeal**: A new school blending Langley's high parental preference (75%+ uptake) with Appletree's larger facilities could attract more families from both catchments, reducing surplus places (currently 14% at Appletree, projected to worsen) and mitigating deficits faster than a standard merger.

- **Educational and Financial Stability**: Higher enrolment would increase funding, addressing projected deficits and supporting quality education. This aligns with the Council's aim to cap NEPA First School places at 390, ensuring smooth transitions to aligned Middle Schools and Whitley Bay High School (390 places).

- **Community and Staff Integration**: A new identity allows collaborative development of ethos, governance, and branding, preserving valued elements from both schools while minimising disruption to staff morale, children and communities.

- **Familiarity:** A fairer solution for both parents and children, enabling a smoother transition between schools through the involvement of familiar staff.

Comparison with Council's Proposal

The Council's plan closes Langley, stops its Reception admissions from September 2026, and operates the merged school on Appletree's site retaining Appletree's DfE number. This risks perpetuating Appletree's lower uptake, as it doesn't fully leverage Langley's parental preference.

Langley First School, November 2025

Our proposal, while more complex, offers a true fresh start, aligning with DfE options for amalgamation and addressing the root issue of desirability. It maintains the Council's goals (60-place reduction, Woodlawn expansion) while enhancing outcomes

Supporting Data

- **Pupil Numbers**: NEPA First Schools are at 87% capacity, projected to drop to 75% (options appraisal). Appletree's 14% surplus and Langley's similar trend underscore the need for a compelling solution. -
- **Financials**: Langley and Appletree are facing current budget challenges that are expected to increase in the future, highlighting the urgency of increasing enrolment to secure funding.
- **Catchment**: Appletree's larger area (44 homes per place vs. 40) but lower uptake (<50%) contrasts with Langley's stronger draw, supporting amalgamation for broader appeal.
- **Absence**: taken from www.compare-school-performance.service.gov.uk

We urge the Council to consider this alternative during the consultation. We understand that this has been considered as part of the local authority's decision-making process, although this was not included in the other options section of the consultation document. We are prepared to discuss this further with our local member of Parliament with a view to raising this with the Secretary of State for Education. We understand that this may require a longer process and takes the decision from local decision makers. However, for a decision of this magnitude and the impact that this has clearly had on the school community, as evidenced by the campaign, further time to consider this solution would be in the best interests of all concerned. Further time may also allow bulge years to move through both schools.

ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL FOR CONSULTATION ON THE FUTURE OF LANGLEY FIRST SCHOOL :

Expression of Interest to Join a Multi Academy Trust

Date 10th November 2025

1. Introduction

This document outlines a proposal for Langley First School to explore and pursue academy conversion with the intention of joining Tudhoe Learning Trust (TLT) as a partner school. This proposal is presented as an alternative to the recommendation of the North Tyneside Strategic Education Review, which suggests merging Langley First School with Appletree Gardens First School.

The proposal aims to secure the long-term sustainability, autonomy, and distinct identity of Langley First School while ensuring continued excellence in teaching, learning, and community engagement.

2. Context

The North Tyneside Strategic Education Review has identified structural changes intended to improve educational provision and financial efficiency across the local area. One of its recommendations is the merger of Langley First School with Appletree Gardens First School.

While this proposal seeks to address local authority priorities, it risks the loss of Langley's unique ethos, community identity, and governance independence.

As an alternative, Langley's governing body proposes joining Tudhoe Learning Trust, a well-established multi-academy trust with a strong track record of supporting schools across the North East to improve outcomes while retaining individual character and community focus.

3. Legal Right to Join an Academy Trust

Under the Academies Act 2010, all maintained schools in England have the legal right to convert to academy status, subject to the approval of the Secretary of State for Education. The governing body of a maintained school may apply to the Department for Education (DfE) to become an academy, either as a standalone academy or as part of an existing multi-academy trust.

The process is governed by the Education and Adoption Act 2016, which also gives governing bodies autonomy to determine the most appropriate trust partnership. Local authorities may provide advice, but they cannot prevent a school from seeking academy conversion or joining a MAT, provided due process and consultation are undertaken.

4. About Tudhoe Learning Trust

Tudhoe Learning Trust is a North East–based multi-academy trust currently comprising seven primary schools with shared values around collaboration, excellence, and community.

Langley First School, November 2025

Key features of Tudhoe Learning Trust include:
• Strong central support for school improvement, HR, finance, and governance.
• A focus on developing leadership capacity within schools.
• A collaborative culture where schools retain individuality within a supportive network.
• A proven record of improving outcomes in schools with varying contexts.

Langley's ethos and values align closely with the Trust's commitment to high standards, inclusion, and community engagement.

5. Advantages of Joining Tudhoe Learning Trust

Educational Improvement – Access to high-quality school improvement services, leadership coaching, and subject networks. Opportunities for collaborative moderation and curriculum innovation.

Financial Sustainability – Greater financial resilience through centralised services, economies of scale, and shared procurement. Ability to redirect savings into teaching and learning.

Governance & Autonomy – Retention of local governance through a Local Governing Committee, ensuring decisions reflect Langley's community needs.

Professional Development – Access to a wider network of staff development, secondment opportunities, and trust-wide leadership programmes.

Pupil Experience – Enhanced curriculum enrichment through collaboration, events, and shared resources across the trust.

Strategic Growth – Being part of a regional trust with strong governance provides stability and resilience against future structural changes proposed by the local authority.

This plan will ease the financial burden place on the local authority by Langley First School's predicted three-year deficit.

6. Potential Disadvantages and Mitigations

Loss of direct local authority support – The Trust provides comprehensive central services that replace and often exceed LA support capacity.

Change in employment terms for staff (TUPE transfer) – Full TUPE consultation will be carried out; no detriment to pay or conditions anticipated.

Reduced individual autonomy over some operational functions – Local governance arrangements will maintain school-level influence; the Trust operates a model of distributed leadership.

Adjustment period during conversion – A clear communication and transition plan will be established to support staff, parents, and pupils.

7. Consultation and Governance Process

Before any final decision, the governing body will:
• Engage with parents, staff, and stakeholders through consultation meetings and written communication.
• Seek feedback from the local authority and the Regional Director for the North East (DfE).
• Conduct due diligence with Tudhoe Learning Trust regarding financial and educational performance.
• Formally vote on a resolution to apply for academy conversion once all consultations are complete.

Langley First School, November 2025

8. Proposed Timeline
Phase 1 – Initial discussions between Langley Governing Body and Tudhoe Learning Trust (Nov–Dec 2025)

Phase 2 – Stakeholder consultation (Jan–Feb 2026)

Phase 3 – Due diligence, financial review, and legal advice (Feb–Mar 2026)

Phase 4 – Governing Body resolution and submission of Academy Order application to DfE (Apr 2026)

Phase 5 – Conversion process (May–Sept 2026)

Phase 6 – Official conversion and joining Tudhoe Learning Trust (Oct 2026)

9. Conclusion
Joining Tudhoe Learning Trust offers Langley First School an opportunity to:
• Secure its long-term independence and community identity.
• Strengthen educational and financial resilience.
• Align with a values-driven, collaborative network of schools.
• Exercise its legal right to determine its own strategic direction.

This proposal represents a constructive and forward-looking alternative to the merger suggested in the North Tyneside Strategic Education Review and supports the continued success and distinctive nature of Langley First School.

Prepared by: The Governing Body of Langley First School
Date: November 2025

Counter Proposal to the North Tyneside Strategic Education Review

Federation Between Langley First School and Woodlawn Special School

Date: November 2025

Submitted by: Langley First School

In response to the North Tyneside Strategic Education Review

1. Executive Summary

This document outlines a counter proposal to the North Tyneside Strategic Education Review, presenting an alternative, sustainable model for education provision in the borough through the creation of a formal federation between Langley First School and Woodlawn Special School.

The Federation would create a shared vision for inclusion and continuity, enabling dual registration, shared teaching, and flexible pathways between mainstream and specialist education. The proposal also includes plans to relocate Woodlawn's sixth form provision (42 students) onto the Langley site, reduce Langley's PAN to 45 to create the necessary space, and explore shared site development opportunities.

The Federation aligns with national and local priorities for SEND improvement, inclusion, and financial sustainability, while strengthening community provision through expanded nursery and wraparound services.

2. Strategic Rationale

2.1 Alignment with National SEND and Inclusion Strategy

This proposal supports the government's SEND and Alternative Provision Improvement Plan, which prioritises inclusion within mainstream education, improved early identification, collaboration between mainstream and special schools, and efficient use of funding and resources.

The Federation would deliver a continuum of provision from Early Years to Post-16 within a single strategic framework, ensuring local children can access high-quality, inclusive education

close to home.

2.2 Local Context and Need
Woodlawn Special School provides exceptional specialist education but faces ongoing pressures on space for post-16 learners. Langley First School has the capacity and facilities to accommodate flexible use, and a reduction in PAN would free sufficient classroom space. There is local and parental demand for stronger inclusion and integrated support between mainstream and specialist settings.

The proposed Federation represents a practical and inclusive response to these challenges.

3. Federation Proposal

3.1 Structure
- Establish a Hard Federation between Langley First School and Woodlawn Special School under a single Governing Body.
- Retain both schools' individual identities while developing a shared leadership model with an Executive Headteacher and Heads of School.
- Create a Joint Inclusion Committee to oversee shared provision, dual registration, and inclusion strategy.

3.2 Inclusion Framework
The Federation will develop an inclusive curriculum and staffing model that enables dual registration, shared teaching, CPD, and therapeutic support, and joint enrichment activities to promote inclusion and social cohesion. This approach positions the Federation as a regional exemplar for inclusion and collaboration.

4. Accommodation and Capacity Plan

4.1 Sixth Form Relocation
Relocate 42 Sixth Form pupils currently educated off-site to newly adapted classrooms within Langley First School. Langley's PAN would be reduced to 45, releasing two classrooms for the Sixth Form. Facilities would be adapted to meet post-16 needs, including accessible teaching areas, life skills zones, and vocational learning spaces.

4.2 Shared Facilities and Future Site Development
Explore shared use of the Playing Field at Drumoyne Gardens, providing outdoor learning and recreation space for both schools. In the longer term, consider site development on the Drumoyne Gardens land to support the Federation—potentially for specialist teaching spaces, therapy areas, or community facilities.

5. Early Years and Wraparound Provision

5.1 Nursery Expansion
Extend Langley's current nursery offer to 30 funded hours, meeting local demand and enhancing

access for working families. Integrate specialist early intervention and inclusion support, drawing on Woodlawn's expertise.

5.2 Wraparound Services
Bring the Schools Out wraparound care provision under Federation management, ensuring consistent safeguarding and quality standards, and creating increased income generation opportunities reinvested in inclusive provision.

6. Financial and Resource Efficiency

The Federation offers a financially sustainable model through shared leadership and operations, optimised use of assets, additional income from nursery and wraparound provision, and enhanced value for money by aligning resources around inclusion and shared outcomes.

7. Anticipated Benefits

Inclusion – Seamless movement between mainstream and specialist settings.
Pupil outcomes – Broader curriculum access and improved transition to adulthood.
Post-16 provision – Creation of a dedicated local base for 42 Sixth Form pupils.
Resource efficiency – Shared leadership reduces operational costs.
Community engagement – Strengthened early years and wraparound support.
Financial sustainability – Increased income from nursery and wraparound provision.

8. Implementation Timeline (Indicative)

Phase 1 – Stakeholder and community consultation (Spring 2026)
Phase 2 – Formal Federation agreement (Autumn 2026)
Phase 3 – PAN reduction and Sixth Form transition planning (Autumn 2026 – Spring 2027)
Phase 4 – Sixth Form relocation and Federation launch (September 2027)
Phase 5 – Feasibility work for Drumoyne Gardens development (2027–2028)
Phase 6 – Expansion of nursery and wraparound services (from 2027 onwards)

9. Impact on Proposals from the North Tyneside Education Review

Reduction of the number of children in NEPA to 390- would reduce by 15. This does not meet the required number, but does have some impact, and other schools could be considered to also reduce PANS eg Appletree Gardens and Southridge.

Use of Langley site to expand Woodlawn provision- still achieves this.

School deficits- Restructure of Langley to develop staffing structure that will reduce predicted deficit.

10. Conclusion

The Langley–Woodlawn Federation offers a visionary, locally grounded alternative to the current Strategic Education Review. It strengthens inclusion, improves the quality of education

for pupils with SEND, and makes efficient use of local assets. This proposal represents a sustainable, inclusive, and community-focused model for North Tyneside.

Contact for Further Information

Langley First School
Langley Avenue, Whitley Bay, NE25 9DL
Tel: 0191 6432026 Email: simon.ward@ntlp.org.uk

Woodlawn Special School
Drumoyne Gardens, Whitley Bay, NE25 XXX
Tel: [Insert number] | Email: [Insert address]

Counter Proposal to the North Tyneside Strategic Education Review

Date: November 2025

Submitted by: Langley First School

In response to the North Tyneside Strategic Education Review

A Sustainable Education Plan for North Tyneside

Guiding Principles

- Maintain **balance of the present 3 tier system and confidence of the local community of Monkseaton** by keeping Langley First School open.
- Expand **special educational needs (SEN) provision** at Woodlawn to meet growing demand.
- Reduce surplus capacity across the North Tyneside Planning Area to **390 pupils per year group**, ensuring financial sustainability.
- Respond to **falling birth rates** and projected deficits without resorting to unnecessary closures.

Key Components

1. Retain Langley First School

- **Rationale:** Langley is a valued community school with strong performance and identity. Closure would disrupt families and reduce parental choice unnecessarily.
- **Action:** Keep Langley operational but **adjust its Published Admission Number (PAN)** to reflect demographic trends (e.g., reduce intake by 10–15%).
- Explore **shared services** (admin, SEN support) with nearby schools to cut costs.

Langley First School, November 2025

---

2. Expand Woodlawn Special School

- **Rationale:** Demand for SEN provision is rising, and Woodlawn is well-placed to deliver high-quality specialist education.
- **Action:** Repurpose **surplus space at other sites** (e.g., underused classrooms in merged or partially vacant schools) rather than closing Langley- the reduction in PAN and therefore available classrooms at Langley would provide sufficient space for the rest of the Woodlawn children currently educated at a different site.
- Phase expansion over 3–5 years to minimize upfront capital costs.

---

3. Reduce PAN Across NEPA to 390 Pupils per Year Group

- **Current Issue:** Surplus places exceed 25%, far above the 10% resilience threshold. This drives deficits because funding is per pupil.
- **Action:** Implement a **coordinated reduction in PAN** across First and Middle schools:
- **Adjust the PANs across other NEPA first schools eg**
- **Appletree Gardens- 45 (from 60)**
- **Southridge 45 (from 60)**
- **South Wellfield 45 (from 60)**
- **Other permutations may be available eg Marine Park 75 or 60 (from 90)**

Admissions at middle schools would be aligned with reduced first school intakes.

---

4. Financial Sustainability Measures

- **Shared Staffing & Resources:** Pool specialist staff (e.g., SENDCOs, caretakers, SBMs) across NEPA schools.
- **Community Use of Surplus Space:** Rent out unused classrooms for childcare, adult learning, or community hubs.

---

5. Long-Term Planning

- Monitor **housing developments** and adjust forecasts annually with specific focus on the Murton Gap development and the proximity to Langley First School.
- Build flexibility into the system to **scale up or down** without major structural changes.
- Prioritise **repurposing over closure** to avoid irreversible loss of assets.

Benefits of This Approach

- Preserves **local school identity** and parental choice.
- Meets **SEN demand** without sacrificing mainstream provision.
- Aligns capacity with **demographic reality** (390 pupils/year group).
- Reduces financial risk by cutting surplus places and sharing resources.
- Avoids the social and educational disruption of mass closures

This would require restructuring across the NEPA which seems a fairer option than the closure and loss of jobs at one school.

Successful schools retain their identity and place in their community in the long term.

Counter Proposal to the North Tyneside Strategic Education Review

Langley/Appletree Federation

Executive Summary

This report presents a revised strategy for managing first school capacity in North Tyneside. It argues against the proposed merger of Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School, demonstrating that the plan is based on a flawed premise. While the Appletree site can physically accommodate additional pupils in the short term, the merger would create a period of significant operational strain followed by a rapid return to surplus capacity.

Updated forecasts, based on the council's own birth data, show that reception cohorts will remain stable, not collapse. Therefore, drastic measures are unnecessary.

A more prudent and effective solution is a **federation of Langley and Appletree First Schools**, with both operating at a reduced PAN of 45.

This is combined with a phased programme of PAN reductions across the area - including the closure of Coquet Park in 2032 (when PFI contracts expire) and an earlier PAN reduction at Marine Park.

If a merger is deemed unavoidable, this report also presents a **less disruptive fallback scenario**. Delaying an amalgamation until **2029** and ceasing reception intake at Langley in 2027 and 2028 would avoid the severe overcrowding of the current proposal.

1. Challenging the Premise

The primary justification for the proposed merger is the need to align first school capacity with the 390 places available in the area's middle and high schools. However, this argument is unnecessary. An analysis of historical birth and admissions data reveals a stable and predictable relationship.

Langley First School, November 2025

Updated forecasts, anchored to the council's 2024 birth figures, project a steady reception intake of approximately **330 - 339 pupils per year** through to 2040. There is no demographic collapse on the horizon.

Birth Year (AY)	Reception Year	NT Births	NEPA Births	Projected Reception Pupils
2024/25	Sep-29	1,814	248	**334**
2025/26	Sep-30	1,793	245	**330**
2026/27	Sep-31	1,800	246	**332**
2027/28	Sep-32	1,809	247	**333**
...	...	...	...	...
2035/36	Sep-40	1,837	251	**339**

Statistical analysis from our research report, *A Critical Review of the Langley & Appletree Merger*, shows that the probability of reception admissions exceeding 390 pupils is **less than 1%**. A surge large enough to cause a capacity crisis is statistically implausible. The problem the merger aims to solve does not exist.

2. The Current Merger Proposal: A Disruptive and Short-Sighted Solution

While the current school estate has a surplus of places that must be managed, merging Langley First School into Appletree Gardens in 2027 is a poor solution. It is strategically timed to cause maximum disruption and fails to provide a sustainable long-term plan.

- **Operational Overload vs. Official Capacity:** The proposal notes that the Appletree site could accommodate up to 432 pupils. However, operating at **407 pupils** in 2027/28 would push the site to its absolute limit, creating significant operational strain on everything from classroom space and shared facilities to playground access and staff workload.

- **A Short-Term Fix:** This period of intense pressure would be brief. The school roll would then fall by over 100 pupils in just three years, declining to just 283 by 2030/31. This "double shock" of operational overload followed by a rapid return to surplus capacity is disruptive and strategically unsound.

- **Maximum Disruption:** Crucially, implementing this merger in 2027 would mean disrupting the **largest cohorts of pupils** currently moving through the system. A far more logical approach is to wait until the smaller birth-rate cohorts are in the schools.

Academic Year (2027 Merger)	Total Roll	vs Max Capacity (432)	vs PAN Capacity (300)
27/28	**407**	25	-107
28/29	336	96	-36
29/30	302	130	-2
30/31	283	149	17

3. A Strategic Alternative: Federation and Phased PAN Reductions

A more logical and sustainable strategy is to avoid the merger and instead establish a **federation between Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School**. This approach maintains both school sites, prevents disruption, and manages capacity intelligently.

The core of this plan is:

1. **Federate** Langley and Appletree, and reduce both schools to **PAN 45** starting in **2028/29**.

2. **Close Coquet Park** in **2032/33**, aligning with the PFI contract expiry.

3. **Smooth Utilisation** by reducing **Marine Park's PAN to 75** at an earlier date.

Langley First School, November 2025

The data shows a dip in utilisation in the late 2020s before the PFI changes in 2032.

Bringing Marine Park's PAN reduction forward to **2029/30 (Scenario N2-early)** is the most effective way to smooth this dip, lifting PAN utilisation to **86.4%** and keeping the area within a stable range.

Scenario	2028/29	2029/30	2031/32	2032/33	2035/36
N1 (PFI-Aligned): Marine -> 75 in **2032**	85.2%	83.3%	80.4%	**89.4%**	**90.3%**
N2-early (Recommended): Marine -> 75 in **2029**	85.2%	**86.4%**	**83.4%**	**89.4%**	**90.3%**

This approach is superior to the 2027 merger. It aligns capacity with demand, keeps both Langley and Appletree viable, avoids the "double shock" at Appletree, and positions the borough to deliver high-quality, inclusive education.

Note: *To avoid a closure of Coquet, Marine Park could also drop to* ***PAN 60 in 2032****, which would have similar, albeit slightly smaller, effects on utilisation.*

4. Ensuring Financial Viability Under Federation

Under the primary 'federation' recommendation, the financial position of both Langley and Appletree is stabilised by matching their structure (PAN 45) to the actual pupil demand. Further financial viability and educational value can be achieved by:

- **Co-locating Specialist SEND Provision:** Using surplus space created by the PAN 45 structure at **both** Appletree and Langley sites for specialist SEND units. This increases building utilisation and secures high-needs funding streams.

- **Leveraging Woodlawn Proximity:** Langley's unique co-location next to Woodlawn Special School should be leveraged. The federated schools can use this proximity to create an integrated provision, offering mainstream access and shared resources for special students, which is a key council priority.

Langley First School, November 2025

- **Balancing Admissions:** Modestly adjusting admissions policies to direct 6-10 pupils per year from over-subscribed schools to the federated Langley/Appletree sites would be sufficient to balance rolls and bolster their financial stability.

5. Fallback Scenario: A Less Disruptive 2029 Merger

While this report strongly recommends the federation (Section 3), if a merger is deemed unavoidable, a later **merger in 2029** offers a vastly superior alternative to the current 2027 proposal. This would involve **Langley First School closing** and pupils transferring to Appletree Gardens.

The primary flaw of the 2027 merger is timing: it disrupts the largest pupil cohorts and creates immediate, severe overcrowding (407 pupils).

A 2029 merger, preceded by **ceasing Reception intake at Langley in 2027 and 2028**, would solve this. The merged school would open in 2029 with a manageable roll of **~351 pupils**, completely avoiding the overcrowding crisis.

This approach also creates a clear pathway for co-location. The two freed-up Reception rooms at Langley ('27 and '28) can be immediately repurposed for a **Woodlawn Special School satellite base** and retained post-merger, removing ~120 places from net capacity and improving utilisation from day one.

A balanced version of this fallback plan (2029 merger + Marine Park PAN 75 in 2030) maintains high and stable area-level utilisation:

Year (2029 Merger)	PAN Utilisation %	Net Util % (at 432)	Net Util % (at 432) with Woodlawn (-120 capacity)
2029/30	89.7%	84.8%	**~90.0%**
2030/31	90.3%	82.1%	**~87.1%**
2031/32	90.0%	81.8%	**~86.8%**
2032/33	89.4%	81.2%	**~86.1%**

Strategic Risk and Mitigation

While logistically superior, this 2029 merger plan still carries a profound strategic risk. The proposal closes the more popular and demographically resilient school (Langley) to save the weaker one (Appletree).

- **Parental Demand:** 2025 admissions data shows Langley's first preferences stood at **78%** of its PAN, with a 5.9-mile draw. Appletree's stood at only **50%**, with a 3.6-mile draw.

- **Demographic Resilience:** Analysis ranks Appletree Gardens as the **most sensitive school** in the area to falling birth rates. Langley is ranked as having medium sensitivity, insulated by its proven popularity.

Therefore, if this merger proceeds, it **must be a genuine amalgamation with a new, collaborative ethos, leadership, and identity** that retains the confidence of *both* parent communities. A simple closure where Langley pupils transfer to "Appletree Gardens" as it currently exists risks inheriting its weaker market position and high demographic vulnerability, causing the new, larger school to fail.

This fallback plan is less disruptive, avoids overcrowding, and provides a clear strategic use for the repurposed space, but it remains secondary to the more flexible federation approach.

6. Recommendations

Based on a thorough analysis of the available data, this report makes the following recommendations:

1. **Reject the proposal** to merge Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School in 2027. The plan is ill-timed, disruptive, and fails to provide a sustainable solution.

2. **Primary Recommendation:** Adopt the Federation Model This involves:

- Federating Langley and Appletree First Schools, with both reducing to PAN 45 in 2028.

- Reducing Marine Park First School to PAN 75 in 2029 to smooth area utilisation.

- Closing Coquet Park First School in 2032 (PFI-aligned).

3. **Fallback Recommendation:** If a merger is mandated, **adopt the 2029 amalgamation plan** (closing Langley and ceasing its reception intake in '27/'28) as a less disruptive alternative, **on the condition** that it is managed as a genuine amalgamation of equals to mitigate the strategic risks.

4. **Immediately begin a feasibility study** for the co-location of specialist SEND units at both the Langley and Appletree sites, leveraging Langley's proximity to Woodlawn.

5. **Implement minor adjustments to admissions policies** to better balance pupil numbers across the borough and support the viability of all schools.

This strategic, data-driven approach will right-size the school estate, protect school finances, and ensure the long-term delivery of high-quality, inclusive education in North Tyneside.

Section 2:

Stage 1 Pre-Publication Consultation responses to free text questions.

North Tyneside Council

Potential merger of Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School

SURVEY RESPONSE REPORT
02 October 2025 - 13 November 2025

PROJECT NAME:
Consultation on the future of Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School

GRANICUS

SURVEY QUESTIONS

Q1 We would like to know what your suggestion is and how you think it could be achieved - please explain in the space below

Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 12:22 PM	merge them into monkseaton high school its the most modern buildings and has space to have more classes in the year groups rather two over sized. its off the residential streets. its challenge getting near the school now as parent if the pubilic numbers increase so does the parent numbers during drop off.
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 12:47 PM	The location of the school, the student demographic, and how well-settled my child is are key reasons why I am unhappy with the proposed merger. Families have not been considered at all in this decision. We specifically chose Langley First School because of its supportive environment, strong values, and family feel. We did not apply for Apple Tree, as it did not align with our family's needs and values.
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 01:28 PM	Instead of uprooting two major schools which are incredibly popular in their own rights, pick other smaller schools to interfere with that are not as popular and distribute their funding amongst the more popular schools. For example, Star of the Sea...
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 02:19 PM	Keep Langley First School
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 02:23 PM	currently langley has 2 classes per year, reduce to 1 and reduce catchment area, will also lessen needs for space within the building area which woodlawn can extend into still
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 03:48 PM	Continue as they are until current pupils have all passed through schools There is so much value in smaller class sizes too
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 04:45 PM	Closure of Rockcliffe and reduction of Whitley Lodge PAN to 30. This would eliminate the need for mixed age classes completely and remove the need for reliance on the old building at Rockcliffe. Whitley Lodge was very close to 30 in terms of pupils in 2025, so a PAN of 30 would be appropriate. There are also schools in Cullercoats that are under capacity, so that could serve people within the Rockcliffe area. Also I believe that many of children at Marine Park are within Apple Tree catchment and could go there and again Rockcliffe children

could move to Marine Park. Finally the building of new houses near the Monkseaton high school, could provide additional children for Langley to increase their numbers. Whilst I understand that 100 houses equates to around 32 children, these children would be closest in proximity to Langley.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 05:18 PM

A new school - not a merged one. The idea of disbanding langley and merging it with appletree is nothing short of obscene, to put double the amount of children in a school that was not designed for that amount of kids smacks of greed. Appletree gardens is an old building and having been around the school it is already in desperate need for modernisation, not just the odd classroom and a lick of paint but structurally and externally. If you have to move these children give them a new modern space to learn, not overload an already aged facility.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 05:51 PM

Leave Langley open! When the hundreds of houses built on Robinson Fields are occupied by families there will be no spaces for them to go to.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 05:55 PM

Langley first school is and always has been an excellent school and a huge part of our community. To merge it with another school and love the another site is effectively closing the school and we would lose the amazing staff, many of which have been there for years. Langley has received much more favourable offsted reports consistently over appletree, so to choose to close Langley over appletree doesn't make sense. My proposal would be to close apple tree if a first school has to close, and move Woodlawn there if they need more space. If monkseaton middle is going to close that would also be another option to move Woodlawn to, without having to sacrifice a wonderful school in Langley.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 06:31 PM

Keep Langley First school, it is thriving and no need to merge the schools. Look into wraparound care, repurpose unused classroom for community use and nursery provision - from 2 years onwards. The staff at Langley have not had a chance to try any of these before being told about the merger.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 06:38 PM

With the current and future planned expansion of the housing area in and around West Monkseaton area, this will bring an influx of new and young families. It was proposed that a new school will be built to accommodate this . I would delay the building of this new school and accommodate the additional pupils in both langley and Appletree.

Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 06:54 PM	Leave the schools as they are. The closure of Monkseaton high school and now further schools is an urgent change for funding which will have been looked at for years if now is the time for changing look at other sectors NOT where children's futures are put at risk
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 06:55 PM	share leadership across both schools but keep their separate identities and sites open. This avoids closure while allowing collaboration.
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 07:00 PM	Allow the children to stay or allow children Tom apply tree to come to Langley instead. It's the more popular and structurally appropriate school. Fantastic facilities and huge community backing.
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 07:03 PM	Continue to facilitate the use of Langley first school for current students and new ones who are coming into the school - allow children from potentially further a field to attend the school if interested. Close apple tree instead Langley.
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 07:12 PM	You could use Monkseaton middle school to teach Langley pupils as well as years 5 and 6 from Monkseaton middle making it a primary school
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 07:40 PM	To merge Appletree & Monkseaton middle which are nearer to each other
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 07:57 PM	There are other schools in Whitley bay that have less children because of expensive housing, south ridge, Whitley lodge, croquet. Why were these not considered first. Use Monkseaton middle as the new Woodlawn as there are 3 larger middle schools that can accommodate the area. Langley is a happy, well rounded school where children are thriving so it seems a real shame to shut it down and get rid of wonderful teachers.
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 08:18 PM	You propose due to low birth rates, yet we have a new housing estate with suggested 1000 houses being built next to Langley. I have had 3 children attend Langley over 10 years and they have been long regarded as one of the best primary schools in the borough. It has always rated excellent by offset and it shows in the excellent running of the school and the children who attend. Appletree has not always had the best reputation. Closing the better school, losing the staff

	who made it that way is nonsensical. I would propose keeping Langley open and assessing the birth rates over the next 5 years given the increase in NT population qq
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 08:22 PM	With the limited information available it's difficult to make an alternative proposal, NTC should share a full and comprehensive report including funding forecasts for each school in the affected area over the next 10 years. Alongside this it would be useful to know what the predicted S106 contributions from new development would be in the same period. Has this been reviewed alongside the new emerging local plan?
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 08:52 PM	The small amount of additional space available at Langley could be used as an extension of Schools Out Langley and provide private nursery places for infants.
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 09:20 PM	Move woodlawn to monkseaton high and use it as a sen school which it also has its own road access so will stop the concerns of the local residents who are allready annoyed with the amount of taxis comming in and out.
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 09:33 PM	Given Langley is a more popular school with an excellent reputation, it should be allowed to continue and the children of Appletree (which is a much less popular school) to merge with all existing schools in the area given existing capacity in year groups in Langley and Marine.
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 10:03 PM	Utilise the empty school Building at monkseaton high as a new Woodlawn site
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 10:43 PM	Instead of finding ways to closed schools around the borough especially when ore homes are being built and more families coming to the area how about the council don't give themselves increases in expenses, how about the council don't become corrupt and greedy people because this is the stuff that comes out further down the line and even though many of you may not be in the council or in a different department it's all comes around again. You're all being corrupt you all deserve to be kicked out of the council, you will create a nightmare for yourselves, public don't sit quietly anymore
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 11:26 PM	Langley First School is currently only 10% below capacity. It's currently an outstanding school that serves its community. The only

reason it's being considered for closure is the availability for the building adjacent to Woodlawn Special school.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 06:56 AM

The most obvious sensible solution is to use Monkseaton High school as a primary for Appletree and Monkseaton middle - continue through to 6th form. Leave Langley as a fabulous baby school. It’s a beautiful school I v been parent/carer/grandparent using this school. Little village schools are a must in our communities. Who’s to say with all these new builds popping up, around Whitley Bay there won’t be a baby boom. Like always NTC will always take the easiest route, losing Monkseaton High to land development is the biggest mistake. That school should be used it’s a bad mistake losing it. Langley needs to stay.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 07:17 AM

Langley should stay open, there are enough spaces at Appletree for all of the Langley children. These children especially the ones who have just started reception are our ‘Covid generation’ who already suffered as babies/toddlers and now they’re expected to change schools at such a young age. Children who are already in the school should be able to stay until they finish in year 4 and gradually close the school if that is necessary. How is merging two schools going to work? Is the name changing, are they merging their aims and beliefs. The parents who chose Langley chose there for a reason, we do not want our children to move.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 09:41 AM

Firstly, your option is predicated on incorrect information. The birthday of around 12 in 2000 and down to around 10.5 in 2020 had a net impact of 3 less children per intake. The birthrate is now predicted at 9.7 in 2027 (this is from office of national statistics). Which means still an impact of 3 per intake. Couple that with the fact the school being closed has a larger than average catchment area and the recent Recption intake was 40 students. Well it is clear to see your argument is completely inaccurate. Instead you're proposing to place a huge catchment area onto the other school so you can take the land and sell - a smash and grab for cash. Your recent committee meeting proposes up 125% pay rises across the committe and mayor despite you running a -c£450m budget. The counter proposal is you stop falsifying data to achieve the goal which is back handed payments for land while you dessicated the community. I am taking this information to GB News, and this information applies to all the schools whose land you're trying to Rob to develop. The developments - whose schools will their kids go to? Your response, who cares that's another councils problem. This is why you're being removed from power. #Reform.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 09:48 AM

The space available in Appletree could be used for a SEN unit, those that don't have physical needs which Woodlawn offers can be placed here. Or a reduced capacity at Wellfield. Langley at a 10% surplus is not much and does not equate this 'merge' proposed. Or nursery provisions could expand at the school, many many families are looking for nursery placements since the new funding was set in place, this could help make up the 10% surplus.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 10:50 AM

[redacted] we see a huge volume of traffic, aggression, near misses and compromised health and safety for both residents who live here and families attending Appletree Gardens school. My proposal would be to use an alternative such as Monkseaton High school. Use this site as a merger for the children as it is still relatively close by, traffic round Appletree would not be unsustainable as it is already, and Appletree and Monkseaton Middle could close. Ideally no schools would close but this could be an alternative solution.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 12:37 PM

I believe the Council should pause the proposal to close Langley First School and instead explore options that preserve both Langley and Appletree sites, such as a federation or shared leadership model, which would allow savings and collaboration without losing vital local provision. The consultation materials focus on aligning numbers but do not address key practical issues: it is unclear whether the Appletree site has the classrooms, dining space, play areas, and SEND facilities to accommodate the combined pupil roll, and no independent suitability review has been published; moving all pupils to Appletree will also increase car journeys, congestion, and parking pressures around an already busy area, raising safety concerns, yet no travel assessment has been completed; and while the Community Impact Assessment acknowledges change, it does not reflect the importance of Langley as a hub for families, especially vulnerable ones, nor the reduction in parental choice its closure would create. Larger schools also do not automatically meet all children's needs, so a detailed plan for SEND support and wraparound childcare provision should be included. A federation between Langley and Appletree would achieve sustainability while keeping both sites open, protecting community links, reducing travel impacts, and maintaining choice for families.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 02:06 PM

Monkseaton high could be used to accommodate Woodlawn

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 02:33 PM

Given that Langley currently takes in a higher number of students, of which these students put langley as 1st choice and Appletree being

	the school that is more undersubscribed , surely it would make more sense to close Appletree. The Appletree site, and also the monkseaton middle school site could be used to facilitate woodlawn school pupils in one place if that is desired, with langley using the space from woodlawn needed to accommodate extra students from Appletree. That being said, there are much less students needing to be moved from Appletree- only 30 in the 2025 intake , apposed to 46 into langley. These may be able to be absorbed into surrounding 1st schools without additional space being required as most schools are undersubscribed .
Screen Name Redacted 10/03/2025 02:59 PM	I believe the merger should not happen. With the new builds, there will be more children needing to go to school and Langley should be an option. As well as this, the merger would create major disruption for pupils, parents, staff and the local community
Screen Name Redacted 10/03/2025 04:33 PM	If you hadn't allowed Monkseaton High to reach the financial deficit that it reached, then this wouldn't be happening. How you can be allowing the building of the new estates in the area (literally not far from Langley First School) and trying to argue that there will be a reduction of children for schools is beyond me. Somebody is making a lot of money from this. It's a disgrace. The simple suggestion is to keep the school open. It's a pilar of the community and has a super reputation for the education of local children. You're selling the land for monkseaton High School so that money should go to the first schools to keep them going. I'm sure the attendances of the schools will pick up as more residents move here. Living at the coast will always be popular.
Screen Name Redacted 10/03/2025 05:06 PM	No changes to the current system
Screen Name Redacted 10/03/2025 05:37 PM	Do not build the new school that is being built to accommodate the 7,000 new homes you have agreed to be built in our locality and use the existing schools for the 7,000 new families moving here.
Screen Name Redacted 10/03/2025 05:51 PM	You are guilty of placing to much trust in trends and forecasting over a 10 year period. Let's look closer at the impact of your declared outbuilding programme. You would expect this to increase the need for local school places in the future and you run a major risk of not having enough local spaces for local children. Demographics and trends can change so where is your alternative study. In the shorter then you run the schools at a loss and look at diverting resources from elsewhere to pick that up. Shelve town improvement plans

	shelve vanity projects shelve cycle routes, increase your education budget, (which I'm sure people would support), plan to divert finances from sale of land eg Monkseaton high when it closes and you no doubt sell it to developers , go to National government for support. Education in my opinion should never be treated as a business it is a basic right enshrined in Labour Party tenets when did it become the norm that we have business managers which incidentally appear to have failed and cohorts of number crunchers in local government- maybe start by trimming bloated bureaucracy to divert funds to schools. Sadly you are missing the point of an education under a Labour government. Finally this option will not sit well with your constituents who like myself are long term Labour voters and you run the risk of driving us to alternative parties and opening up the door to Reform. Consider your actions carefully as every action has a consequence
Screen Name Redacted 10/03/2025 06:14 PM	To keep the schools open as you already have we have over 3000 homes in the process of being built where are those children going to school
Screen Name Redacted 10/04/2025 07:24 AM	Constructive Alternatives • Form a Federation: Keep both schools open under one leadership structure to share expertise and resources while maintaining separate sites and community access. • Collaborative Partnership: Encourage shared initiatives—such as curriculum enrichment, teacher training, or resource pooling—without forcing a merger. • Partial Site Use: Allow Woodlawn Special School to develop specialised facilities within part of Langley's site while continuing mainstream education alongside it. • Gradual Development Plan: Conduct a full review of local educational needs before any irreversible decision to close a school is made. For these reasons, I urge the local authority to reject this merger proposal and instead pursue cooperative, community-centred alternatives that protect quality education, choice, and stability for all families involved.
Screen Name Redacted 10/04/2025 04:30 PM	Keep Langley open
Screen Name Redacted 10/04/2025 05:43 PM	1) Keep Langley First School open using the fabulous reputation to maintain student numbers. Use metrics like KS results and qualititive feedback from stakeholders including Ofsted and quality. Spend on schools and social care and not unnecessary events etc. 2) Close schools elsewhere in North Tyneside that are not as good. 3) Move to a junior and high school structure which would mean the children staying at both schools longer.

Screen Name Redacted
10/04/2025 06:43 PM

The children need the space in these schools..you build new housing in this area and don't consider extra schooling or dentists and drsbto accommodate needs I work in a private nursery snd our baby room is full to the brim and we have waiting lists. ..where would these children go when they become school age? Which is the dates you propose to merge. Its a shame also my daughter attended Langley. It's a lovely school. What also would happen to the business on the site operating the wrap around care. It's so important to a children's development to have stability..bonds made with staff will be destroyed.

Screen Name Redacted
10/04/2025 09:09 PM

Use of empty classrooms at Langley for nursery and wrap around care. Community use.

Screen Name Redacted
10/04/2025 09:28 PM

Don’t merge, schools shouldn’t have to merge in order for those buildings to be turned into houses. It is the fault of the government for being ill equipped to handle the housing crisis and forcing schools and other educations to suffer for the sake of extra houses.

Screen Name Redacted
10/05/2025 05:09 PM

There are huge areas of land since the closure of Monkseaton high to expand Woodlawn. I don’t see how closing other schools and creating widespread disruption is helpful. There are plots of land close by.

Screen Name Redacted
10/05/2025 07:55 PM

It is evident that fundraising and a new prospect of volunteers is making a huge social media stir, to help save the schools

Screen Name Redacted
10/05/2025 08:30 PM

Leave thriving schools alone

Screen Name Redacted
10/08/2025 05:28 AM

I am writing to you as a member of the Langley First School community. I was lucky enough to go to Langley First School as a child. Because of the experience I had there, it inspired me to become a teacher myself. Langley First School is a VITAL part of our community and the impact you closing it will have will be felt for many years to come. I urge you to oppose the proposed merger of Langley First School with Appletree Gardens First School. This plan is not in the best interests of our children or community, and I have serious concerns about its impact: Loss of culture, ethos, and curriculum Langley First has a unique culture and ethos which cannot simply be transferred to another setting. Each school develops its own curriculum focus, values, and ways of working with children. Merging into Appletree Gardens does not guarantee that the strengths and

traditions of Langley will continue. Disproportionate impact on SEND children Children with additional needs thrive on stability, routine, and familiar staff who know them well. Moving them into a larger, unfamiliar environment risks setting back their progress and widening the gap between SEND pupils and their peers. Displacement of pupils and loss of community Langley First is more than a school building – it is the heart of our community. Closing it will displace pupils, split up established friendship groups, and weaken vital links between families, staff, and local services. This harms children's sense of belonging and the cohesion of our community. Capacity concerns The council's figures show Langley has only around 10% surplus places (an acceptable level), while Appletree Gardens has 25% – but this equates to only about 15 spare spaces per year group. This is not enough to accommodate all Langley pupils, meaning children risk being sent further afield. For these reasons, I strongly urge you to reconsider these proposals and protect Langley First School's future. Our children deserve stability, belonging, and the high-quality education they are already receiving in their own community school. Thank you for your time and for listening to our concerns. I hope you will stand with us to keep Langley First open.

Screen Name Redacted
10/08/2025 10:49 PM

Close Coquet park first on the criteria that it has the greatest debt of all the first schools and no pupils would be adversely affected in walking to school as Marine and Whitley Lodge are both close by. They also serve similar communities. Make Marine park a PAN of 60 once the additional places were no longer needed.

Screen Name Redacted
10/09/2025 12:15 AM

Proposing to open a new school instead of merging with appletree to make equal opportunities for staff to apply & create its own identity Facilitating room for Woodlawn to expand into Langley schools surplus classrooms Expanding nursery facilities repurposing surplus classrooms to wider community wrap around facilities etc

Screen Name Redacted
10/09/2025 10:32 AM

By creating a guaranteed system of 450 PAN from the primary schools in the proposal a guaranteed place at Whitley Bay High School, you create a compelling case for families to move to the area for the outstanding schooling, and with a housing project including over 3000 new houses, i believe the 450 PAN could be achieved by the year 2032. The crux of this solution is being able to accommodate the 450 PAN at Whitley Bay High School, having spoke to Steve Wilson, this might not actually be possible. If this is not possible, the suggestion to reduce the PAN to 390 and create a guaranteed path for local residents from primary through to Whitley Bay High School is the next best option. If Langley First School has to close, and merge with Appletree Gardens, I believe a change of name from Appletree

Gardens, to Langley Gardens First School would be an excellent gesture to the parent community and to commemorate a much loved education establishment in the local area.

Screen Name Redacted
10/09/2025 01:25 PM

I don't think it is a suitable site, given the increase in people who would drive their children to school. I think that should Monkseaton middle school be closed, then Appletree and Langley should merge on this site. A large part of the field at vernon drive could be made into visitor and parent parking for drop off and pick up. This could be made a one way system in and out which would prevent congestion and make it safer. Also to prevent congestion make vernon drive one way, it's already not accessible from the bottom at the Beverley road junction but it isn't a one way street, make it accessible from the Appletree/haig junction. This would also make those junctions safer. This option means that residents are not effected with people parking outside their properties or opposite driveways which prevent us accessing them.

Screen Name Redacted
10/09/2025 04:28 PM

From my understanding Coquet Park is the school with the biggest deficit and least pupils. I understand this is a PFI school so can't be closed immediately. I've heard 2032?! Surely however it makes best financial sense to close that in 2032 and deal with financial deficit of Langley until that point. The work to restructure Appletree and Langley will cost way more than any deficit by that point. Capital expenditure or not, it's all tax payers money. After that you then don't have an expensive rental school. Not to mention down at Coauet removing the 800 metre commute radius leaves barely any people not still within reach of Marine or Whitley Lodge Additionally down at the sea front is not where any new housing will ever be built as there is no space. Whereas Langley is on the edge of new urban sprawl with the estates at Murton and near Monkseaton High and so exactly where demand will be needed in the future

Screen Name Redacted
10/09/2025 06:06 PM

Firstly - I propose that woodlawn school is moved into either the Monkseaton high school site or the Monkseaton middle school site, which is again proposed to be closed. This would give Woodlawn enough space to fit all their pupils without the need to move Langley pupils! Secondly, I would propose that Appletree gardens pupils are moved into the current Woodlawn building merging it with Langley first school. Therefore there would be less work to be done, rather than having to do repairs to Langley first school to accommodate Woodlawn pupils AND having to also make adjustments and building work to ensure there is enough space at appletree gardens as we are aware and it was confirmed that apple tree gardens do not currently have the space for all pupils. This surely must make more sense

	financially! This would also ensure that both pupils from Langley and appletree have the required space for SEND pupils with less disruption to their learning. To a lot of people this looks like Langley is suffering due to the council wanting to move Woodlawn into the Langley building. Why should all of our children suffer for this move when there are plenty of other options available to look at? This consultation has been extremely rushed and no thought given to all the children who are going to suffer, not to mention the jobs lost! This needs to be looked at and put on hold. Most schools in the area will be gojng into a lot more deficit than Langley first school! Langley first school is the preferred school of first school over appletree gardens. Maybe if a poll was done then you get an insight into this!
Screen Name Redacted 10/09/2025 07:32 PM	Your data is inconclusive and whilst the lower birth rate is a fact, the current student population of Langley could not be absorbed into Appletree. The SEND provision at Langley is second to none; both our children have recently been students there and their needs were met fantastically by Langley. I have not read similar reports of the SEND provision at Appletree. My suggestion is that you leave both schools as they are for the next 3-5 years and review them.
Screen Name Redacted 10/11/2025 12:34 PM	Keep the school open
Screen Name Redacted 10/12/2025 08:34 PM	Leave Langley First School as it and all the other schools that you have proposed to close or merge
Screen Name Redacted 10/13/2025 02:10 PM	Leave the schools as they are or spread the Langley children in to other schools. Merging is far too much.
Screen Name Redacted 10/13/2025 08:35 PM	Alter the system around funding per pupil. Look for other options - senior council staff salaries and bonuses, for example.
Screen Name Redacted 10/14/2025 06:15 PM	Keep the school open
Screen Name Redacted 10/14/2025 06:24 PM	Keep things the way they are! It’s absolutely ridiculous that this has even got to the proposal stage. The amount of upheaval not just at the affected schools but the wider community is significant! Children will be massively impacted by this proposal, the stress and anxiety it is causing is not acceptable. Has anyone from the council been into these school and seen how truly wonderful they are! Those children

who don't get a space where are they supposed to go? Into other primary schools across north Tyneside? The staff too imagine being in their position, mortgages to pay etc the list goes one. Absolutely shocking from North Tyneside. Maybe they should be focusing on what we do have and making the area significantly better! Local play parks are shocking no wonder people don't want to live here. North Tyneside council can blame the low birth rate they want but let's face it it's just yet another excuse from them!

Screen Name Redacted
10/14/2025 07:52 PM

I strongly object to the Local Authority's current proposal, which effectively amounts to the closure of Langley School under the misleading label of a "merger." It is both inaccurate and dismissive to claim that a true merger is not legally possible. The Department for Education's Statutory Guidance (October 2024) clearly outlines two lawful routes for amalgamating maintained schools: Amalgamations There are 2 ways to amalgamate 2 (or more) existing maintained schools: • The local authority and/or governing body (depending on school category) can publish proposals to close 2, or more, schools and the local authority (or a proposer other than the local authority depending on category) can publish a proposal to open a new school. Where this is a presumption school, this will be subject to publication of a section 6A notice (see part 2 of this guidance). This will result in a new school number being issued. • The local authority and/or governing body (depending on school category) can publish a proposal to close one school (or more) and enlarge/change the age range/transfer site of an existing school (following the statutory prescribed 26 alterations process as necessary), to accommodate the displaced pupils. The remaining school would retain its original school number, as it is not a new school, even if its phase has changed. This is sometimes referred to as a 'merger'. These options are supported by legislation including: • The Education and Inspections Act 2006 • The School Organisation (Establishment and Discontinuance of Schools) Regulations 2013 • The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013 It is concerning that the Local Authority consultation documents fail to mention amalgamation as a viable and equitable solution, nor was it included in the presentation meetings at WBHS. This omission undermines the transparency and fairness of the process. An amalgamation of Langley and Appletree on the Appletree site would still address the Woodlawn issue while treating staff, families, and — most importantly — children fairly. It would also preserve Langley's ethos and educational strengths within the newly formed school. Examples of Successful Amalgamations • Tower Hamlets (2020–2021): Amalgamated Globe Primary and Rachel Keeling Nursery Schools into a single 3–11 primary school, preserving staff and community ethos. • Hackney (2020–2021): Merged Colvestone Primary with Princess May Primary, and Baden Powell Primary with

Nightingale Primary, as part of a strategic plan to address falling rolls and financial pressures. • Westminster (2023): Merged St Stephen's and St Mary Magdalene's Church of England Primary Schools to maintain educational standards and financial viability. Furthermore, if space constraints at the Appletree site are going to prove problematic, I would further propose that the Monkseaton Middle School site — if closed — could be repurposed to house the newly amalgamated school. This would provide a more spacious and future-proof solution, ensuring the long-term success of the new institution. I urge the Local Authority to reconsider its current proposal and engage meaningfully with the community on a fairer, legally sound, and inclusive path forward. Amalgamation offers a balanced solution that respects both school communities and ensures continuity of education for all pupils.

Screen Name Redacted
10/16/2025 08:25 PM

Keep both schools open. Actually visit the schools in the area and see what fantastic work they are doing for local children and stop putting profits before people.

Screen Name Redacted
10/18/2025 02:04 PM

This is about a land grab for the council, nothing else. Green fienlds will be replaced by a housing estata. With all the housing being built nearby where will the children go to school

Screen Name Redacted
10/19/2025 10:01 PM

This is not a merger it is a closure. This is a fundamentally flawed plan removing a successful school from the community and causing endless issues for parents and also making significant unnecessary job cuts. Are we sure that the staff at Appletree can offer the best education? Is the Appletree leadership the best for the children? Is it ethical to displace hundreds of settled children following the chaos caused by COVID. My proposal would be to look more closely at the use of the buildings and to potentially house some of the overflow Woodlawn children in Monkseaton Middle if plans are to close this school anyway. Sadly I think there is a longer political game at play and the children and staff at Langley are merely collateral damage.

Screen Name Redacted
10/20/2025 09:49 AM

In order to reduce to deficit, different options can be explored, like opening the surplus rooms to wider community use. I have spoken with a local artist who has shown interest in using this location to conduct her workshops. Also, the surplus room should be used as an opportunity to decrease the number of children per form and hire more teachers, which would allow staff to better focus on their students and increase their learning and performance at school. In the long run, this would contribute to the overall performance and reputation of the school, and attract more families.

Screen Name Redacted
10/20/2025 04:13 PM

The numbers suggest that Langley has only a shortfall of students from being full of less than 10%. That is not a massive number although I accept the demographic ETIMATES that have been submitted suggest the decline will continue. 2 key points here: This is a superb school, both my Children went to Langley, thrived, went through the Middle School system at Valley and Whitley High School [redacted] The grounding and start at Langley was second to none and the work Langley does with children of all abilities and background is exemplary. Has the team making the decision actually been to the school and met with teachers parents and pupils - I would have to think this whole exercise is just spreadsheets, where the computer 'says no' without any human interaction? Secondly, are you really sure about your demographic predictions, with all the new housing being constructed around the coast - surely this is going to bring in significant numbers of new families with young children who will need a school like Langley. Do we want children having to travel further than they need to? Do we really want classes so full that effective teaching is constrained.....and remember once you sell off the land (to property developers) where these fine schools once sat - you can't get the land back! I feel that this is a deliberately rushed process - the whole debate around school mergers and closures needs more time AND DIALOGUE with those tasked in making these difficult (and life changing) decisions

Screen Name Redacted
10/21/2025 11:46 AM

Keep the school system as it is. The lower birth rate is cited for funding, however, 610 homes are currently being built on the Rake House and Rake Lane sites (immediately behind Langley school) which will increase catchment density. There is a total of 3000 houses planned across the Murton area. Even 10% increase in pupils from this development size put demand back to where it has been previously.

Screen Name Redacted
10/21/2025 01:13 PM

Since Langley is the better performing school it baffles me as to why you want to move all pupils to a less performing school. What happens to the teachers at both schools, surely more would be needed to accommodate. I don’t have an alternative but strongly oppose the closure of Langley. I do agree that there needs to be SEND and special educational places but Woodlawn extending over to Langley is not the answer, especially when the streets around it will become even more congested due to the number of mini buses and taxis going through then with little or no regard to residents of the surrounding streets. Langley has full year groups so is not in deficit yet, maybe the council should have managed the school admissions better to have avoided this altogether instead of thinking about the

money they will get / benefit from by carrying out these changes.

Screen Name Redacted
10/22/2025 12:05 PM

The Council should look into the possibility of re-locating the Woodlawn school site(s) to the current Appletree site, and thus leaving the Langley school unaffected. The current vehicular access to the Woodlawn site at Langley is extremely congested , especially in view of the needs of some of the Woodlawn pupils and in my view the move of Woodlawn pupils to the Appletree site would significantly improve access, added to which the Langley pupils would be able to continue to enjoy the existing facilities at Langley school.

Screen Name Redacted
10/23/2025 08:45 AM

With Monkseaton High school closing Woodlawn could use that site

Screen Name Redacted
10/23/2025 11:10 AM

I support the option to let the schools admit up to their collective PAN

Screen Name Redacted
10/28/2025 07:23 AM

Make sure it is a merge and not a closure of Langley.

Screen Name Redacted
10/28/2025 09:49 AM

Stop closing schools. Stop being driven by numbers alone and actually listen to the community, who you are supposed to represent. The birth rate figures only tell one side of the story. You also need to look at the number of children moving into Monkseaton, but who were not born in North Tyneside. People move here precisely BECAUSE of the schools. The proposed merger will see a year group size of 120 children which is ludicrous. I find it extremely convenient that the Langley Site is very close to the proposed Murton Gap development where additional houses could be built which is, presumably, far more lucrative for the council.

Screen Name Redacted
10/29/2025 11:06 AM

Years ago I worked at [redacted] first school one of the years there was not enough pupils so they double a class up and had two teaching assistants it worked fine then the birth rate went up

Screen Name Redacted
10/31/2025 03:00 PM

Relocate Langley First School onto the Appletree Gardens site (as per Ivy Road/Forest Hall Proposal) Appletree Gardens has a larger building more suitable for the merged years, Langley cannot accommodate the 3 years of merged children on its current site and the building can be repurposed for use by Woodlawn School but Langley First School is proven to be a school favoured in parental choice. The option to close Appletree Gardens First School and the relocation of Langley First School onto Appletree site meets all of the

requirements of the Council proposal but provides a more financially sustainable solution which is less disruptive to the children of the merged years. Langley First School is more likely to succeed than maintaining an Appletree identity following the merger; • 73% of Langley catchment parents choose Langley in comparison to 44% of Appletree (data from council proposal) • 12% of Langley pupils attend from the Appletree Gardens catchment area (data from Langley first school office team) • Projected pupil numbers of the existing schools from the consultation options and backgrounds data indicate an average of 26% surplus places from 2025-2034 in contrast to 15% for Langley despite Appletree having 44 homes per planned place compared to Langley's 40 homes. The keeping of Langleys identity and ethos would increase the number of parents in the current Appletree catchment to attend the school compared to if it were to remain as Appletree • In the most recent 2 previous years of higher birth rates, 2020 reception and 2023 reception intakes, Appletree was the only NEPA first school with surplus spaces in admissions, 14 and 6 respectively. For the 2 lowest birth rate years, 2024 and 2025 intake Appletree had the largest portion of surplus places in admissions against PAN, 32% and 45% respectively • Appletree is statistically shown to be the NEPA first school most sensitive to falling birth rates, with the current NEPA birth indicating a requirement of 145 children to attend from outside of NEPA (at the reduced 390 NEPA PAN) they will be most at risk of being undersubscribed and susceptible to falling into deficit. The addition of Langley catchment into Appletree is not going to solve the issue of surplus places when the number of school places far exceeds the number of children in the NEPA catchment area, allowing parents to have freedom of choice for all of the NEPA first schools. The trend for the school with the greatest surplus will continue and Appletree will become unviable. Langley catchment will attend Southridge, Wellfield and Marine which have capacity to take many children from outside of their catchment area and the Appletree Gardens catchment children will continue to apply for the other first schools. However if Langley was to relocate to the Appletree Gardens site then the Langley catchment would attend along with many from the current Appletree catchment. • The persistent absence rate at Appletree is 15%, Langley persistent absence rate is 5.9% (the North Tyneside average is 13.7%). Absence data is a critical indicator of pupil engagement and school effectiveness, particularly under Ofsted's updated inspection framework which has been recently broadened to include grading of 'attendance and behaviour' Familiarity for the Children affected by the merger; • The proposal to close Langley First School is disruptive and detrimental to the children involved, they would move to an unfamiliar school with a new ethos, uniform and teachers. Moving Langley to the Appletree site allows the Appletree children to remain in the surroundings they are accustomed to. Langley children will have a smoother transition to the new location by remaining as Langley

children and with familiar staff. Wraparound and Preschool – relocation of Schools Out Northern to Little Pips site; • “Schools Out Northern” at Langley First School provides childcare services from 7.30am to 6.00pm term time and allow for flexible booking, Appletree Little Pips provides 7.45am – 5.30pm (4.30pm for nursery children), this is a significant time difference for working parents and could even cause a requirement to change employment. Prospective reception parents with longer hours requirements will choose schools with wraparound provisions more suitable to their needs than Little Pips provides. • “Schools Out Northern” at Langley First School provides day care services from 9 months allowing parents to have one drop off and collection for their children from 9 months until 9 years whereas Little Pips provides from age 2 years forcing school parents with younger siblings to attend an alternative childcare provider until the youngest is over 2 which can be impractical for the working parent and again prospective reception parents will favour schools with options suited to their needs.

Screen Name Redacted
11/05/2025 05:45 PM

Come together with the schools to find a solution, through engaging and Working with senior leadership teams and allow governors to be involved to act and come up with solutions. The current proposal was done after only consulting the headteachers, who are unable to act alone. They together are the best people to guide the future of decisions impacting the future of the school.

Screen Name Redacted
11/05/2025 06:55 PM

Langley is a popular local school, with surplus places within the government recommended 10%. Other schools have much higher surplus rates eg appletree it would make more financial sense to close Appletree and their much smaller pupils to be spread out amongst other first schools. Or close coquet which is only 1 form entry and already in deficit and you have already stated that 1 form entry schools aren't financially viable.

Screen Name Redacted
11/06/2025 08:59 AM

The current proposal has had very poor reception in the local community, and has created divisions in coming across as a hostile takeover (Langley closing, children then just attending Appletree). I would propose a true democratic merger into a new school, where all carers/children/staff could have an input into a new school’s name, ethos, uniform. There are great benefits to such a merger, in terms of keeping the best bits from both schools, and outside scrutiny driving standards up.

Screen Name Redacted
11/06/2025 10:00 AM

Another school should be chosen for closure given the Langley pupil numbers are well within the council boundaries, whereas Appletree's

are not. Should the council not hear the voice of the Langley parents and choose to go ahead with the merger regardless, my view is this should be a true merger if our hand is to be forced, which it currently is not. The current consultation has already created divides within our community which are unhelpful. Both schools are good schools, it's not fair to penalise one over the other. A true merger would mean both schools - and most importantly the children - could have an input into a new school's name, ethos, uniform etc and would mean we could keep the best bits from both schools, including staff. It would also make the transition smoother for the children.

Screen Name Redacted
11/06/2025 01:14 PM

Bring Apple Tree Gardens into the premises that Woodlawn School use next door to Langley First School which would allow ALL children from Langley and Apple Tree to have a school place, staff will still have their jobs, and ALL children will be surrounded by familiar faces, teachers, their school ethos. This would also allow children to continue into Year 6, due to more classroom availabilty making the school a Primary not First then move onto High School. Have the use of Monkseaton High School as a Special Education Provision for Woodlawn and multiple other SEN provisions and unit's, this site provides excellent space for transport vehicles and taxi's who drop off and collect children.

Screen Name Redacted
11/06/2025 03:02 PM

We have lived in Monkseaton for 45 years and have had children & grandchildren who have attended and loved Langley First School, and come out of it well rounded and well educated people. We would make the following comments. Langley has an excellent reputation and people have moved to the area because of it. More houses are being built nearby & families will need good schools. Langley is inclusive to all & carers well for SEN children & those with disabilities. If Langley stays where it is it could develop even more varied & positive links with Woodlawn. This promotes integration and empathy amongst pupils which sits well within government policy of integration and inclusion. We also suggest a full community assessment should take place. This should cover the effect on the area if Langley closes and it should involve people living in the community, local businesses, Wrap Around, nursery & pre school facilities. Safety - Langley has very good foot access for children, there is free car parking nearby, roads are already cordoned off at key times for safety purposes & there are not many busy roads for pupils and parents to cross. If Langley and Appletree were to merge, there doesn't appear to be enough room to accommodate all pupils at Appletree. We also understand that the birth rate in the area is to rise in future, so why change things now? It seems short sighted to close a First, Middle & High school in Monkseaton at present, why not wait, undertake more consultation, agree a longer term strategy which takes all this into

account? Why the rush? We should be planning this fully & properly after consulting everyone.

Screen Name Redacted
11/06/2025 05:20 PM

Close failing Coquet school in 2032 as it in financial deficit and a one form entry school.

Screen Name Redacted
11/06/2025 11:41 PM

Langley First School is a thriving, popular, successful school with a great reputation and amazing teaching staff and management. I am shocked that the council has not even visited Langley before it made it's proposal to see what the school has to offer. It is not currently in any deficit and is almost full, with the surplus places being below the acceptable 10% level stated on councils own website. It would be completely the wrong decision to close one of the best and most popular schools in the area and would have a massive detrimental effect on the pupils, families, staff and wider community. This area is know for it's good schooling system and is one of the reasons for the high property prices and awards for 'best place to live'. Families move to this area for the schools and one of the schools they move for is Langley First. The councils proposal is portraying the worst case scenario for birth rates. According to the Office for National Statistics, birth rates will level off from 2026 and begin to increase again. They cannot fall forever, they will obviously stabilise to a new normal. Birth rates have been declining since 2008 and is a national problem but despite this, schools in NEPA have been resilient to this trend and most schools have stayed within the the acceptable 10% surplus with the exception of Appletree. The council has also not taken into account internal migration. People move into this area for the schools. The ONS shows more young children move into North Tyneside than out of it. Many parents at Langley moved to this area for the schools including myself. The councils proposal has many glaring errors and inaccuracies. From basic things like saying Langley doesn't have two halls, or the children don't have a field and have to cross a road to do P.E, to errors in the deficit predictions. All of this is completely untrue. Langley is not in deficit and has never been in deficit, it has always been manged well and been popular. The same cannot be said of Appletree which has never been anywhere near it's capacity due to people not choosing it. Appletree has already been in deficit and had to be in receipt of Falling Rolls funding so why would you chose to keep this school open and close the more popular and successful school. This make no sense financially long term as Appletree will continue to go into debt as nothing has changed. Langley has an excellent history and legacy from the early 1950s and has always achieved OFSTED outstanding or good. The same cannot be said of Appletree which has been satisfactory for many years and good in recent years. The level of persistent absence is concerning at Appletree also (~15%) and is above the national average. Persistent

absence is now a very important factor for OFSTED. Langley however has persistent absence of only 5%, well below national average, which speaks volumes for how good the teachers and management are at engaging with the pupils and making the school somewhere people want to attend. 75% of families in catchment for Langley chose Langley, only 44% of families in catchment for Appletree chose Appletree (many choosing to come to Langley). This is eye-opening and should show the council the difference in popularity between the two school and shows Langley should not be the one to close. Appletree is ranked as the most sensitive school in the entire NEPA to falling birth rates. Langley by contrast has a medium sensitivity. Choosing Appletree to remain open purely as it's building is bigger is not a good enough reason. Having the bigger building also doesn't make sense financially in the long term as if the birth rates do what the council predict they are going to do then Langley is actually the more appropriately sized school and will cost less to run, heat and maintain. Appletree already has empty classrooms while the year sizes were big so will be too big and expensive to run for future declining numbers. Also, although Appletree may have more classrooms, those classrooms are smaller than Langley's classrooms and will therefore be ill prepared for the merged pupils. Another massive reason to keep Langley open is that Langley provides excellent wraparound provision which is essential for working parents. It is open for 7.30am-6pm daily. This allows working parents to do a full working day. Appletree's wraparound is only open 7.45am-5.30pm. This is hugely restrictive. I work [redacted] until 5pm and would not be able to get back to pick up my children in time. Labour repeatedly states that it wants to help working families/parents and encourage and help mother's back into the workplace but the councils proposal would lead to me and many other parents having to reduce their working hours and taking them out the workplace. There is also huge concerns that the wraparound couldn't cope with this increased number of pupils in the merged schools leaving some families with no wraparound care. A worrying part of the councils proposal is that it robs parents of their parental choice. Every parent should be able to choose their child's school. Langley was my first choice for my children, I was so happy when both my children got their place there and they are thriving there. I didn't put Appletree as any of my choices when doing my school application for both my children. How can the council force people from their first choice school to a school that most of us would not even consider for our children. The Langley Parent Survey showed that over 88% of Langley parents did not put Appletree as any of their choices when applying for school. This shows that parents will not want to sent their children to merged Appletree as the council suggest in their proposal and will look at other options. The timescale of the councils proposal is also hugely concerning and it feels very rushed. Choosing to merge the largest, most full, year

group (the current year 2) makes no sense and lead to cohort bulge. This will lead to overcrowded classrooms which will be hugely unsettling and detrimental to the pupils learning and wellbeing. This year group would also have to move twice in one year (a new first school, then a new middle school) which is very unsettling for the children who have already suffered a lot during covid lockdowns. Whatever proposal goes ahead, the council should delay it at least a year so to not include this large year group of almost 120 children. It would make no sense financially to expand and build extra provision when numbers drop off after this year group. If the council delay a year then Langley is actually the better sized school, with better wraparound provision and is much more popular and likely to success and thrive. The council's proposal driver of 390 children to match Whitley Bay High School capacity is also misguided as due to the falling birth rates it is unlikely the number of pupils at WBHS will even reach 390 in the future so this won't be an issue. The issue of the 390 relates to pupils already in the system so closing Langley will not help this issue. The only reason I can see that the council are proposing to close a thriving, popular successful school is due to Langley's proximity to Woodlawn. The long term health of a mainstream school system should not be compromised to solve a logistical problem for SEND provision, however important SEND is. Langley has 300 local children, Woodlawn has 32 children from various locations that are mainly taxied in so extra provision could be anywhere. You should not be displacing 300 mainstream children for the benefit of 32 SEND children, this is morally bankrupt. SEND provision is an important and separate issue and should not be bundled in with a proposal to tackle the issue of falling birth rates. There is also the issue of Coquet Park First school which is not deemed financially viable with a one form entry, the council can't act on this at the moment due to an existing PFI deal but it is difficult to understand how the council proposes to stop this school from being forced to close once the PFI deal ends in 2032. If this happens then it seems unnecessary to close another school. There would be no need for the councils short sighted short term fix. In conclusion, my proposal is for Langley to remain open as it is the more popular and successful school with more resistance and elasticity to falling birth rates and to close Appletree and merge Appletree's pupils with Langley after a delay of a year or two to mitigate the disruption of larger year groups merging. This could be done on the Appletree site or the Langley site. This would keep Langley's strengths of experienced, caring teachers and management and nurturing skills to look after the wellbeing of the merged pupils, the superior wraparound care and the popularity of the school with parents choosing it and the wider community. Langley would provide a 'firm commitment' to create a school with the best of both schools. In contrast, during this whole consultation period, Appletree has refused to speak to Langley and work with them. This shows that the head teacher/management of Appletree does not put the children first

in all of this and does not care about the wellbeing of the Langley children, only her own school. This gravely concerns me and I would not trust a school with my children that is not willing to talk to another school in a proposed merger and put the children first. Another way of doing is and my 2nd proposal is to close both schools and open a new school (with DFE approval) to create a true merger and allow all staff equal opportunity to go for jobs. This is a fair way of doing things. I believe we would get approval as it is clearly a very fair option and there is no need to rush if it is the right thing to do. Lastly, the council will have seen our campaign, our data, our community support and how we have all come together. We have been on local news, radio, newspaper and have so much community support. Everyone supports Langley and feels this is the wrong decision. We have over 6000 signatures on our petition and have raised over £10,000 in a matter of weeks. Surely this must show the council the strength of feeling and how the community feels about this proposal. The council is meant to work for and serve the will of the people after all. Please see the submitted proposals: Merger plus and Amalgamation for full details of the two proposals I have suggested. PROPOSAL: AMALGAMATION Summary: Close both Appletree Gardens First School and Langley First School and open a new school with a new DfE number on the Appletree Gardens site. Proposal: We propose that North Tyneside Council, with approval from the Secretary of State publish proposals to close both Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School, and open a new first school on the Appletree Gardens site (or Langley site), integrating the strongest aspects of both schools' ethos, staff, and practices to form a new identity with enhanced community appeal. Unlike the Council's plan (closing Langley and enlarging Appletree while retaining its DfE number), this creates a genuinely new entity with a new DfE number, fostering a genuine fresh start. Benefits: Community and staff Integration: this proposal will allow us the potential to retain some of Langleys; ethos, governance, and branding, preserving valued elements from both schools while minimising disruption to staff morale, children and communities. The council's current proposal loses all of what makes Langley, Langley. Familiarity: A fairer solution for both parents and children, enabling a smoother transition between schools through the involvement of familiar staff which otherwise would be lost under the current proposals. Enhanced parental appeal when compared to the current proposal: A new school blending Langley's high parental preference (75%+ uptake) with Appletree's larger facilities could attract more families from both catchments, reducing surplus places (currently 14% at Appletree, projected to worsen) and mitigating deficits faster than a standard merger. Educational and financial stability: Potential for higher enrolment (when compared to the councils' proposal) would increase funding, addressing projected deficits and supporting quality education The proposal aligns with the council's aim to cap

NEPA First School places at 390, ensuring smooth transitions to aligned Middle Schools and Whitley Bay High School (390 places). The proposal allows for Woodlawn expansion, again aligning with the council's proposal. A two year delay can be incorporated into this proposal. PROPOSAL: MERGER PLUS Summary: Instead of closing Langley First School and expanding Appletree Gardens, we recommend merging Appletree Gardens with Langley First School. Moving the entire operation of Langley First School to the Appletree Gardens site (or remaining at Langley site). Langley First School would agree to a ‘Firm Commitment’ to adopt the best of both schools on the Appletree Gardens site Proposal: Merge appletree gardens with Langley First School, Langley First School will agree to a ‘Firm Commitment’ including but not exclusive to the following conditions: A change of school name A staff consolidation between Langley and Appletree gardens A change of uniform A change of governance A new ethos incorporates the best of both school Benefits: Community and staff integration: this proposal will allow us the potential to retain some of Langley’s ethos, governance, and branding, preserving valued elements from both schools while minimising disruption to staff morale, children and communities. The council's current proposal loses all of what makes Langley Langley. Familiarity: A fairer solution for both parents and children, enabling a smoother transition between schools through the involvement of familiar staff which otherwise would be lost under the current proposals. Enhanced parental appeal when compared to the current proposal: A new school blending Langley’s high parental preference (75%+ uptake) with Appletree’s larger facilities could attract more families from both catchments, reducing surplus places (currently 14% at Appletree, projected to worsen) and mitigating deficits faster than a standard merger. Educational and financial stability: Potential for higher enrolment (when compared to the council’s proposal) would increase funding, addressing projected deficits and supporting quality education The proposal aligns with the Council’s aim to cap NEPA First School places at 390, ensuring smooth transitions to aligned Middle Schools and Whitley Bay High School (390 places). The proposal allows for Woodlawn expansion, again aligning with the council's proposal A two year delay can be incorporated into this proposal.

Screen Name Redacted
11/07/2025 12:06 AM

Proposals: If the merger is to go ahead despite the clear opposition, would it not be more beneficial to undertake a fair amalgamation, one that genuinely takes the best of both schools? Such an approach could allow Langley to retain some of its staff, helping children through what will be a difficult transition and preserve parts of Langley’s ethos and culture that have made it such a high-performing, much-loved school. This would show respect for both school communities and ensure the merger, if unavoidable, is implemented

in a way that minimises harm and preserves the strengths that make Langley exceptional. I have summarised two ways that I believe this could be achieved: Proposal 1 - Amalgamation. Close both Appletree Gardens First School and Langley First School and open a new school with a new DfE number on the Appletree Gardens site. Proposal: We propose that North Tyneside Council, with approval from the Secretary of State publish proposals to close both Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School, and open a new first school on the Appletree Gardens site, integrating the strongest aspects of both schools' ethos, staff, and practices to form a new identity with enhanced community appeal. Unlike the Council's plan (closing Langley and enlarging Appletree while retaining its DfE number), this creates a genuinely new entity with a new DfE number, fostering a genuine fresh start. Benefits: Community and staff Integration: this proposal will allow us the potential to retain some of Langleys; ethos, governance, and branding, preserving valued elements from both schools while minimising disruption to staff morale, children and communities. The council's current proposal loses all of what makes Langley, Langley. Familiarity: A fairer solution for both parents and children, enabling a smoother transition between schools through the involvement of familiar staff which otherwise would be lost under the current proposals. Enhanced parental appeal when compared to the current proposal Educational and financial stability: Potential for higher enrolment (when compared to the councils' proposal) would increase funding, addressing projected deficits and supporting quality education The proposal aligns with the council's aim to cap NEPA First School places at 390, ensuring smooth transitions to aligned Middle Schools and Whitley Bay High School (390 places). The proposal allows for Woodlawn expansion, again aligning with the council's proposal We would propose to open a new community school as it aligns perfectly into the NEPA and particularly into the three-tier system and that a true amalgamation would benefit both schools over the current proposal. While we would acknowledge that this is not as simple as a 'merger' we would argue that Langley First School has been at the heart of the community for the last 70+ years and a little extra time and complexity, to get a fair amalgamation is the least that it deserves. Merger Plus a 'Firm Commitment' Instead of closing Langley First School and expanding Appletree Gardens, we recommend merging Appletree Gardens with Langley First School. Moving the entire operation of Langley First School to the Appletree Gardens site. Langley First School would agree to a 'Firm Commitment' to adopt the best of both schools on the Appletree Gardens site Proposal: Merge Appletree gardens with Langley First School, Langley First School will agree to a 'Firm Commitment' to change the name, consolidate the staff, change the uniform, consolidate the governance and provide a new ethos that incorporates the best of both schools. I believe it is important to highlight that the leadership team at Appletree Gardens First

School have now had five weeks to engage with Langley First School in an effort to reach an amicable and fair arrangement. As far as I am aware, such engagement has not yet taken place? my concern—one that I believe is shared by many parents whose children are being asked to merge, is that the leadership at Appletree gardens does not appear to be prioritising the wellbeing of all the children or the concerns of parents? Therefore, in my view, a Firm Commitment could only reasonably be provided by Langley First School, whose leadership has consistently shown that the wellbeing of all affected children is at the centre of their decision-making. Benefits: Community and staff integration: this proposal will allow us the potential to retain some of Langley's ethos, governance, and branding, preserving valued elements from both schools while minimising disruption to staff morale, children and communities. The council's current proposal loses all of what makes Langley Langley. Familiarity: A fairer solution for both parents and children, enabling a smoother transition between schools through the involvement of familiar staff which otherwise would be lost under the current proposals. Enhanced parental appeal when compared to the current proposal Enrolment (when compared to the council's proposal) would increase funding, addressing projected deficits and supporting quality education The proposal aligns with the Council's aim to cap NEPA First School places at 390, ensuring smooth transitions to aligned Middle Schools and Whitley Bay High School (390 places). The proposal allows for Woodlawn expansion, again aligning with the council's proposal It is worth also noting that a two year delay can be incorporated into both of these proposal to allow us to get past the 'cohort bulge' of pupils at one school site

Screen Name Redacted
11/07/2025 12:29 PM

I strongly oppose the proposal to merge Langley First School and Appletree First School on the Appletree site, under the Appletree DfE number and governing body. Prioritising Appletree—a less popular school with higher absence figures—risks community division and is not in the best interests of pupils, staff, families, or the wider community. Alternative Proposal: A True Amalgamation on the Langley Site I propose a true amalgamation of both schools, preferably on the Langley First School site, creating a new school with: A new name and ethos A new or proportionally combined governing body Integrated staffing and leadership This is the fairest and most inclusive option, ensuring both school communities come together on equal footing. Although the Council notes that this requires approval from the Secretary of State and Schools Adjudicator, this route should be actively pursued. It is not impossible, and failing to attempt it is unfair to pupils and families. A new school would allow pupils, families, and staff to contribute to its identity (name, uniform, ethos), supporting unity and belonging. Why the Langley Site Is Preferable 1) Educational Reputation & Demand

Langley has consistently strong Ofsted outcomes, rated Outstanding for over 18 years and Good for the last two. It is the more popular school locally and has lower surplus places than Appletree. Many children living in Appletree's catchment already choose Langley, demonstrating confidence in its provision. 2) Leadership Strength Langley's leadership has significant strengths (NPQSL qualifications, Ofsted experience). Langley also has significantly lower absence and persistent absence rates than Appletree, who exceed both the Local Authority and national average. Their expertise must be harnessed to benefit all pupils, particularly vulnerable and SEND learners. 3) Staffing & Continuity for Pupils A true amalgamation would: Ensure fair staffing structures with Qualified Teachers in every class Protect educational standards Combine specialist expertise from both schools Maintain continuity for SEND pupils and families through familiar relationships This would ease transition, especially for the large Year 2 cohort (who would be Year 4 at merger) and those preparing for middle-school applications. A move to Appletree with immediate secondary-transition pressures would be highly stressful; dual staff representation can mitigate this. Practical & Financial Considerations 1) Building Costs & Long-Term Efficiency Langley is cheaper to operate and maintain than Appletree, making it a more sustainable long-term option. While Appletree currently has more classrooms, this additional space is only needed for one year to accommodate an unusually large cohort. After this, those surplus classrooms would sit unused — creating unnecessary long-term running costs for heating, maintenance and cleaning. The Langley site therefore represents better long-term value for public funds. 2) Space & Class Sizes The current Langley Year 2 cohort (118 pupils) would require at least four classes to ensure fair provision. Langley has larger classrooms; Appletree's classrooms are smaller and would be cramped with larger class sizes, limiting pupils' ability to learn and thrive. 3) Transport, Safety & Parking Langley has safe and accessible free parking, with a public car park immediately next to the school. Appletree sits within a residential area with very limited parking and higher traffic pressure. This poses a safety risk to children and complicates drop-off for families with siblings. Langley is therefore more suitable for managing traffic safely and efficiently. 4) Environmental Sustainability Minimising unnecessary building use and avoiding long-term underutilised space at Appletree reduces energy use and carbon footprint. Retaining the existing, more energy-efficient Langley building as the central site is a more sustainable choice. Proposal to Delay Merger to September 2028 I recommend delaying the merger by one year, until September 2028. This allows the unusually large Langley Year 2 cohort to complete First School before transition. It ensures: Adequate space and staffing Fair class sizes Minimised disruption at a critical transition point Rushing the merger would compromise education, SEND support, settlement, and middle-school applications. Admissions Considerations To support a stable transition: From

Autumn 2026, both schools' nursery PAN should be set to 30, enabling siblings to attend the same site and easing childcare and work logistics. Current Reception pupils should remain on their existing site until amalgamation. Community Cohesion The current proposal — effectively closing Langley and subsuming it into Appletree — has already created division. A true, equal amalgamation would support unity and fairness and is far more likely to result in long-term success for the school and the community. No school should be automatically prioritised over another; this disadvantages staff, parents, and children, particularly those with SEND. Woodlawn ● The consultation outlines the intention for the council to repurpose the Langley site and move the post-16 provision from Marden High School (32 children in total according to Ofsted), thereby displacing 300 children for the benefit of 32 children ● By bundling the two issues - the alleged need to close a school with the need to expand Woodlawn - the council is effectively creating a false choice: asking the community to accept a suboptimal and unstable mainstream solution in exchange for a desirable SEND solution. ● The long-term health of the mainstream school system should not be compromised to solve a logistical problem for SEND provision, however important that provision may be.

Screen Name Redacted
11/07/2025 01:51 PM

Appletree Closure as an Alternative to Langley Appletree Gardens First School Building is only more suitable than Langley First School for one year; - The larger number of classrooms at Appletree is only an advantage during the merged year groups stage, subsequent to this, the building has higher utility costs of circa £44,000 in comparison to Langley circa £7,000 and lower space efficiency for the return to a 300 PAN school. - Only 2 of the proposed 13 Appletree classrooms meet the government guidance of 62m2 for 30 reception children and 55m2 for 30 KS1+. Whereas 10 of the 11 Langley classrooms exceed the guidance. - Government guidance recommends a hall of a minimum 140m2 for PE and assemblies for KS2, Appletree assembly hall is below guidance at 130m2, Langley has an assembly hall of 190m2. Both have separate suitable dining halls. - If the proposed merger of pupils was delayed until 2028, the current 118 year 2 students would have left the first schools and Langley building size would be a suitable proposal. If the merger was to be required in 2027, Langley has adequate space to site temporary classrooms. The detrimental impact of the consultation for both schools is highly likely to cause current parents to move their children to the spaces within the other NEPA first schools and discourage parents applying for either school in the reception admissions and therefore the increased numbers for the merged years is likely to be far lower than the current numbers show. Langley First School is more likely to succeed following the merger; - 73% of Langley catchment parents choose Langley in comparison to 44% of

Appletree.(from council supporting documents) - 12% of Langley pupils attend from the Appletree Gardens catchment area (data from Langley first school office team) - Projected pupil numbers of the existing schools (from the consultation options and backgrounds data) indicate an average of 26% surplus places from 2025-2034 in contrast to 15% for Langley despite Appletree having 44 homes per planned place compared to Langley's 40 homes (from the consultation options and backgrounds data) The keeping of Langley's identity and ethos would increase the number of parents in the current Appletree catchment to attend the school compared to if it were to remain as Appletree. - In the most recent 2 previous years of higher birth rates, 2020 reception and 2023 reception intakes, Appletree was the only NEPA first school with surplus spaces in admissions, 14 and 6 respectively. For the 2 lowest birth rate years, 2024 and 2025 intake Appletree had the largest portion of surplus places in admissions against PAN, 32% and 45% respectively - Appletree is statistically shown to be the NEPA first school most sensitive to falling birth rates, with the current NEPA birth indicating a requirement of 135 children to attend from outside of NEPA (at the reduced 390 NEPA PAN) they will be most at risk of being undersubscribed and susceptible to falling into deficit. The addition of Langley catchment into Appletree is not going to solve the issue of surplus places when the number of school places far exceeds the number of children in the catchment area, allowing parents to have freedom of choice for all of the NEPA first schools. Langley catchment will attend Southridge, Wellfield and Marine which have capacity to take many children from outside of their catchment area and the Appletree Gardens catchment children will continue to apply for the other first schools.The trend for the school with the greatest surplus will continue and Appletree will become unviable. There is a risk to the financial stability of the middle schools and Whitley Bay High School if the first school places aren't filled and the location of Langley at the edge of the NEPA catchment and it's ease of accessibility by car along with nearby parking provides a strong advantage over Appletree - The parental survey undertaken by Langley highlights the points above with the following responses; - 73% of respondents in catchment moved to the area for Langley - 88% of respondents did not choose Appletree as any of their preferences when they applied for a school place - If Langley was not an option only 11% of respondents said Appletree would be their first choice, preferred schools were South Wellfield 39% and Southridge 20% - 33% of respondents would consider home schooling their children if Langley were to close - The persistent absence rate at Appletree is 15%, Langley persistent absence rate is 5.9% (the North Tyneside average is 13.7%). Absence data is a critical indicator of pupil engagement and school effectiveness, particularly under Ofsted's updated inspection framework which has been recently broadened to include grading of 'attendance and behaviour' Choose

an education phase - Compare school and college performance data in England - GOV.UK - “Schools Out Northern” at Langley First School provides childcare services from 7.30am to 6.00pm term time and allow for flexible booking, Appletree Little Pips provides 7.45am – 5.30pm (4.30pm for nursery children), this is a significant time difference for working parents and could even cause a requirement to change employment. - “Schools Out Northern” at Langley First School provides day care services from 9 months allowing parents to have one drop off and collection for their children from 9 months until 9 years whereas Little Pips provides from age 2 years forcing school parents with younger siblings to attend an alternative childcare provider until the youngest is over 2. Safety; Langley First School has a free car park nearby and the street is closed every morning creating a safe place for parents to drop their children. Appletree cannot close the street due to it being on a bus route. The parking outside of schools is a hazard for children crossing and a safety issue for emergency services – highlighted in a 2022 news article regarding Tyne and Wear Fire and Rescue services stating that parking outside Appletree Gardens as an “accident waiting to happen” following a fire engine struggling to drive through the area due to Appletree parents parking https://www.itv.com/neapplews/tyne-tees/2022-11-25/warning-issued-after-bad-parking-forces-fire-engines-to-crawl-past-school Woodlawn; Woodlawn requires a building to accommodate the 32 children they have atttending their sixth form site, although we fully appreciate it would be beneficial for the sites to be closer together, the Langley building of 300 capacity, larger in size than the building Woodlawn have for approx 140 children, with 2 fields, 2 playgrounds and 2 halls (all in addition to the current Woodlawn under 16 facitility) is far in excess of the requirements for 32 pupils and will incur the maintenance and running costs of a site larger than necessary.

Screen Name Redacted
11/07/2025 05:51 PM

The proposal is not a merger as I see it. If this has to happen this has to be a true merger with merging of governors, staff and most importantly, school ethos. As I see it in the proposal, this is a takeover of Langley by Appletree, which is not a fair outcome.

Screen Name Redacted
11/07/2025 11:55 PM

Create a new school with input from all pupils and parents - this is much fairer for all rather than making successful Langley become Appletree Gardens Keep thriving Langley open and site Woodlawn at Appletree Seriously consider the impact of the build and school places in the near future and keep Langley open

Screen Name Redacted
11/08/2025 10:15 AM

To keep the school open. North Tyneside have approved the building of 300 new homes (story) and a further 1000 homes by permissions all in catchment area of Langley first school. If only 50% of people

have children that's still 650 students needing a first school. Where do you suspect they're going to go. Langley first school is a fantastic first school and it's hard to say this about the other schools including apple tree. You're doing north Tyneside a disservice by closing this school and j suggest you stop the planning of any More further homes.

Screen Name Redacted
11/08/2025 11:49 AM

Survey Response: Proposed Merger of Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School Before any merger or alternative proposal is considered, the Council must provide a clear, transparent, and evidence-based plan. The current proposal lacks essential information and creates significant uncertainty for parents, staff, and the wider community. Without clarity on admissions, staffing, site use, and financial rationale, residents cannot make informed judgments or provide meaningful feedback. 1. Clarity and Transparency The proposal is ambiguous and incomplete. • What is the intended form entry of the new school — two, three, or four forms? • Will class sizes remain capped at 30? Families also need to understand where displaced pupils will go if Reception places across the Langley and Appletree catchment areas are reduced from 120 to 60. Combined, both schools currently have approximately 90 children in Reception. Will this reduction force around 30 children each year into the two-tier system, with longer travel distances to the nearest non-faith school? A redrafted proposal with full, factual information on admissions, capacity, staffing, and site use is essential before meaningful consultation can take place. 2. Pupil Placements and Communication Mixed messages have caused confusion. The Council has stated that all pupils will be taught at Appletree Gardens, while also confirming that Langley will not admit 60 Reception pupils in 2026. • How will sibling placements be managed if Langley admissions stop next year? This uncertainty risks splitting families and displacing local children. A clear, evidence-based admissions plan is required to ensure fairness and continuity. The current proposal compares this situation to children moving to middle school, which is inaccurate. Having one child in Reception and another in Year 1 at different schools is not equivalent to siblings attending different phases (first and middle). 3. Popularity and Fairness Data in the proposal show that 73% of families in catchment choose Langley, compared to 44% for Appletree Gardens. Closing the more popular and successful school is inequitable and undermines parental choice. The Council should consider: • Retaining Langley as the continuing school, or • Closing both schools and opening a new one with a new DfE number and governing body. Full, costed comparisons of all options must be published to demonstrate fairness and transparency. 4. Reduction in School Places The proposal refers to a reduction of 60 first-school places. If this effectively means closing Langley, that must be stated clearly, and the consultation restarted

with transparent documentation. The Council must also clarify: • Whether there will be roles for Langley staff in the new structure. • How staffing and leadership decisions will be made fairly. 5. Rationale and Site Use The rationale appears primarily linked to the expansion of Woodlawn School, which unfairly penalises Langley's thriving community. • How has the Council assessed the impact on Langley's 270 pupils, including those with SEND? • Has it considered the significant cost of adapting Langley's site for specialist provision when it is currently unsuitable for Woodlawn's needs? If the aim is to expand Woodlawn, the Council should explore building a new, purpose-built facility funded through the dedicated SEND capital budget, rather than displacing an established first-school community. 6. Financial Context and PFI Constraints It appears that decisions may have been influenced by PFI contractual constraints at Coquet Park and Marine Park, which restrict capacity changes or reductions at those schools. Coquet Park also currently has a financial deficit, which is affecting the Council's strategy and unfairly penalising staff and families at Langley. If PFI obligations are a key reason Langley and Appletree have been targeted, this should be stated openly. Decisions should be based on educational need and community impact, not on financial or contractual convenience. The Council must publish: • Full financial comparisons between schools, including the implications of PFI contracts. • A transparent explanation of how PFI restrictions have limited other options and shaped this proposal. 7. Employment and Community Impact Langley currently has more pupils and staff than Appletree. This proposal would therefore lead to more redundancies and greater disruption for Langley families. Describing the process as a "merger" is misleading when, in practice, it represents the closure of Langley. The Council should confirm whether experienced Langley teachers will move with the pupils to ensure continuity of education and stability for children. 8. DfE Number and Legal Status Under Department for Education guidance, a genuine merger involves closing both schools and creating a new one with a new DfE number. The current plan retains Appletree's DfE number, which legally constitutes the closure of Langley. The terminology used should therefore be corrected to reflect this reality. 9. Safety and Accessibility Many Langley families would need to cross a busy main road to reach Appletree Gardens. The Council must assess and mitigate this safety risk, particularly for younger pupils. In 2026, families may have children at both schools. How will the Council support safe travel and ensure educational continuity during this period? 10. Three-Tier System and Parental Choice The proposal claims to support the three-tier system yet removes a popular and successful first school from it. This reduces parental choice and undermines confidence in the Council's commitment to maintaining a balanced and sustainable three-tier structure. 11. Key Questions 1. Why is this described as a merger when it is effectively the closure of Langley? 2. Could a true merger — closing both

schools and opening a new one — be considered instead? 3. What will KS2 class sizes be, and can the Council guarantee they will not exceed 30? 4. Will Langley's experienced teachers transfer with their pupils? 5. How will families manage if siblings are placed at different schools next year? 6. What is the impact on SEND provision if intervention rooms at Appletree are repurposed? 7. Why should Langley's education be compromised to accommodate Woodlawn's expansion? 8. How have PFI constraints at Coquet Park and Marine Park influenced this proposal? 12. Alternative and Constructive Suggestions If a merger is still considered necessary, fairer and more sustainable options include: • Retaining Langley's DfE number and basing the merged school there. • Transferring Langley's leadership and staff to the new structure. • Building a purpose-built facility for Woodlawn to meet specialist needs effectively. • Reducing PANs gradually at other schools (where possible), such as Appletree or Marine Park, to balance numbers without dismantling a thriving community. An additional long-term alternative could be to convert Appletree Gardens into a one-form-entry primary school, preserving local access while easing pressure on the three-tier system. This would be helpful as around 30 children within the Appletree and Langley catchment would otherwise be unable to secure first-school places. If Appletree became a one-form-entry primary, 60 places would be reduced from the three-tier system, and neither school community would need to close. 13. Consultation Process The current six-week consultation is insufficient given the lack of clear information. The Council should: • Extend or restart the consultation once complete, transparent plans are available. • Provide detailed evidence on admissions, staffing, financial rationale, and PFI limitations before seeking public comment. • Demonstrate that children's wellbeing and educational continuity are the top priorities. Summary Parents, staff, and residents request that the Council: 1. Redraft the proposal with full clarity on admissions, finance, and PFI constraints. 2. Be transparent about whether Langley is closing. 3. Reopen or extend the consultation once accurate information is provided. 4. Give serious consideration to retaining Langley First School as the continuing school, given its success, stability, and community support. Until these issues are addressed, the current consultation cannot be regarded as fair, transparent, or meaningful.

Screen Name Redacted
11/08/2025 12:49 PM

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed merger of Langley First School into Appletree Gardens. While I understand that the Department for Education (DfE) uses the term "merger," it is clear to all involved that this proposal does not constitute a true merger. Rather, it represents an amalgamation of some Langley First School pupils into the Appletree Gardens site, with little likelihood that current Langley staff will transfer. I have significant concerns regarding the impact this proposal will have on the children, their

education, and their wellbeing: Transition and Wellbeing: The proposed move will be highly distressing for the children, particularly those with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND). They will be separated from their peers, familiar staff, and a known environment that provides them with security and stability. The emotional and psychological impact of such upheaval has not been adequately considered, and the consequences for their mental health and sense of belonging could be severe. Educational Impact: The children's education will inevitably suffer as they adapt to new teaching schemes, values, and ethos at Appletree Gardens. This inconsistency will hinder their progress and disrupt the continuity of their learning, particularly for those who rely heavily on structured routines and trusted relationships to succeed. SEND Provision: Langley First School currently supports a number of children with highly specific and, in some cases, complex medical and educational needs. The existing staff have developed deep understanding and expertise in recognising early signs of distress or medical complications. Appletree staff cannot be expected to acquire this level of insight immediately, leaving these children vulnerable and at risk of regression or harm. In addition, I am deeply troubled by the inaccuracies within the proposal. Examples include: The false claim that Langley pupils must cross a public highway for PE sessions; The incorrect assertion that Langley has only one hall (it has two); Misstatements regarding the school's financial position (Langley is not currently in deficit); and Inaccurate pupil data. Although some of these errors have since been amended, their presence in the initial proposal raises serious questions about the reliability and thoroughness of the process. It suggests that the proposal has been rushed, poorly planned, and insufficiently scrutinised. I am also concerned about the physical space at Appletree Gardens. The suggested accommodation for Langley pupils would likely require repurposing areas currently used for essential functions such as SEND provision, interventions, and breakout spaces. This would not only undermine the support available to Langley children but also disrupt the education and wellbeing of existing Appletree pupils. I urge you to pause this proposal and give full consideration to more sustainable and child-centred alternatives. Closing a thriving, inclusive, and highly successful school such as Langley First would be a grave mistake—one that unfairly penalises children and staff for administrative or council-level failings. There have been many alternative proposals submitted to you, and we expect to see evidence that these have been properly reviewed and considered. This alone warrants a pause to the current process. You should also consider a true merger—one that brings together Langley's staff, ethos, and values with Appletree's, allowing both teams the opportunity to co-create this 'new' school collaboratively. Furthermore, given the ongoing Murton Gap development and the eventual establishment of a new school, Langley's children, staff, and

ethos could transition together into that new provision—ensuring continuity, stability, and a genuine sense of renewal. You must also reflect on the unfair and detrimental impact this proposal would have on Woodlawn sixth formers. Housing pupils aged 4 to 19 on a single site removes vital transition experiences and milestones of achievement. It does not extend SEND provision in a meaningful way; instead, it reallocates a large school site designed for approximately 300 pupils to accommodate just 27 SEND students. If this proposal were reconsidered with these points in mind, there would be no justifiable reason for Langley First School to be the one to close.

Screen Name Redacted
11/08/2025 02:03 PM

Whilst this has been presented as a merger between two schools, it is clear to many of us that it amounts to the closure of Langley First School. As a parent of two children with special educational needs (SEN), I understand the challenges North Tyneside Council faces in accommodating the growing number of children requiring specialist support. However, I strongly believe that these challenges should not come at the expense of the children currently thriving at Langley. Langley First School is home to many children, even those with SEN, including my own son. The staff there have built trusted relationships and provide tailored support that cannot simply be replicated elsewhere. I urge the Council to consider a more inclusive approach—one that strengthens collaboration between Langley and Woodlawn, allowing for integration where appropriate. Inclusive education, when thoughtfully implemented, is far more beneficial than a segregated system. If Langley and Woodlawn worked together move - and made the most of being on the same site - you could have a real gem in children's education as a whole. [redacted] and I must express concern that my child's needs are not being adequately met. It feels as though too many SEN children have been placed in one setting, rather than being supported across multiple middle schools. Schools such as Valley Gardens, Marden Bridge, and Wellfield have the capacity to accommodate children from the Whitley Bay catchment area, but they must also be encouraged to foster a more inclusive and welcoming environment for SEN pupils. This requires a shift in mindset and culture, supported by training and leadership. If this happened... Langley could relocate to the Monkseaton Middle School building, it would allow the children to remain with their trusted teachers—something that is absolutely vital for continuity and emotional wellbeing. It would also create opportunities for Langley and Appletree to collaborate more closely, potentially evolving into a joint primary setting if that is the long-term vision. Importantly, this would also address the issue of limited space at Appletree for Langley pupils. Above all, retaining Langley's staff is essential. They know the children, understand their needs, and provide the stability and care

that families rely on. Preserving these relationships is key to minimising disruption and safeguarding the progress our children have made.

Screen Name Redacted
11/08/2025 02:17 PM

Keep Langley open. You are closing schools but then inevitably building more houses. Where are all these new families going to go to school? Merging is going to put so much extra pressure on these schools and staff. Teachers are already on their knees and losing staff every day because of the horrendous and impossible pressures put upon them. This is going to push them to breaking point. Our class sizes in this country are already too large. Smaller class sizes (even just 24 or 25 pupils) makes such a difference to the amount of time teachers can spend with them and makes for a much more positive experience for everyone. North Tyneside could lead the way! It works in Scandinavian countries. I can't understand why this government doesn't look at best practice across the globe and try to emulate it in this country.

Screen Name Redacted
11/08/2025 02:51 PM

Close Appletree Gardens who have less children attending in catchment, expand Langley to accommodate the small number of students. The government is wanting to see more SEN lad provisions within mainstream schools. Expand this in Langley which is a thriving school with 75% of children within catchment. Woodland can expand on the field opposite. The cost of making changes to Langley all the adaptations will come at a significant cost. Use the funds for a purpose built school for woodland.

Screen Name Redacted
11/08/2025 09:40 PM

I am confused by the councils rush to dramatically change the educational provision within North Tyneside especially with the large scale development of the land around Monkseaton High School. Firstly by closing Monkseaton High School and disputing the education of students in the vital GCSE years and expecting them to flourish despite a plethora of research which highlights that any change in educational provision causes regression. Secondly another major upheaval, the closure of Langley and Monkseaton Middle schools, which will again dramatically disadvantage the prospects of North Tyneside students. The Monkseaton High School building will be empty and as a very new educational resource should be used to its fullest extent. Could that not be used to accommodate the students from Langley and Appletree Gardens as well the students from Monkseaton Middle and develop a three tier educational provision within the same building and if the building can accommodate move Woodlawn Special School into that building and future proof the provision of SEND education within the authority. It could prove to be a trail blazing provision which other authorities would look to emulate.

The Monkseaton High School building could accommodate all of the students from Langley, Appletree and Monkseaton Middle as well as those of Woodlawn, they could all receive their education under one roof and this would allow for a truly inclusive education for all. The Monkseaton High School site allows for future growth of the setting as well as adequate parking for all of the staff, something which is dramatically lacking in all three of the existing sites.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 08:35 AM

I think you should consider reducing numbers at Langley and appletree from September 2026 intake to 45 but turn Appletree into a primary school up to Year 6 and then feed into a high school not the three tier. Use the spare classrooms for Year 5 and 6 With the extra space at Langley you could still move Woodlawn sixth form to Langley as there would be more space. I think by shutting one school and packing children into another school not of their choice you're taking away communities and bonds. Reducing numbers to 45 also then gives leeway in the future to shuffle things about if the birth rate increases again. Which it will at some point if it's an ageing residency at the moment.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 11:12 AM

1. True Amalgamation – Langley First and Appletree Gardens First School both closing and a new ‘Monkseaton First School’ opened. This will take a longer process but taking time will allow communities to digest the information and feel assured that the council are carefully planning the future of our children’s education. All governors and staff would reapply for their jobs and roles so there is a fair representation of both schools within the new school. 2. Closure of schools with unacceptable structural/financial issues – Coquet Park First School and Rockcliffe First School. Langley is not on any of these lists! A predicted deficit is not a deficit yet. Langley’s school is sound structurally and has a new school roof. 3. Build Woodlawn 6th form school on Langley’s field site across the highway. If Langley remained open, Woodlawn could use the land that Langley use once a year for sports day, to build a site specifically for their 6th form students. Langley would continue using their ‘green space’ for PE, Sporting events and outdoor learning. This means the hydro-pool would continue to be used and Woodlawn headteacher can also their older site close by. This means another 2-form entry first school would need to be closed, e.g. one that is in significant debt, a one whose building is not fit for purpose or a one form entry school which is not financially sustainable. 4. Langley First school to have an Early Years ARP. If Langley and Woodlawn work together, Langley could educate some of the younger children with lower needs. Children could be dual registered and flow between both sites. SEND provision is already extremely high quality at Langley and this would boost numbers so that the 10% surplus would be filled and Langley would

not be predicting a deficit budget. 5. Langley to become the primary school in the Murton Gap housing development. Langley staff and it's governors are an extremely successful school. The community is strong and passionate about this. It is going to be a tragedy to the education system if we lose these amazing people. Could the Primary school in the planning development be protected for the staff at Langley? The whole community would be outraged if this school pops up in the next few years and we've lost highly dedicated and skilled educators due to this restructuring. 6. Build Woodlawn a totally new site. If it's so important for Woodlawn to all be 'under one roof' then would it not be better for the children to have a purpose built facility rather than spending huge amounts of money to change and adapt current community schools? Langley could use the Woodlawn site while we have Appletree children 'merge' with us. The hydro-pool would continue to be used by Langley children for swimming experiences, saving the council money by children not using Waves swimming pool. Langley could then rent out the pool to other schools and swimming providers, making money to add to their school funds.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 11:13 AM

There are a few possible options - -make it a fair and proper merger - new school name, new uniform, mix of staff from both schools, values and ethos from both schools -merger Appletree Gardens and Monkseaton Middle School - similar to Wellfield first and Middle... - Close Coquet Park First School as in a few years time this school wont remain open..... -Langley First becomes an academy

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 12:08 PM

Keep Langley First School Open. Use DfE and council funding, as well as using the proposed increase in funding to education from the Labour government, to keep the school open and operational. Children's QUALITY education is absolutely paramount. Merging schools not only results in highly dangerous and detrimental class sizes if all children from Langley go to Appletree; it also increases teacher and school staff workload to unattainable levels of planning, marking and assessment. Education is a right. Supporting our future generations is non-negotiable. By merging the schools, NEPA are guaranteed yet another cohort of children who have been failed by a government that clearly has no care nor regard for their attainment, their wellbeing, their aspirations- and then produces a generation of workers who do not have the knowledge, confidence, support or desire to work hard and achieve in a council that clearly never took them into consideration. You want a future workforce who are willing, cooperative, and aspirational? Then it lies in their education from KS1. If you are happy to settle for a generation of children who will grow up without the DfE and Ofsted guided curriculum knowledge and successful grades from First school through Middle and High School, then by all means merge Langley with Appletree, and ensure teacher

burnout, a retention crisis, higher proportions of CAMHS referrals for unsupported children, higher percentage of EBSA and low attendance, and a group of children who will grow up without the proper education they WOULD have received just by keeping a thriving school open.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 12:38 PM

I am strongly against these proposals for the following reasons, please consider the points I have mentioned below; As a former parent [redacted] Despite being in Appletree catchment, we chose Langley based on its ethos, location and facilities. Once we started in the school it was clear to see the compassion and expertise that all staff had towards the children, particularly those with SEN as one of my daughters is. My children attended Langley for 12 years collectively, only just finishing in July 2025, [redacted] I feel very well placed and informed to ask that my voice is heard by NT council. It is short sighted to close the school based on declining birth rates despite the fact that Covid and lock down had a direct impact on the economy, and cost of living and therefore on young families and their choices on family size. This was an unprecedented time which we have never seen before, and hope to never see again. This has medium term affects on the economy which we are still experiencing but the affects are not indefinite. Therefore making a long term decision on school places based on a short to medium term situation is short sighted. North Tyneside's new local plan itself identifies that it has not planned to meet the demand of housing needs in the area, and by 2032 NT council intend to correct this shortfall. This includes plans for Whitley Bay town centre and intends to repurpose disused buildings in the town centre to residential properties. This in turn will have an affect on the surrounding school places such as Marine Park and Coquet, Rockliffe, meaning that more first school aged children will be living in the area, these schools may become over subscribed and children in the area would therefore require the additional places that Langley and Appletree offer in their current forms today, as well as impacting on Middle school places further ahead. Additionally a one form entry first school such as Coquet which we know has PFI attached to it, is not financially sustainable in the long term therefore presumably once this PFI is completed, the plan will be to close this school as it is currently known, resulting in a further reduction of available first school places in the area. Why shut a 2 form entry school as Langley is, which is financially viable, when in less than 10 years a smaller one form entry school which is not financially viable will be out of the PFI period which the council signed up to, misguidedly, at the time, with no foresight for this process that is being forced upon children and families unnecessarily now? Langley first school in any instance

currently has a good uptake of places and surplus places are considered to be within the council's own reasonable limits. In addition, Langley have always managed their finances extremely diligently, despite the short term lower than usual pupil numbers, which we believe will be addressed once NT council address their shortfall on housing needs in the area, particularly if the primary school that NT council had planned for the Murton Gap, if Langley could instead be allowed to include those predicted first school places required by the new build houses (the council predict will see an additional 748 primary school places), in Langley catchment, given that some of those houses are directly opposite Langley First school and in closer proximity to Langley than any other first school. Note that Star of the Sea cannot be considered in the council's proposals given that it is a faith school and is funded by the government directly, not by North Tyneside council therefore NT council will have limited reach over what happens to this school in the future. Additionally parental choice is key, given that many families will not choose to send their children to a faith school, nor is it in the 3 tier system therefore children would not naturally flow from this faith primary school to a Middle school in the local area. Langley have benefitted from senior management who manage budgets and finances extremely well, even when budgets are as limited as they are given the current under-funding in education. To simply make redundant these senior lead team staff, when they have been so successful at maintaining the school and its' finances, in favour of retaining a school which has required to be in receipt of the Falling Rolls Funding, as Appletree is, does not make any logical sense. According to the government school spending comparison tool, Appletree currently spend £29 per square metre to run their building versus Langley who spend £4 per square metre. Langley has benefitted from a recently appointed new Headteacher who has great plans and visions for the school, yet this proposal has not allowed any time for him to even begin and put those plans into action.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 02:15 PM

I have emailed [redacted] today but I wanted to complete this too so my vote is counted Thank you

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 02:56 PM

I believe that the wrong school has been chosen to close. That the 'merger' should flip, with Langley being the school that retains it's staff, governing body, DFE number, ethos and building. Re-establishing an ARP at Langley (using the computer room space) and making use of the expertise across the staff team to adapt learning and support children with SEN. Develop opportunities for integration from Woodlawn to Langley for children who would benefit from dual registration. Adaptations to the Langley building could serve to accommodate the children from Appletree Gardens (Langley own a

	separate field on which a 'wing' of provision could be established). There is also scope to develop the EYFS offer at Langley with the potential to become something very bespoke and valuable to the community and renowned more widely (using School Based Nursery Capital Grant) to develop forest/beach school setting in addition to the very successful provision already on offer.
Screen Name Redacted 11/09/2025 03:06 PM	Langley should stay, that Appletree gardens should merge with Langley site and that Langley should work together with Woodlawn. Langley school is more popular with higher achievements
Screen Name Redacted 11/09/2025 03:11 PM	Langley school is more popular and higher achieving with better facilities therefore Appletree should merge with Langley and work with Woodlawn.
Screen Name Redacted 11/09/2025 03:49 PM	Langley should stay and and Appletree Gardens merge to that site. Then work with Woodlawn together
Screen Name Redacted 11/09/2025 04:16 PM	Given that there will be costs incurred in this reshaping of the education provision in Whitley Bay could the vehicular access be looked at for Monkseaton Middle School with a view to gathering the SEND education on that site as it is to be closed completely? Currently the vehicular access around Woodlawns and Langley First school is very congested at drop-off and pick-up times posing a risk to all who are walking / moving around the area. If there are more vehicles arriving and leaving with the increased numbers of children under the SEND remit this congestion will only become worse. Where Monkseaton Middle School is situated there appears to be much easier vehicular access with easier access to the buildings. This may well lend itself to lighter, brighter and better learning conditions for the children and young people with SEND with maybe the same or not much more financial outlay and perhaps a more secure future than expanding Woodlawns into the Langley First School site. By considering Monkseaton Middle School for SEND children, Langley First School could be kept as an option for children who will most certainly be occupying the housing that is being built on the Rake Lane - Murton Gap site which is all 3, 4 and 5 bedroom houses and therefore likely to produce more than the Government projected average of 37 children per 100 houses..
Screen Name Redacted 11/09/2025 05:03 PM	I strongly urge you to reconsider and explore more viable and forward-thinking alternatives, such as: Transitioning Langley First School into a primary school as part of the two-tier system.

Temporarily maintaining Langley and transferring its pupils and staff into the new Murton Gap school once it is built. Repurposing the Monkseaton High School building to accommodate Woodlawn School. Extending Woodlawn's existing site by developing additional facilities on the field at Drumoyne Gardens, which could be funded through SEND-specific capital allocations. Relocating Woodlawn's sixth form provision to the Monkseaton site, as these students spend significant time on placement and would therefore not require the full Langley site, freeing space for expanded SEND provision. I urge the council to take these proposals into serious consideration before proceeding with a decision that would cause lasting harm to pupils, staff, and the wider community.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 05:59 PM

I am writing to express my deep concerns regarding the proposed merger between Langley First School and Appletree Gardens. At present, the children at Appletree Gardens benefit from a number of breakout rooms, intervention spaces, and dedicated areas that allow children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) to regulate and receive targeted support. If these essential rooms are repurposed to accommodate pupils from Langley, all children will lose access to these vital resources. This would have a significant negative impact on the quality of education and emotional well-being of both existing and incoming pupils. With the school operating at full capacity under this proposal, there is no suitable or sustainable way for children to be taught effectively. In addition, I have serious concerns about the well-being and job security of the Langley First School staff. The council appears to have taken no clear accountability for the impact this decision will have on their employment. These staff members work incredibly hard and have shown unwavering dedication to their pupils. They do not deserve to face the loss of their jobs through no fault of their own. Furthermore, based on Department for Education guidance, this proposal does not appear to represent a true merger. This distinction should have been made much clearer to the public. Throughout the consultation process, I have observed numerous errors and subsequent corrections in the proposal, which raises serious concerns about how rushed and insufficiently considered this process has been. As both a parent and a member of the local community, I understand how vital consistency and stability are in education. Expecting children as young as five to move into an unfamiliar environment—with new staff, peers, and routines—will undoubtedly cause distress and disruption. It is especially disappointing that Langley First School has been chosen for this change. Langley is a highly valued part of our community, widely recognised for its inclusive ethos and exceptional support for children with SEND. The school regularly welcomes pupils that others cannot accommodate. Aside from its proximity to Woodlawn, there appears to be little justification for selecting Langley. It feels deeply

unfair that a thriving, inclusive, and successful school is being penalised rather than supported. Langley currently operates with only a 10% surplus—a figure your own documentation deems acceptable. Considering this, and the fact that several viable alternatives have already been presented, I would be extremely disappointed if these were not properly explored. Proceeding with the current proposal without full consideration of these alternatives would severely undermine public confidence in the council's decision-making process.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 07:51 PM

Langley should stay. Apple tree gardens should merge with Langley site and they should work together with Woodlawn.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 09:02 PM

There is now a redundant educational site and Monkseaton High School that is not being used. If the council wants to centralise SEND education under one roof and expand it then why not use that site? The grounds are huge and the facilities would more than accommodate all the taxis and disabled transport that is required for SEND pupils. Langley is in surplus financially, well run and its pupil headcount is only just below the ideal with the rest just being predictions into the future. Ousting Langley for Woodlawn to expand is unnecessary and unjust. I also understand a new school is going to be built for the families on the new build estate on Rake Lane, but why not fill up the existing schools first. Geographically, Langley and Appletree are closer than New York.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 09:13 PM

1. Close both Appletree and Langley and open a new school with a new DfE number on the Appletree site. - This would allow integration of the strongest aspects of both schools' ethos, staff and practice to form a new school with a unique, positive identity within the community. - This would be a fair 'half way point', as it would minimise disruption and allow the new school to retain familiar aspects, ensuring the children - whom are impacted most - would have a smooth transition. - A new school could combine the high parental preference for Langley with the larger site of Appletree, attracting families from both catchments and mitigating deficits faster than a standard merger, whilst also increasing funding. - This aligns with the councils aim to cap NEPA First School places at 390, ensuring transitions to middle and high school are seamless. - It also allows Woodlawn to take over the current Langley site. 2. Instead of closing Langley and expanding Appletree, the two could be merged, moving Langley's entire operation to the current Appletree site. - Essentially, Appletree would 'become' Langley First School. - This would minimise disruption for the current Langley pupils. They would move to a new location, but everything else would be retained (uniform, staff, etc). -

This would also minimise disruption for current Appletree pupils. They would remain in the same location as they always had, but there would simply be some new staff (which is very common in schools anyway) and a change of uniform (potentially rolled out to avoid costing parents significant amounts of money). 3. Phased transition to a single site. - This would create a single legal school entity, operating from both Langley and Appletree sites. It would operate over both sites for three years before fully consolidating onto the Langley site, as the Appletree site being larger is only appropriate for the 'bulge' years. - This would mitigate the issue, as it would allow the PAN to be adjusted accordingly to ensure the current children are not impacted. No matter what happens, there needs to be a one year delay to the proposals at an absolute minimum, to allow the current Year 2s to go through the school unaffected.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 09:40 PM

I am writing to express my deep concerns regarding the proposed merger between Langley First School and Appletree Gardens. Based on Department for Education guidance, this does not appear to be a true merger, and I believe this distinction could have been communicated more clearly to the public. Throughout the consultation process, I have noticed numerous errors and subsequent corrections within the proposal. This raises serious concerns about how rushed the process appears to have been and whether it has been thoroughly considered. As a member of the local community—and as a parent—I understand the importance of consistency and stability in education. Asking children as young as five to transition into a new environment with unfamiliar staff, peers, and routines will undoubtedly be unsettling for many of them. It is disappointing that Langley First has been identified for this change. As a long-standing and respected part of our community, Langley is known for its inclusive ethos and strong support for children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND), often accepting pupils other schools cannot accommodate. Aside from its proximity to Woodlawn, I see little justification for its selection. It feels as though a thriving, popular, and inclusive school is being penalized rather than celebrated. Langley currently operates with only a 10% surplus, a figure that your own documentation recognises as acceptable. Given this, and the fact that alternative options have been presented, I would be deeply disappointed if these were not seriously considered. If this proposal proceeds without further exploration of other solutions, it would significantly diminish my confidence in the council’s decision-making process. I urge you to reconsider the approach being taken. Could Langley instead be transitioned into a primary school or integrated into the two-tier system? Such an option might preserve the school’s strengths while still addressing budgetary pressures. This would protect the children, staff, and wider school community, while also avoiding additional strain on Whitley High, where many of these

	pupils would not otherwise enrol. Please take the time to re-examine this proposal and consider the long-term impact on our children and community
Screen Name Redacted 11/10/2025 11:13 AM	I believe Langley should stay on that site, and Appletree Gardens should merge with them and together work with Woodlawn. Langley has good facilities and is so popular.
Screen Name Redacted 11/10/2025 11:20 AM	Do not merge the schools because in the longer term there will be a demand for school places from families living in the Rake Lane. In addition North Tyneside may be obliged to accommodate some of the thousands of immigrants arriving in Kent.
Screen Name Redacted 11/10/2025 01:26 PM	Cooperate with head teachers and governors in order to find a solution.
Screen Name Redacted 11/10/2025 02:27 PM	see my comments below on how a merger would be more acceptable and effective. Having had to go through this in the Private Sector I am trying to share the experiences and ways to improve the chances of it succeeding as smoothly as possible!
Screen Name Redacted 11/10/2025 05:41 PM	Our alternative option is to retain the status quo , monitor all the statistics being utilised in the closure proposals and reappraise on the back of a longer projection of costs and birth rate statistics. The National Pupil Projection methodology only goes up to 2030 and there are estimates that post 2030 pupil numbers will be increasing to close to the councils acceptable levels.
Screen Name Redacted 11/10/2025 07:42 PM	To wait and monitor the next couple of years not take any rash decisions .
Screen Name Redacted 11/10/2025 07:46 PM	First of all I urge you to pause this proposal and get an independent company to review your facts and figures. The amount of inaccuracies shows that this has not been thought through properly and needs to be looked at again properly. You still have the fact that Langley doesn't have its own field and has to cross a main highway to get to the field. This is absolutely wrong. They have a massive yard and a field all signing the gated school. They also have 2 large halls. One dining room and one hall for assembly etc. The council would have know this is they had took the time to visit the school. Close Appletree School and keep Langley open. Langley is thriving

with the majority of pupils living within catchment. Appletree currently has less pupils and the majority of those who attend aren't in catchment for Appletree. Langley is a thriving school with an amazing ethos. It truly is the heart of the community. You intend to move 32 children from Woodlawn and see this has a good enough reason to displace 300 children? You need to close a school to expand Woodlawn. You are creating a false choice. Why does the community need to accept a suboptimal and unstable mainstream solution in exchange for a desirable SEND solution? Are our children not as important? Woodlawn could build a purpose built facility on the filled opposite their current site. What would be the cost of adapting Langley to be a suitable school? In the consultation documents it is mentioned about closing Coquet Park but this was not deemed financially viable due to private finance initiative school which the council is contractually obligated to until 2032. According to the councils cabinet paper 2022/23 was the first financial year that the school ended with deficit balance. 24/25 with a cumulative deficit of £0.325m. No budget plan has been submitted that shows it coming back into financial balance writhing 3 years. It is classed as being in structural deficit which means there is a long term financial problem that requires significant change to resolve. It also has a one form entry which you say is not financially viable? As well as being poor value for money for the tax payer, due to high interest charges the PFI contract costing the council, this school is not financially viable by your own recognition? It is difficult to understand how the council will not have to close this school too possibly leaving the borough with not enough primary school place. Why close Langley when it is not currently in debt? The forecast deficit is only a forecast and the budget system used has its flaws as we all know!

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 08:45 PM

I (and many others) believe a true merger is the only viable option. Ensure both schools have the same say and retain their best staff. Ensure that schools have equal opportunities to play a role in the future of First Schools in North Tyneside.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 08:46 PM

Close appletree.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 08:52 PM

I think langley should take some of the woodlawn pupils that don't require specialist equipment (such as the hydro pool) as langley already has a strong send provision and it increases the number of send pupils in mainstream education. This then creates more space at woodlawn. Pupils could then move onto monkseaton middle as a specialist send provision and extend that offer to 16 or 18, which also reduces pressure in WBHS.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 09:07 PM

I suggest that the Council explore a federation or shared leadership model between Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School instead of a full merger. This would allow both schools to remain open while sharing a headteacher and governing body, helping reduce costs and increase collaboration without closing a school or moving pupils. The arrangement could be reviewed after 2–3 years using actual pupil numbers and financial data to decide whether further changes are necessary. Federation has been used successfully in other North Tyneside and Northumberland schools to maintain quality education while adapting to changing pupil numbers. This would protect stability for children and give the Council flexibility based on real evidence rather than long-term forecasts.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 09:09 PM

Formal Objection to North Tyneside Council's Proposal to Close Langley First School I wish to formally record my objection to North Tyneside Council's proposal to close Langley First School and "merge" it with Appletree Gardens First School. This response sets out my serious concerns about the inaccuracy of the information presented, the absence of sound educational reasoning, and the potentially damaging effects on pupils such as my two sons, families, and the wider community. Misleading and Inaccurate Information in the Proposal A number of statements within the consultation documents appear to support a predetermined decision rather than provide a fair and transparent evaluation. Key areas of concern include: • Incomplete and Misleading Birth Rate Data: The Council appears to have based its projections solely on birth rates within the Langley First catchment area. This approach fails to recognise that many families, including my own, have moved into the area specifically for access to Langley School. This selective use of statistics presents a distorted picture of genuine demand. • Langley Operating Within Acceptable Capacity: Langley First is currently fewer than 30 pupils below capacity—under 10%, a level the Council itself considers acceptable. By comparison, Appletree Gardens is 14% under capacity, making Langley the more viable school in terms of current enrolment. • Questionable Financial Assertions: The proposal implies that Langley faces financial deficit; however, this is not the case. Predictions that Langley's finances will deteriorate faster than Appletree's are unsupported by evidence—particularly since Langley maintains higher pupil numbers and stronger parental preference. The absence of transparent financial modelling raises doubts about the validity of these claims. • Errors in Data Presentation: During the first consultation meeting, a Langley parent identified a serious error in one of NTC's graphs, which was later replaced. This incident calls into question the reliability of the remaining data. Numerous inconsistencies have been identified across the consultation materials, including in projected pupil

numbers, budget forecasts, and comparative data. • Misrepresentation of Facilities: The proposal inaccurately suggests Langley lacks sufficient outdoor space and that pupils must cross fields for PE or break times. This is entirely false. Langley has two large halls and an extensive on-site field used daily. The nearby field is only used once a year for sports day. Such misrepresentations seem intended to disadvantage Langley unfairly in comparison to Appletree. • Overlooked Transport and Safety Concerns: While the Council claims the schools are less than half a mile apart, this ignores the fact that children would be required to cross two major roads—Seatonville Road and Bromley Avenue. No traffic or safety assessment has been undertaken. Appletree already faces congestion problems, whereas Langley benefits from a Council-led "Safe Street" policy and nearby free parking. • Disregard for Parental Preference Data: Only around half of families in Appletree's catchment choose that school, compared with 73% of families in Langley's area who actively select Langley. This demonstrates stronger community trust and satisfaction with Langley and undermines the rationale for closing a more popular and high-performing school. Building Capacity and Class Size Concerns North Tyneside Council has failed to explain where or how additional pupils from Langley would be accommodated at Appletree Gardens. The consultation document claims Appletree can hold 432 pupils, yet official government figures list its capacity as just 293. This major discrepancy casts serious doubt on the reliability of the Council's data. Without clarity, there is a genuine risk that children could be placed in temporary or overcrowded classrooms, to the detriment of teaching quality, learning outcomes, and pupil wellbeing. This is particularly concerning for our eldest son, currently in Year 2, whose year group would swell to 118 pupils under the proposed merger. No information has been provided on projected class sizes. With no legal maximum for children over age seven, there is a real danger that classes will become excessively large, reducing the individual support each child receives and negatively impacting both progress and wellbeing. SEND Provision and Inclusive Education At present, 40 pupils at Langley have identified SEND needs, with a further 24 receiving additional support—amounting to around 24% of the school's roll. The Council has offered no assurances about how these children will be supported should Langley close. Rather than closing Langley due to its proximity to Woodlawn, the Council should consider a dual registration model that aligns with national inclusive education policy and ensures children with additional needs remain integrated within mainstream settings. Furthermore, NTC's proposal to move 32 post-16 pupils from Marden High to the Woodlawn site would displace approximately 300 younger pupils to benefit a small minority. Expanding SEND provision must not come at the expense of the broader school community or the quality of mainstream education. The proposal to close Langley First School and merge it

with Appletree Gardens First School is deeply flawed—both in evidence and intention. The inaccuracies within the Council's documentation, the absence of clear educational or financial justification, and the lack of transparency throughout the process have seriously eroded public trust. Langley First School is a thriving, inclusive, and respected institution that serves its community with distinction. Its closure would cause unnecessary disruption, diminish parental choice, and remove a vital pillar of local education.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 09:13 PM

Across the UK, other councils are finding innovative ways to make better use of existing school estates, particularly in response to the growing demand for specialist and inclusive education spaces. Rather than closing Langley First School, I urge the council to consider a forward-thinking alternative: repurposing available classrooms and space as SEND hubs within the existing school infrastructure. This approach would bring multiple benefits: It preserves a thriving and popular community school. It meets the increasing need for local SEND provision without the expense and disruption of new builds. It aligns perfectly with the Department for Education's ongoing push for inclusive education within mainstream environments. Importantly, this proposal reflects comments recently made by Bridget Phillipson, Secretary of State for Education, who said: "We are thinking very carefully about how we can expand SEND provision in schools – more specialist provision in mainstream schools and considering how we can make good use of the school estate, including spare space that has come about because of capacity to put that to good use as well." It is difficult to reconcile this national direction with a local proposal to close a school that is both successful and nearly full. If the government is actively encouraging the use of existing space for SEND expansion, then Langley First School offers exactly the kind of opportunity being described. Other areas of the country are already putting this model into action. For example, Lincolnshire County Council has recently announced plans to create 40 new classrooms for SEND children across existing schools, transforming available capacity into much-needed specialist provision (source https://www.lincolnshirelive.co.uk/news/lincoln-news/40-new-classrooms-send-children-10621139?utm_term=Autofeed&utm_medium=Social&utm_source=Facebook&bri d=upw9I23lu0hVJeMDzJpJjQ#Echobox=1762334274). This is exactly the kind of proactive, inclusive solution that could and should be replicated here. I therefore urge the council to reconsider closure and instead explore the option of establishing SEND hubs within Langley First School. This would safeguard an invaluable local school, meet urgent SEND needs, and demonstrate alignment with both government priorities and best practice from other local authorities. By taking this route, the council could turn a threat into an opportunity — strengthening education for all children and ensuring

that Langley First School continues to serve our community with pride and purpose. No guarantees have been given about what, if any, adapted provision, SEN specific places or breakout spaces would be available at Appletree following the closure of Langley It is also unclear how all children will be accommodated into classrooms before even considering the need for SEN specific spaces. Appletree was in the process of applying for the development of an Additionally Resourced Provision (ARP) to accommodate SEN but we understand this plan has been put on hold due to this consultation. The Inclusive culture and staff expertise have been developed over time at Langley. [redacted] SENCO responsible does a fantastic job alongside many other staff members at Langley who have thrive specialist training and as mental health ambassadors. This culture at Langley is authentic and reliant on the staff team – their strong relationships, communication skills, connection and dedication to the children. Langley offers support for children with additional needs such as the building being all on ground level with ramp access, accessible toilets and changing space. The sensory room has padded wall and floor and no windows to allow for a fully darkened experience if needed. The outdoor space in reception garden follows a forest school ethos and a potting garden for small groups of children. Every classroom has a 'haven' are which children can use to regulate and reset. Teachers offer a lunchtime club for those who find the playground overwhelming and there is also a specifically adapted KS2 space. Rather than being viewed as a candidate for closure simply because it is located next to a special school, Langley's position represents a strategic opportunity. Its proximity to Woodlawn Special School allows for dual registration, enabling pupils to access targeted interventions and therapies as needed while continuing to participate in mainstream classes and interact with a diverse peer group. This approach supports the government's key priority of inclusive education, keeping children with additional needs in mainstream settings wherever possible.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 09:21 PM

Do not close Langley First. It is a very good school that appears to be the fall guy for poor choices around PFI rather than being judged on its own merits. Why close an excellent school to hold open a one form entry school? If you are set on reducing pupil spaces then it should be a true merger. This is a rushed decision with the minimum time given to the community to comment and provide other ideas. You have been working on this since 2022. We have had six weeks. The unfairness of this and the weighting to your own preference is shocking. Langley is not in deficit yet so following the true merger approach and involving the useful overview of Secretary of State would give us more belief in the approach and trust that the education of our children as a whole is being explored and understood. I feel that you are not giving decision making to the local area as it is

because we have been given so little time and space to respond. The true merger pathway would make things clearer and fairer and more neutral.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 09:47 PM

Firstly I feel like an urgent review is required based on correct information and all the relevant factors taken into account. These are detailed below: There have been several inaccuracies and misleading statements made by the Council throughout the proposals. The Cabinet members have therefore been misinformed and based their decision to allow the proposals to go ahead based on incorrect information. They have not been presented with a balanced argument and there is clear bias towards Appletree Gardens First School in their briefing materials.: In the Cabinet Supplementary Agenda document it was stated that Langley pupils have to cross a public highway for PE lessons and did not have a field to play on for breaks and lunchtimes. This is untrue. Langley has a large grassed area where all PE lessons take place (as well as on the yard). Furthermore, Reception has a large outdoor exploration area. The Cabinet Supplementary Agenda document also states that most dwellings in Langley catchment would not require families to cross a main road to get to Appletree. This is also untrue. Most families from Langley catchment would have to cross either Seatonville Road (an extremely busy main road) or Cauldwell Lane to get to Appletree. Furthermore the Council did not include the fact that Langley actually closes the street to cars every morning to make it safer for their children to get to school but Appletree Gardens entrance is on a bus route which means they can’t close the street. It is also a very busy street for traffic. We used to live opposite Appletree gardens (but note we still chose to send our kids to Langley) and buses would often drive on the pavement to get past parked cars. We also often had people parking over our drives during school drop off and pick up points. The Cabinet Supplementary Agenda document mentioned that Langley is in deficit (this was highlighted in large writing and in a different colour). This is untrue. Langley has predicted a deficit by the end of the financial year in March 2026. there could be ways Langley could raise more funds for example, the under three provision and wrap-around care is currently run by a private business. Langley could take this over as a means to generate extra finance. The Cabinet Supplementary Agenda Document also states a reason for choosing Appletree over Langley is that Appletree is not in deficit - neither in Langley so this is a very misleading/bias statement. The Cabinet Supplementary Agenda Document also states a reason for choosing Appletree is that it has two school halls. So has Langley which is not stated so again is a misleading/bias statement. Langley’s hall is larger than Appletree’s. Part of a key argument for keeping Appletree is that Appletree’s building is larger than Langley’s. This is untrue. Langley has more square metres of space than Appletree.

Appletree has more classrooms however their classrooms are small and do not have capacity to fit 30 students in them. The supporting documents for the proposal state that the capacity of Appletree is 432 students. Where has this number come from? On the Government website it states the capacity of Appletree as being 293. The proposals state that Appletree is larger than Langley. This is not true. Langley is larger. 1614.22m2 and Appletree is 1522m2. Appletree does have more proposed classrooms but none of them meet the minimum guidance for 30 Reception age students of 62m2 and only 4 exceed 55m2 which is the minimum guidance for 30 KS1+. Langley has 9 classrooms which exceed 62m2 and 10 which exceed 55m2. Appletree's Hall is smaller than the Government recommended size whereas Langley's is 62m2 larger than Appletree's and large enough to section off to create another classroom. The proposals say Appletree Gardens has 17 classrooms and Langley has 13. However Appletree only has 14 plus two nursery rooms. Langley has 11 plus 2 nursery rooms (currently used as one large one). Failure to take into account all factors and concerns over methodologies Other factors the Council have failed to consider: The Council have failed to address the issue of nursery provision and wrap around care and issue which was of grave concern to parents in our parent survey. 47% of parents who currently use wrap-around service at Langley said that losing this would have a significant impact on their family such as having to cut hours at work or even give up work altogether. Langley predicted a deficit but has been given no support/time to look at how they could improve their financial situation. Currently the wrap around service at Langley is outsourced. Appletree provides this in-house and it generates a significant amount of income. Langley could generate more income by providing this under 3's provision in-house. The Council have also not completed a Community Impact Assessment on the merger of Appletree Gardens and Langley First School. There was an impact assessment done in December 2024 but this was in relation to the closure of Monkseaton High School. The Pupil Projection methodology used was not published at the time of the proposal. [redacted] I find it extremely disappointing that a public body would not do this. It does not bode well for gaining trust from the public and certainly isn't transparent, the Code of Practice for Statistics has three main pillars which are quality, trust and value. I would argue that none of these pillars has been upheld by the council when producing their statistics for the following reasons: We only received the pupil projection methodology through a Freedom of Information request and I can't help but think it was created after the fact and rushed. In the pupil projection methodology It states that the data does not reflect where the children are born by either postcode, catchment or planning area - how can this be when they are using this data specifically for projecting pupil numbers within the NEPA? There are also a couple of errors in the methodology document. Firstly the year of the Local Plan is given as

1017 instead of 2017. There is no section on Data Inaccurracies which should include the limitations of their data and possible reasons for where there may result in inaccuracies. Projections will never be completely accurate and this should be recognised with reasons why. Additional points: There has been a lack of an audit trail in terms of maintaining a record of what has been discussed with key stakeholders in the lead up to the proposals. In response to an FOI where we requested 'copies of attendance lists, calendar invites, or distribution lists for headteacher briefings or meetings held by the Council to discuss the Langley–Appletree merger or the wider NEPA reorganisation, from January 2023 onward'. The response was as follows "No information held. The proposed merger of Langley and Appletree Gardens First School has not been discussed at Headteacher Briefings." Yet on the FAQs there is a long list of meetings which were held. The FOI clearly states that the content of the meetings could have been about the wider NEPA reorganisation and not just the Langley/Appletree merger. This is such an important issue, why is there not a clear record of what has been discussed and evidence as to the interactions had with education leaders in the area? It suggests to me that there has not been proper engagement with the leaders with regards to these issues and more could have been done. Misleading use of the Whitley Bay High School 390 Pan Reasoning I want to address the 'issue of the 390' which we are told we have to 'find a solution to' to avoid the disruption of older students having to move to the two tier system. I feel this is not a pressing issue given the projected pupil numbers. As a parent research group, we have used the current birth rates to project pupil numbers in the NEPA to estimate the total number of pupils in first schools across the North East Planning Area (NEPA - the ' Whitley Bay High School catchment). The council believe they have to act quickly to reduce the PAN in the first schools to 390 (it's currently 450) to match Whitley Bay High School's PAN. We have shown that the 390 issue is very much an issue with the year groups which are already in the three-tier system. Year 1 to Year 5. There is a potential levelling off/steady increase of birth rates predicted by ONS figures. There is a balancing act to be had and a need to ensure that we also protect Whitley Bay High School and don't limit families moving to the area for schools and we may possibly have to consider increasing the NEPA area. An ideal option for this relates to the house building due in the fields behind Langley which puts Langley in prime position for being catchment for these homes. The issue from Reception onwards looking at the data provided by the Council is more likely to be that the PAN student numbers at Whitley Bay High falls too low and they potentially end up in deficit. I find it extremely concerning that the Council's main concern is to ensure they don't have students from outside of the NEPA attending our First schools. These projections include students from outside of the NEPA. We should if anything be encouraging people to use the First Schools and increase the size of

the NEPA . Whilst I agree that the numbers look concerning and action may have to be taken it is especially important that we ensure we keep the popular schools due to parental choice. Sensitivity analysis done by our research team has shown that due to parental choice Appletree is the most sensitive to low birth rates and there it is extremely likely that parents will not choose to send their students to Appletree and move them to other schools in the NEPA which will have space running the risk of Appletree not being financially viable due to is massively reduced PAN. So we could end up with Langley closed, and Appletree closing shortly afterwards leading to a total reduction of 120 places in the First School system and in turn a 330 PAN - which would mean Whitley Bay High being at least 11% surplus at its reduced 370 PAN level or 15% surplus at the 390. Furthermore, we know Coquet Park is in debt (Langley is not). When the PFI agreement runs out in 2032, will this school close? The Council have stated that a one form entry school is not financially viable. Coquet is a one form entry school. What is the plan for this school? Will this close? I fear a closure of Langley could then result in a closure of Appletree and then in a few years we will also see Coquet Park close. Surely, the solution is to expand and grow the High School to service and (if there is one!) rather than approach this completely backwards. The economic impact on an area of closing a popular school (which could result in the closure of more schools in the area) and therefore reducing first school provision will be significant. We know schools are one of the key influencers on house prices in an area. House prices will go down in Monkseaton, people will stop moving to the area for schools and we will end up with an ageing population. The trend of birth rates decreasing is not to continue, they are starting to level off and are due to rise again according to ONS. It is vitally important that we keep the most popular schools, otherwise we run the risk of people moving out of the area. Concern over the proposal to repurposing Langley to allow expansion of Woodlawn Part of the reason the Council gives for choosing to close Langley is that the building can be used to explain Woodlawn (the Special school next to Langley) The proposal to separate SEND students into a dedicated special school (like Woodlawn) goes against the principle of inclusion in mainstream schools. Dispersing SEND students to the “bottom of the estate” and keeping them apart from the mainstream community feels like a step backward in fostering an inclusive school environment. The intention would be to move around 32 students from the current Marden Bridge Woodlawn site to Langley. Do 32 students really need the space which is currently used by 300 students? By relocating students, this is not increasing SEN provision in the area, it is merely moving it around. Parents who have children at Woodlawn are expressing their concerns at their being the huge range of age ranges potential all on one site. Is it appropriate for 2 year olds to be in the same educational setting as 18 year olds? The rising need for SEND

(Special Educational Needs and Disabilities) support is well-recognised but expanding Woodlawn would result in a missed opportunity to use the unique situation of it being situated next to a mainstream school to allow opportunities for dual registration and the ability for both schools to work together to create a more integrated education model. North Tyneside has the opportunity to be a flagship region for the provision of SEN in the region. On her recent visit to North Tyneside, Bridget Phillipson recently emphasised expanding SEND provision in mainstream schools and utilizing spare space effectively. The extra space created by the surplus could be used to create SEND units/provision. It would be more appropriate to consider using a smaller school like Coquet Park (30 PAN entry) for the expansion of Woodlawn (if it is required), where there's more space for taxis and safer student transport. Given that Coquet Park is only one form entry which is deemed not financially viable by the Council and it is currently in debt so it seems a logical move to repurpose this building (which also keeps in line with the PFI agreement as far as I understand). Ultimately the Council have not considered how they will support students with SEND in any of their proposals which is hugely concerning. We should be putting our most vulnerable members of the community first and not leaving them as an after-thought or plan to segregate them away from mainstream. Given all the above my alternatives to closing Langley would be; 1) Keep all schools open but look for ways to use the surplus space for SEND units and raise funds using under 3 provisions and wrap around services. Bring the wrap-around service in-house for Langley to raise additional funds for the school. Langley and Woodlawn are in a unique situation to be next to each other so make the most of this unique relationship. This keeps in line with the government agenda for inclusivity of SEND students in the mainstream. Use Monkseaton Middle School to dually host the 32 sixth form students from Woodlawn and look to also make this a mainstream High School as the current Year 5 middle school students move up to Year 9, providing a smaller High School setting which may be more of an appropriate, alternative High School choice for some students. 2) Alternatively repurpose Coquet Park for use by Woodlawn. Coquet Park is one form entry, currently in debt and has a small catchment area. Reduce Marine Avenue Pan to 75. Bear in mind that Rockcliffe building is not in a good condition also and may need to be rebuilt in a few years also. 3) If you really do need to close a school then it would make more sense to close Appletree over Langley given the following reasons: Langley is a larger school and has more space. Only 2 of the proposed 13 Appletree classrooms meet the government guidance whereas 10 of the 11 Langley classrooms exceed the guidance. Langley has a larger dining hall within government guidelines - Appletree's is too small. Both have separate suitable dining halls. If the proposed merger of pupils was delayed until 2028, the current 118 year 2 students would have left the first schools and Langley building size would be a suitable

proposal. Langley First School is more likely to succeed following the merger; 73% of Langley catchment parents choose Langley in comparison to 44% of Appletree.(from council supporting documents) 12% of Langley pupils attend from the Appletree Gardens catchment area (data from Langley first school office team) Projected pupil numbers of the existing schools (from the consultation options and backgrounds data) indicate an average of 26% surplus places from 2025-2034 in contrast to 15% for Langley despite Appletree having 44 homes per planned place compared to Langley's 40 homes (from the consultation options and backgrounds data) In the most recent 2 previous years of higher birth rates, 2020 reception and 2023 reception intakes, Appletree was the only NEPA first school with surplus spaces in admissions, 14 and 6 respectively. For the 2 lowest birth rate years, 2024 and 2025 intake Appletree had the largest portion of surplus places in admissions against PAN, 32% and 45% respectively Appletree is statistically shown to be the NEPA first school most sensitive to falling birth rates, with the current NEPA birth indicating a requirement of 135 children to attend from outside of NEPA (at the reduced 390 NEPA PAN) they will be most at risk of being undersubscribed and susceptible to falling into deficit. The addition of Langley catchment into Appletree is not going to solve the issue of surplus places when the number of school places far exceeds the number of children in the catchment area, allowing parents to have freedom of choice for all of the NEPA first schools. Langley catchment will attend Southridge, Wellfield and Marine which have capacity to take many children from outside of their catchment area and the Appletree Gardens catchment children will continue to apply for the other first schools. The trend for the school with the greatest surplus will continue and Appletree will become unviable. There is a risk to the financial stability of the middle schools and Whitley Bay High School if the first school places aren't filled. The location of Langley at the edge of the NEPA catchment and its ease of accessibility by car along with nearby parking provides a strong advantage over Appletree. The positioning of Langley also makes it a prime candidate to become the catchment school for those families who move into the new housing estate on Murton gap in years to come to help with the issue of low birth rates. The parental survey undertaken by Langley showed that f Langley was not an option only 11% of respondents said Appletree would be their first choice, preferred schools were South Wellfield 39% and Southridge 20%. 33% of respondents would consider home schooling their children if Langley were to close. The persistent absence rate at Appletree is 15%, Langley persistent absence rate is 5.9% (the North Tyneside average is 13.7%). Absence data is a critical indicator of pupil engagement and school effectiveness, particularly under Ofsted's updated inspection framework which has been recently broadened to include grading of 'attendance and behaviour' "Schools Out Northern" at Langley First School provides longer hours compared to Appletree

and caters for children from 9 months as opposed to 2 years at Appletree. Safety; Langley First School has a free car park nearby and the street is closed every morning creating a safe place for parents to drop their children. Appletree cannot close the street due to it being on a bus route. 4) A true merger of Langley and Appletree to allow for a new identity and ethos and the chance to keep the amazing Langley staff and ways of working. This can be done - we can apply by writing to the Secretary of State and it will take more time but I have shown that there is not the urgency in this like the Council suggests. I have had to cut my answer to this section to make it significantly shorter and not include supporting documents so I will also be sending my full 'have your say' directly to the council.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 10:14 PM

Langley First School is more than just a place of learning — it's a trusted, nurturing environment where children feel safe, supported, and inspired. The staff at Langley are the heart of that experience. They know the children personally, understand their needs, and work tirelessly to help each one reach their potential. I strongly suggest that Langley First School remains open and that its dedicated staff are retained. Here's why: Families actively choose Langley — not just from its own catchment, but from Appletree Gardens too. That speaks volumes about the quality of teaching and the relationships built between staff and families. The staff at Langley are deeply embedded in the community. They've built trust over years, and their continuity is essential for children's emotional wellbeing and academic progress. Disrupting this team would risk losing what makes Langley special — the consistency, the care, and the high standards that parents value so much. Children thrive when they feel known and understood, and Langley's staff have created an environment where that happens every day. Rather than merging or restructuring, we believe the best path forward is to invest in Langley, support its staff, and allow the school to continue doing what it does best: giving children a brilliant start in life.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 10:27 PM

While I would strongly prefer Langley not to close, I can only see one strong alternatives that would suit both schools, the council, and the community in a way that makes sense for the long term, and not just the short, should the "merger" be inevitable. As it stands, the current proposals do not feel thought through enough, which is not a comfort to the parents of either school. Phased transition to a single site at Langley: This proposal creates a single legal school entity (by merging Appletree into Langley) effective from September 2026. This new school would operate across both the Appletree and Langley sites for a three-year transitional period before fully consolidating onto the Langley site in September 2029. This meets council objectives, secures an easier transition, utilises a stronger site, and is more cost

effective.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 09:42 AM

Phased transition to a single site at Langley Summary: This proposal creates a single legal school entity (by merging Appletree into Langley) effective from September 2026. This new school would operate across both the Appletree and Langley sites for a three-year transitional period before fully consolidating onto the Langley site in September 2029. ●Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School legally merge to form one school with one headteacher, one governing body, and one DfE number. Initially, between Sept 2026-July 2029, the school would operate across two campuses: the Langley site and the Appletree site, to allow the large "bulge" cohorts (currently in Years 2 and 3) to move through and exit the school before the sites are physically consolidated The Published Admission Number (PAN) for Reception would be set at 30 for each site, for a total intake of 60 pupils per year across the merged school. After the three-year transition, the “bulge” cohorts will have moved to middle school and the total school roll will have reduced to a manageable size (approx. 320-330 pupils). All pupils and staff will then be consolidated onto the Langley First School site and the Appletree Gardens site would then be fully vacated and available for the council to proceed with the planned expansion of Woodlawn School. Benefits: Resolves the “Bulge” issue: By delaying the merger by two years, the largest cohorts will have moved on, meaning the consolidated school will open with a manageable pupil roll (estimated ~323-325 based on current data) that fits the capacity of the Langley site without overcrowding or the loss of specialist teaching areas. Utilises the stronger Site: This proposal moves the unified school to the Langley site, has shown stronger parental preference and greater resilience to fluctuating birth rates. This ensures better long-term sustainability. Less disruptive transition: It avoids the “double move” scenario of merging onto the Appletree site only to face immediate overcrowding and subsequent surplus. Staff and pupils have a clear two-year window to prepare for the final move. Cost-effective: This avoids the significant capital expenditure that would be required to temporarily (and inadequately) expand the Appletree site to accommodate 403 pupils, only for that space to become redundant within a few years. This model also allows the school to access specific split-site funding from the local authority, making this transitional period financially viable. Meets council objectives: This plan still achieves the council's key objectives of creating a single 60 PAN first school for the area and freeing up the Appletree site for the expansion of Woodlawn, just on a slightly delayed (but more stable) timeline.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 09:49 AM

PROPOSAL 1 : AMALGAMATION Summary: Close both Appletree Gardens First School and Langley First School and open a new

school with a new DfE number on the Appletree Gardens site. Proposal: We propose that North Tyneside Council, with approval from the Secretary of State publish proposals to close both Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School, and open a new first school on the Appletree Gardens site, integrating the strongest aspects of both schools' ethos, staff, and practices to form a new identity with enhanced community appeal. Unlike the Council's plan (closing Langley and enlarging Appletree while retaining its DfE number), this creates a genuinely new entity with a new DfE number, fostering a genuine fresh start. PROPOSAL 2 : MERGER PLUS Summary: Instead of closing Langley First School and expanding Appletree Gardens, we recommend merging Appletree Gardens with Langley First School. Moving the entire operation of Langley First School to the Appletree Gardens site. Langley First School would agree to a 'Firm Commitment' to adopt the best of both schools on the Appletree Gardens site Proposal: Merge appletree gardens with Langley First School, Langley First School will agree to a 'Firm Commitment' including but not exclusive to the following conditions: A change of school name A staff consolidation between Langley and Appletree gardens A change of uniform A change of governance A new ethos incorporates the best of both school PROPOSAL 3 : FEDERATION Proposal: Forming a Federation between both schools, followed by a prescribed alteration to transfer the entire operation of Langley First School to the Appletree Gardens site under the DfE statutory guidance PROPOSAL 4: Phased transition to a single site at Langley Summary: This proposal creates a single legal school entity (by merging Appletree into Langley) effective from September 2026. This new school would operate across both the Appletree and Langley sites for a three-year transitional period before fully consolidating onto the Langley site in September 2029. PROPOSAL 5 - LANGLEY INCLUSION HUB Summary: This proposal is a forward-thinking, federation-based approach that aligns with long-term demographic trends and upcoming changes to other schools in the area. It advocates for a strategic reduction in Pupil Admission Numbers (PAN) across the local school system and repurposes the Langley First School site into a specialist Inclusion Hub. This hub would be created by formally federating Langley First School with the co-located Woodlawn Special School, serving both mainstream pupils and those with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND). PROPOSAL 6: MERGER WITH CLOSURE OF APPLETREE GARDENS Summary /Proposal: Merge Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School and move pupils from Appletree Gardens to the Langley First School site.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 10:00 AM

Don't try and fix what isn't broken! Langley is a great primary school and there are numerous children and families that benefit from all it provides.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 10:11 AM

Proposal 1 - Phased transition to a single site at Langley Summary: This proposal creates a single legal school entity (by merging Appletree into Langley) effective from September 2026. This new school would operate across both the Appletree and Langley sites for a three-year transitional period before fully consolidating onto the Langley site in September 2029. Proposal Details: . Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School legally merge to form one school with one headteacher, one governing body, and one DfE number. . Initially, between Sept 2026-July 2029, the school would operate across two campuses: the Langley site and the Appletree site, to allow the large "bulge" cohorts (currently in Years 2 and 3) to move through and exit the school before the sites are physically consolidated . The Published Admission Number (PAN) for Reception would be set at 30 for each site, for a total intake of 60 pupils per year across the merged school. . After the three-year transition, the “bulge” cohorts will have moved to middle school and the total school roll will have reduced to a manageable size (approx. 320-330 pupils). All pupils and staff will then be consolidated onto the Langley First School site and the Appletree Gardens site would then be fully vacated and available for the council to proceed with the planned expansion of Woodlawn School. Proposal 2 - MERGER WITH CLOSURE OF APPLETREE GARDENS Summary /Proposal: Merge Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School and move pupils from Appletree Gardens to the Langley First School site. Benefits: . Langley First School is more likely to succeed following the merger; . 73% of Langley catchment parents choose Langley in comparison to 44% of Appletree. . Projected pupil numbers of the existing schools indicate an average of 26% surplus places at Appletree from 2025-2034 in contrast to 15% for Langley despite Appletree having 44 homes per planned place compared to Langley’s 40 homes . Appletree is statistically shown to be the NEPA first school most sensitive to falling birth rates, with the current NEPA birth indicating a requirement of 145 children to attend from outside of NEPA (at the reduced 390 NEPA PAN) they will be most at risk of being undersubscribed and susceptible to falling into deficit. . There is a risk to the financial stability of the middle schools and Whitley Bay High School if the first school places aren’t filled and the location of Langley at the edge of the NEPA catchment and it’s ease of accessibility by car along with nearby parking provides a strong advantage over Appletree . The parental survey undertaken by Langley highlights the points above with the following responses; - 73% of respondents in catchment moved to the area for Langleyh - 88% of respondents did not choose Appletree as any of their preferences when they applied for a school place - If Langley was not an option only 11% of respondents said Appletree would be their first choice - 33% of respondents would consider home schooling their children if Langley were to close . The persistent absence rate at

Appletree is 15%, Langley persistent absence rate is 5.9% (the North Tyneside average is 13.7%). Absence data is a critical indicator of pupil engagement and school effectiveness, particularly under Ofsted's updated inspection framework which has been recently broadened to include grading of 'attendance and behaviour' . "Schools Out Northern" at Langley First School provides childcare services from 7.30am to 6.00pm from term time from the age of 9 months and allow for flexible booking, Appletree Little Pips provides childcare from age 2 years, 7.45am – 5.30pm (4.30pm for nursery children), this is a significant time difference for working parents and could even cause a requirement to change employment . Appletree Gardens Building is only more suitable than Langley First School for two years; . The larger number of classrooms at Appletree is only an advantage during the merged year groups stage, subsequent to this, the building has higher running costs of circa £44,000 in comparison to Langley circa £7,000 and lower space efficiency for the return to a 300 PAN school. . Only two of the proposed 13 Appletree classrooms meet the government guidance of 62m2 for 30 reception children and 55m2 for 30 KS1+. Whereas 10 of the 11 Langley classrooms exceed the guidance. . Government guidance recommends a hall of a minimum 140m2 for PE and assemblies for KS2, Appletree assembly hall is below guidance at 130m2, Langley has an assembly hall of 190m2. Both have separate suitable dining halls.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 10:20 AM

I propose to use the funding intended on developing Langley first school for Woodlawn coupled with the funding required to adapt Appletree, to build another site over the road from Langley currently for Woodlawn. Leave Langley and Appletree as they are, surely with the new housing on the fields at the rear of Langley, there will be sufficient intake to keep both schools open. Another option would be to merge Appletree and Woodlawn on the Monkseaton High site as it is no longer required. Other families, like mine have moved to the area purposely for our children to attend Langley school, the proposal to close it, whilst it is thriving appears to be a short sighted, desperate cash grab. A lot of people in the local area are completely losing faith with the local council, our children are being robbed of a decent education, meanwhile, billions of pounds are spent on housing migrants who have never contributed a penny to the state.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 12:55 PM

As a retired senior community health professional I believe that Special Needs children should be educated in mainstream schools wherever possible. As there is already a mainstream school and a special needs school on Langley First School site, surely best practice would be to integrate those schools. The necessary facilities for all ranges of children would be available. This would develop understanding, friendship and inclusivity between the different pupils

which would extend into the greater community lasting well beyond the school age range, and could only enhance the wellbeing of everyone involved. Closure of Langley Park First School, reduces parental choice in the area (FOREVER) it will impact for generations to come. I also understand that Cocauet Park School is not , in fact will never be financially viable, but cannot be closed due to the council's financial constraints. Has anyone thought about how valuable the land is, it is practically on the seafront, it could be sold and may solve your financial problems.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 12:55 PM

Our preference would be for no closure to take place at all. However we realise that your hands are tied to a degree here because of funding issues. Therefore our preferences in order would be: 1. Close Appletree. Use the vast experience of Monkseaton Middle in educating children with additional needs (with or without an EHCP) in mainstream school, and add in some first school provision. Children requiring a more mainstream option can choose Langley, which is already the school of choice in the area. ***Although my kids do not go to MM, my own personal feeling is that the closure of MM will be a financial disaster as many of these children will need education outside of the mainstream system; as well as the regional economic cost of increased rates of non-attendance, home schooling, loss of parental income from not being able to access 2. If Monkseaton Middle is to close, and the above is not possible, then consider closing Coquet park. Single form entry, several schools in close proximity. The PFI building is required to be retained for a few more years yet - if needed, use this PFI building for Woodlawn 6th form where there is lots of car parking for the kids with significant additional needs who require a lift to school. 3. Close Appletree. In the combined catchment of Appletree and Langley, Langley is the preferred school. We are not aware of any families in the Langley catchment area who choose Appletree. But there are may families in the Appletree catchment who choose Langley preferentially. It therefore makes no sense for it to be Langley which closes. Langley also has a large amount of land in a SECOND school field which could be used for temporary accommodation during the first few "sticky years" of the merger until new children work their way through the system in a more natural distribution through the other local schools. 4. If (3) is not possible because there is a REALISTIC, costed, though-through plan to use Langley site for Woodlawn, then a proper merger between Langley and Appletree. We are aware that the council is not able to found a new school without permission from DfE - suggestion would be to apply for this permission, despite the paperwork and time delay, and start a new school with a new ethos

Screen Name Redacted

I have several alternative solutions to the current proposals and will

11/11/2025 02:09 PM

list them below. 1. AMALGAMATION - Summary: close both Appletree Gardens First School and Langley First School and open a new school with a new DfE number on the Appletree Gardens site. - With approval from the Secretary of State, NTC should publish proposals to close both Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School, and open a new first school on the Appletree Gardens site, integrating the strongest aspects of both schools' ethos, staff, and practices to form a new identity with enhanced community appeal. Unlike the Council's plan (closing Langley and enlarging Appletree while retaining its DfE number), this creates a genuinely new entity with a new DfE number, fostering a genuine fresh start. - This would mean the strongest aspects of both schools' ethos, staff and practice could be combined to form a new identity with strong community appeal. This would also be a fairer solution for parents and children and enable a smoother transition between schools through the involvement of familiar staff. A new school which blends Langley's high parental preference combined with Appletree's larger facilities could attract more families from both catchment areas and therefore reduce surplus places and deficits. This potential for higher enrolment would increase funding, therefore addressing projected deficits and support quality education. This plan would also align with the council's aim to cap NEPA first school places at 390. It also allows for the proposed Woodlawn expansion into Langley to continue. Appletree currently is not a favoured school – in fact it has the lowest attendance rates in the area and people simply do not want their children to attend. Although this plan would take slightly longer than simply closing Langley and moving the children to Appletree, it must be realised that Langley has been at the heart of the community for 70+ years and a fair amalgamation is the absolute least this school deserves, particularly when considering its strong reputation and parental choice (clearly demonstrated through an analysis of past admissions data) in comparison to Appletree. 2. MERGER PLUS - Summary: Instead of closing Langley First School and expanding Appletree Gardens, merge Appletree Gardens with Langley First School by moving the entire operation of Langley First School to the Appletree Gardens site. Langley First School would agree to a 'Firm Commitment' to adopt the best of both schools on the Appletree Gardens site. - Langley will agree to a 'Firm Commitment' including (but not limited to): a change of school name, staff consolidation between Langley and Appletree, a change of uniform, a change of governance, a new ethos which incorporates the best of both schools. - This proposal will allow the potential of retaining some of Langley's current ethos, governance and branding whilst preserving valued elements from both schools and minimising disruption to staff, children, morale and communities. It is also a fairer solution for all parents and children and will enable a smoother transition between schools through the involvement of familiar staff (for current Langley children) and a familiar building (for current

Appletree children). This proposal would have enhanced parental appeal in comparison to the current proposal; a school blending Langley's high parental preference (75%+ uptake) with Appletree's larger facilities could attract more families from both catchments, reducing surplus places (currently 14% at Appletree, projected to worsen) and mitigating deficits faster than a standard merger. This potential for higher enrolment would increase funding and therefore address projected deficits whilst supporting quality education. This proposal also allows for the Woodlawn expansion into Langley's current site to continue. The 'Firm Commitment' mentioned above is important; it must be noted that the current Appletree leadership have refused to engage with Langley's leadership team over the course of the consultation. This has led to worries that Appletree are not genuinely prioritising the wellbeing of the children and staff involved in this process. Therefore it is clear that a 'Firm Commitment' could only reasonably be provided by Langley whose leadership has consistently shown that the wellbeing of all individuals affected is at the centre of their decision making. - The data (mentioned above) clearly demonstrates that Langley is BY FAR the preferred school of the two which highlights why Appletree should be the school to close instead. It is not, and never has been, a school of choice for parents and children in the area. 3. PHASED TRANSITION TO A SINGLE SITE AT LANGLEY - Summary: Create a single legal school entity (by merging Appletree into Langley) effective from September 2026. This single school would operate across both the current Appletree and current Langley sites for a 3 year transitional period before fully consolidating onto the Langley site in September 2029. - Step one: legal merger (September 2026): Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School legally merge to form one school with one Headteacher, one governing body, and one DfE number. This new entity would operate across two campuses: the Langley site and the Appletree site. - Step two: transitional phase (Sept 2026 – July 2029): For this three-year period, the school would manage its intake to alleviate capacity issues. The PAN for Reception would be set at 30 for each site, for a total intake of 60 pupils per year across the merged school. This managed intake allows the large "bulge" cohorts (current Year 2 and Year 3) to move through and exit the school before the sites are physically consolidated. This model also allows the school to access specific split-site funding from the local authority, making this transitional period financially viable. - Step three: final consolidation (from September 2029): After the 3 year transition, the "bulge" cohorts will have moved to middle school and the total school roll will have reduced to a manageable size (approx. 320-330 pupils). All pupils and staff will then be consolidated onto the Langley First School site. The Appletree Gardens site would then be fully vacant and available for the council to proceed with the planned expansion of Woodlawn School. - This proposal moves the unified school onto the Langley site which has shown stronger parental preference and

greater resilience to fluctuating birth rates which ensures better long-term stability. It also avoids a scenario in which Langley is merged onto the Appletree site only to face immediate overcrowding. Staff and pupils will have a clear 2 year window to prepare for the final move. This proposal is also cost-effective in that it avoids the significant capital expenditure that would be required to temporarily (and inadequately) expand the Appletree site to accommodate 403 pupils, only for that space to become redundant within a few years. This proposal also still achieves the council's key objectives of creating a single 60 PAN first school for the area and freeing up the Appletree site for the expansion of Woodlawn, just on a slightly delayed (but more stable) timeline. 4. MERGER WITH THE CLOSURE OF APPLETREE GARDENS - Summary: Merge Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School (with the closure of Appletree) and move pupils from Appletree Gardens to the Langley First School site. - This proposal is inherently more beneficial than the council's current proposal as Langley First School is more likely to succeed following a merger than Appletree is. Indeed; 73% of Langley catchment parents choose Langley in comparison to 44% of Appletree; projected pupil numbers of the existing schools indicate an average of 26% surplus places at Appletree from 2025-2034 in contrast to 15% for Langley despite Appletree having 44 homes per planned place compared to Langley's 40 homes; Appletree is statistically shown to be the NEPA first school most sensitive to falling birth rates, with the current NEPA births indicating a requirement of 145 children to attend from outside of NEPA (at the reduced 390 NEPA PAN) they will be most at risk of being undersubscribed and susceptible to falling into deficit; there is a risk to the financial stability of the middle schools and Whitley Bay High School if the first school places aren't filled and the location of Langley at the edge of the NEPA catchment and it's ease of accessibility by car along with nearby parking provides a strong advantage over Appletree; The persistent absence rate at Appletree is 15%, whereas Langley's persistent absence rate is 5.9% (the North Tyneside average is 13.7%). Absence data is a critical indicator of pupil engagement and school effectiveness, particularly under Ofsted's updated inspection framework which has been recently broadened to include grading of 'attendance and behaviour'. - Although the Appletree site is slightly larger than the Langley site, this is only an advantage for 2 years (where the merged year groups have a large cohort). The Appletree building itself has much higher running costs (circa £44,000) in comparison to the Langley building (circa £7000) and lower space efficiency to return to a 300 PAN school once the transition phase is completed. In addition, only two of the proposed 13 Appletree classrooms meet the government guidance of 62m2 for 30 reception children and 55m2 for 30 KS1+, whereas 10 of the 11 Langley classrooms exceed the guidance. It must be noted that government guidance recommends a hall of a minimum 140m2 for PE and

assemblies for KS2. Appletree's assembly hall is below guidance at 130m2, whereas Langley has an assembly hall of 190m2. Both have separate suitable dining halls. - Although this proposal does not provide a solution for Woodlawn, a 300 PAN school building is unlikely to be a more efficient solution than the current split-site arrangement. 5. NOTES REGARDING THE CURRENT PROPOSAL - As an absolute minimum, if the current proposals were to proceed, there must be a delay of at least one full academic year – ideally two years – to allow the current large cohorts (currently in Year 2 and Year 1) to complete their time within the first school system. Implementing the changes before this point would cause significant disruption to pupils' education and unnecessary upheaval for families and staff. A short delay would enable a far smoother transition, allowing the schools to merge in a way that minimises disruption to learning and maintains educational continuity. It would also remove the need for costly and temporary adaptations to the current Appletree site (such as additional classrooms or temporary facilities), which would become redundant once the larger year groups have naturally moved through the system. Proceeding immediately would risk wasting public funds on short-term measures that will no longer be required, and this would almost certainly and irreversibly damage the council's reputation. Financially and operationally, a phased approach makes far greater sense. It ensures resources are not wasted on unnecessary works, protects the welfare of children during the transition, and allows for better planning around essential facilities such as classrooms, dining areas, toilets, and outdoor spaces. SUMMARY: To summarise, I strongly urge the council to reconsider their current proposal and recognise that the alternative of retaining Langley while closing Appletree is a far more sensible and sustainable option for the local community. Admissions data clearly demonstrates that Langley is by far the more popular and successful school, consistently chosen by parents for its strong reputation, proven academic performance, and positive community standing. It is evident that Langley offers stability, high standards, and confidence among families - qualities that Appletree simply does not possess. If Appletree were to remain open while Langley were closed, there is no evidence to suggest that parents would choose to send their children there. This would only exacerbate existing problems with surplus places and financial inefficiency, particularly once the current large year groups have progressed through the system. Closing Langley would not only disrupt a thriving and high-performing school but would also fail to address the underlying issue of uneven school demand. Past admissions data makes this point unequivocally clear: Appletree has consistently been regarded as a last resort by parents within the area. It attracts significantly less interest, and its continued operation risks leaving the local authority with under-enrolled classes and unsustainable costs. By contrast, Langley's popularity, stability, and proven track record make it the logical choice to remain open. It

would therefore be a serious strategic error to close Langley when a more resilient, well-supported, and high-achieving school could continue to serve the community effectively. The data cannot be ignored - Langley is the school families actively want, while Appletree is not. The council should therefore prioritise closing Appletree and securing the future of Langley for the benefit of children, staff, and the wider community.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 02:23 PM

Best practice indicates that special needs children should be educated in main stream schools with appropriate support. As there is a special school on the same site as Langley First School it seems more sensible to integrate these two schools which will foster friendship and understanding and will improve community relations to all concerned.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 02:31 PM

1. Allow More Time The decision to close Langley First School is based on pupil numbers from 2019 onwards—a period marked by unprecedented global disruption. The COVID-19 pandemic significantly altered family planning patterns due to lockdowns, social distancing, and economic uncertainty. Many couples postponed having children, and access to fertility services was severely restricted. These factors inevitably impacted birth rates, and the effects are still being felt today. Additionally, the council asserts that the new housing development of approximately 3,000 homes will not affect local pupil numbers. However, this cannot be confirmed until the estate is complete. The proposal itself estimates a need for 748 additional primary school places, which suggests future demand. Even if new residents are relocating locally, the homes they vacate will likely be filled by new families, further influencing pupil numbers. Time and accurate data are essential before making irreversible decisions. 2. Address Financial Issues Where They Are Most Critical Langley First School is not in debt; it is operating within the council's acceptable predicted deficit range. In contrast, Coquet First School is already in actual debt and faces a far greater financial risk when PFI funding ends in 5–7 years, creating a significant future burden for the council. Resources should first be directed toward schools in genuine financial crisis rather than penalizing a successful, sustainable school like Langley. 3. Consider a True Merger, Not a Takeover Both Langley First School and Appletree Gardens are successful institutions (Langley arguably more so). The current proposal fosters division between the two communities. A fairer solution would be to merge the best aspects of both schools to create a new, unified school where pupils, parents, and staff have input. This approach would preserve Langley's long-established ethos—developed over more than 70 years—and maintain the sense of community that families value. Parental choice is a cornerstone of the education

	system, and Langley's reputation attracts families from a wide area. A merger would honour that choice while ensuring continuity for all children.
Screen Name Redacted 11/11/2025 02:35 PM	Allow both schools to remain open. Neither are in financial crisis and the merger seems like taking a sledgehammer to crack a nut.
Screen Name Redacted 11/11/2025 03:52 PM	I would like to see a full report on how the council proposal has been reached. I am concerned that the drop off in pupil numbers has been part of a flawed process and does not take into account families moving into the area for the excellent school provision at Langley.
Screen Name Redacted 11/11/2025 04:31 PM	Whilst I would dearly love for all proposals to be dropped and the schools identifed in all proposals to remain open, I understand that the financial situation that North Tyneside has found themselves in. A massive opportunity has been missed to win the hearts and minds of both school communities. Proposing a merger like this has created division where there needs to be unity. The option for an amalgamation is clear in the DFE guidelines for Opening and Closing Schools, despite being told at numerous points that the Local Authority cannot do this. We have been told that this would need secretary of state for Education involvement, but why not explroe this route for the long term future of these local communities? If something is worth doing, take time over doing it-especially where schools with a long and successful tradition are concerned. If necessary, we have an academy trust who are prepared to back us- rather than just joining a MAT alone, why not give the academy trust the responsibility of creating this new school to avoid needing the Secretary of State involvement? This would maintain all aspects of the strategic review- reduction in numbers, Woodlawn moves into Langley site, less financial burden on the local authority. Surely this is a better solution than Langley just going alone with an academy trust? Bring the two schools together. This would require, as outlined by the DfE document, shutting both schools and opening a new one. But whereas there would be a hope that the " new" school would adopt the best of both original schools, there would be a firm commitment of an exciting new development for the Monkseaton community. Not only would this be about the ethos and practices, but also the expertise of both sets of staff. There would be an equitable approach regarding jobs, where a newly formed govering board could select the best teachers from both schools; matching skills and expertise with the vision and values of the new school. There are other options that need to be explored, with no evidence in the consultation that they have. For example, why has the reverse solution not be considered where Langley retains it's governing board

and DFE number, but on the exisiting Appletree site. Lanlgley is the more popular school, with higher numbers coming to a merged school, as well as having a far superior attendance record. Just because a school has more space, does not mean that it is the best option. It is frustrating that schools with structural deficit eg Coqut Park have been shielded by PFI, and it also feels like there could be a solution with regards to working with Woodlawn as a federated school. Having been aware of this process [redacted] it is incredibly frustrating that it took until July for Head Teachers to involve their chairs of governors. Sworn to secrecy, it was impossible for Head Teachers to make decisions without governing boards involved. Collective PAN reductions would never have saved enough money, and federations were not necesarily viable financial models that the schools could sign up to. It feels like there has been little thought around the proposal that has been published, and that obvious solutions have not been discussed. The lack of transparency, innacuracies in the data provided, and mistakes that have been published in the documentation does not inspire confidence in an organisation charged with supporting our children. It's time to really listen to the voices of the Monkseaton community and be prepared to work with the schools, rather than impose a process done to the schools.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 04:54 PM

1. Phase out intake at Coquet Park First School A strategic, long term financially stable, and community-focused alternative is to phase out intake at Coquet Park First School, a one-form-entry school already in deficit and identified as less sustainable due to being 1 form entry. This allows for the natural redistribution of pupils, avoids large-scale disruption, maintains parental choice as there are several options for family very close by. The Coquet Park building could then be repurposed to provide 6th form provision, needed after the closure of Monkseaton High School. This solution has known costs so can be planned, unlike the current proposal with unknown costs which cannot therefore cannot be adequately planned for. Whilst also providing an extra needed provision In the area. Therefore making it a more viable option. 2. Alternative options to manage capacity • Reduce PANs across multiple schools while increasing their SEND provisions allowing all schools in the area to adopt the inclusive culture Langley has created over multiple generations This is inline with long term educational objectives, redistributing rather than removing provisions therefore making it a more viable alternative. 3. Phase out the three-tier system if closures are necessary If school closures are required for long-term financial stability, the least disruptive option is to phase out the three-tier system. Children currently in middle schools could continue their learning without adding new students, while teachers are gradually redeployed to expanding primary schools. Whitley Bay could operate across two

sites: Whitley Bay High (Years 7–11) and Whitley Bay College (on the monkseaton high site focused on 6th form and adult learning). Meaning the additional college provision would also be achieved. This would save money on middle school buildings, stop the waste of resource, maintain educational stability, retain jobs, and provide a long-term sustainable system. These alternatives protect educational stability, maintain community cohesion, and provide flexibility, while ensuring minimal disruption for children and families due to a phasing out approach. 4. Work with Headteachers and Governors The current proposal contains numerous inaccuracies and incomplete analysis, largely because it was developed without sufficient engagement with headteachers and governors. This lack of transparency has lead to the current proposal being one that highlights to residents of North Tyneside that they can't trust their council to make strategic decisions based on accurate data. • Consultation documents incorrectly claim that Langley lacks an on-site playing field, is already in financial deficit, and that most families can safely walk to Appletree Gardens without crossing major roads. These errors distort assessments of safety, suitability, and demand. • Langley is financially stable, well-attended, and operating with only 10% surplus places. Reception intake this year was 39% greater than Appletree's, and 79% of pupils are in-catchment, compared with 50% for Appletree. • Closing Langley would disrupt Monkseaton-area children immediately and later impact children at Appletree who live outside its catchment when they don't get a middle school place creating a ripple of unnecessary disruption across an unnecessarily large group of children. • The proposals rely on Covid-era birth rates, ignoring local population growth from housing developments and the fact that coastal schools are at capacity for year 2. Along with the fact a high number of people move to the area for the schools, making birth rates unreliable when making predictions. • The proposed "merger" is effectively a closure, requiring uncosted modifications to the Langley site for SEND provision, accessibility, safety upgrades, therapy spaces, and staffing. Retaining Langley could prove more cost-effective than an uncosted conversion elsewhere. • Operationally, absorbing Langley pupils into Appletree would double year groups, remove SEND spaces, increase class sizes, and lengthen travel, contradicting public health and road safety guidance. Working collaboratively with headteachers and governors would ensure proposals are accurate, consider all operational and community factors, and reduce disruption for children and families

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 05:54 PM

If Langley and Appletree Gardens are forced to close, it should be a true merger which takes the best of both schools. Under the current plan, Langley is being penalised as it is not a merger but a closure. Langley is not in deficit so what is the rush? By using Langley's building to expand Woodlawn, 300 children are being displaced to

accommodate 32. I find it irresponsible to isolate the proposed closure of these schools from the rest of the NEPA schools. They are bound to be impacted. The council has failed to provide a comprehensive overall strategic plan for the NEPA area. Its proposal is mired in discrepancies and incorrect information. And the process is opaque.. This is not a consultation but a premeditated act by the council to deliberately sow fear amongst its population. Look at your figures NTC, they don't add up! If you are intent on closing perfectly good schools at least have the decency to consult properly and transparently, provide us with a complete strategic plan which looks at the equality impact within NEPA, not a generic, borough wide one.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 06:24 PM

Continue to keep Langley first school open. Closing only Monkseaton middle school to plug some of the gap. Obtain additional funding for SEND spaces. Consider opening Langley first school places to the new housing estate which currently isn't in the catchment area. It is clear that the plan has not considered other variables such as impact of children not being able to walk to school. Particularly for those now proposed to drive to Apple tree as the traffic is already poor. If parents are driving it's unlikely they will select Apple tree due to being able to drive to other options and the parking / driving to school already being so chaotic. In addition having such a large year group will put prospective parents off Apple tree so this won't really plug the gap financially in the way that's expected. I would urge to keep Langley open as a minimum. To raise funds, consider opening Woodlawn pool to raise further money from the council / council swimming lessons there if the pool is council owned.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 06:55 PM

My suggestion is to adopt a phased transition to a single site at Langley m This approach achieves the long-term goal of one sustainable first school for the area while managing pupil numbers and minimising disruption. By legally merging Appletree Gardens and Langley First Schools in September 2026, but keeping both sites open until 2029, the larger current cohorts can move through naturally before full consolidation. This avoids overcrowding, maintains stability for staff and families, and allows time to prepare the Langley site for full occupation. This plan also enables the council to meet its key objectives—creating a single 60 PAN first school and freeing the Appletree site for Woodlawn's expansion—without costly short-term works. To achieve this: • Form a single governing body and leadership team in 2026. • Operate as one school across two campuses until 2029. • Begin phased investment at Langley to ensure readiness for full transition. • Develop a clear communication plan for parents, staff, and the community throughout the three-year transition. Or Create a federation between Langley First and Woodlawn Special School, forming a shared Inclusion Hub for

mainstream and SEND pupils. Adjust admissions to align with lower birth rates. Key Points: • PAN reduced to 45 per site (total 90). • Shared leadership and governance between Langley and Woodlawn. • New Additionally Resourced Provision (ARP) with 12–24 specialist places. Benefits: • Builds an inclusive, co-located education model. • Expands local SEND capacity and reduces external placements. • Financially sustainable, with right-sized admissions and shared estate. • Avoids short-term overcrowding. Challenges: • Requires formal federation agreement. • Complex integration of staffing, timetabling, and safeguarding. • Shifts away from original simple merger plan.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 07:38 PM

Make both schools ARPs. They have the teaching expertise and space. The LA has committed to increasing ARP spaces however current local first school ARP places are decreasing due to lack of experience and space. Both AGFS and Langley have brilliant SEN care and the LA should use this as an opportunity to demonstrate their commitment to improving SEN in mainstream. There is no evidence presented on the cost of actually closing these schools; the increase in EHCPs that will be needed, staff redundancies, mental health impact, finding a new school place for the SEN children. Another suggestion is looking at using additional space during holidays, evenings and weekends for community groups, healthcare (e.g. baby clinics and flu jab clinics) and hiring out space for additional income. Expand the early years provisions in both schools making use of the space. The early years provisions attached to these schools has not been mentioned during the consultations. Open up the preschool from 9months to increase funding and get the children settled in the school environment from an earlier age. Working parents want their children settled with good wrap around care. AGFS currently offers brilliant flexible wrap around which is one main reason why we chose this school. This covers holiday clubs and teacher training days too. Free breakfast clubs should be offered shortly to first school students. How will these be managed if these schools merge and how will AGFS manage the afterschool care numbers? Working parents need a plan for this. It is extremely beneficial for the preschool settings to be in the same school building site as Little Pips currently is at AGFS. It has allowed my son to transition easily to the school nursery and hopefully reception. The Little Pips staff have helped take him along for settling in days, eating lunch together and school events. Opening up to from 9months will be attractive to more working parents with multiple children or parents of children with SEN.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 08:07 PM

The proposal says more people are moving into North Tyneside (for example, moving out of other areas close by) and they “may” need

homes, but not school places, but you provide no evidence of this. How can you evidence the demographic of people moving into North Tyneside and how this data supports the proposed “merger” - this “merger” should not be based on declining birth rates only. You have specified this consultation as a “merger”. This is not a “merger”, but a closure of Langley First School and this will heavily impact on the Langley First School ethos. In the FAQs you discuss integration, but only examples are suggested. There has been no clear reassurance with any specific detail how the individual ethos of Langley First School will be maintained. I agree the 'DFE Guidance October 2024 Opening and closing maintained schools' says “this option is sometimes referred to as a merger”. Yes this is DFE terminology, however, use of the word “merger” in this proposal is misleading and incorrect, as this suggests that two schools are merging to form a single, new school - The fact is Appletree Gardens First School would retain its original school number, as it will not be a new school. Even if closing both schools and then opening a new one requires consent from the Secretary of State which you say is more complex, it would ensure fairness for all the staff and pupils involved. Presently Appletree First School has an advantage as the headteacher and Governing Body will remain as is and it is unclear what, if any influence the Langley First School Staff and Governing Body will have when Langley First School pupils move to the new site. You say that closing both schools will increase uncertainty. Closing Langley First School site is unfair and will increase uncertainty for all pupils and staff at the school. The consultation documentation says “this route is more straight forward, and decisions remain in local control” and that using this route “simplifies the legal and administrative process, reducing delays and making the process more efficient and practical for children and their families impacted by the proposals”. Speed and efficiency of the process by closing one school and merging it with another doesn’t mean that this is the right outcome for the pupils and staff of Langley First School and does not mean that closing Appletree Gardens and Langley First schools and opening a new one is not a viable alternative. The potential “merger” of Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School will not address all the issues with deficits in the NEPA and should not be progressed, as this is not a sustainable solution. The fact remains that Coquet Park is going to be in worse deficit in a few years due to the PFI scheme. This should not unfairly disadvantage other schools such as Langley First School. This proposal does not address further impact on first schools in the area, once these PFI contracts expire in a few years time. You therefore should stop this consultation and revisit the wider impact that “merging” these schools will have on the wider system in North Tyneside. The data represented does not represent all the influencing factors and the data analysis, such as your pupil projection methodology is unclear and not explained. The use of the word “merger” is misleading. There are other schools in the area, who

will contribute more to the deficit in the future and Langley First School should not be the main focus of a NEPA wide issue and be the school to close.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 08:38 PM

Whilst I understand the numbers/financial reasoning that we have been given as justification, I must say that I feel massively let down by the council's inability or refusal to see the bigger picture. Should we not be prioritising first and foremost what is best for the children involved. I really do feel that there has to be an alternative solution and that the local authority have a duty to prioritise the hundreds of children who I believe are at risk of experiencing a poorer quality of education as a result of these school closures. Smaller class sizes should be seen as something to be valued and school leaders should be given support to keep their schools running efficiently with reduced numbers. I know that a key driver for the closure of Langley is that of improving local SEN provision by expanding the Woodlawn school site. [redacted] have worked with children with SEND for over 10 years. I recognise the benefits of bringing the two Woodlawn sites together however I really do feel that these benefits do not by any stretch outweigh the impact that school closure would have on the children with SEND attending our mainstream schools. I have worked in mainstream schools that are at full capacity and stretched for space, and have seen first hand how these schools struggle to meet the needs of SEND children. With a lack of learning space for interventions and staff that are overstretched, the attainment gap can so easily widen and children with SEND can struggle to achieve. I propose that Langley First School should not be closed and instead should form a partnership with Woodlawn. The Langley mainstream intake could be reduced to 1 form entry. This would allow space for Langley to take on pupils with EHCPs requiring more specialist provision. I would love to see Langley staff working in partnership with Woodlawn to provide pupils with an ARP type provision. I really feel that something special could be created, drawing upon the expertise and success of both schools.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 08:56 PM

I have tried to write this several times and stay calm and reasonable. However I find myself just getting angry and upset by this proposal. The use of the word merger is false and a PR speak to try and fool people into thinking this is in some way a joining of the two Schools. It is not and should not be spoken of as such. My suggestion is that this process is scrapped and started again. Using correct information and working with all parties to try and come up with a plan. This should involve governing bodies as well as teachers and parents. The focus of the solution should be thinking about the impact on the children. Something I feel the current proposal does not do. I realize that thr council have already made this decision based on false

	information and with very to little planning other than they will close Langley and everything will just magically be ok. This is irresponsible and incredibly disappointing. I would hope that the outrage and opposition to the current proposal would make the council stop and truly look at solutions instead of just needlessly rushing forward. Of course I have missed the most important factor on this won't someone please this of the Money!
Screen Name Redacted 11/11/2025 09:29 PM	FOL suggestions
Screen Name Redacted 11/11/2025 09:31 PM	Leaving things as they are. Langley doesn't want to come to Appletree. It's going to be horrendous to settle everyone over. I don't want the drama from the Langley Parents. Too many questions unanswered.
Screen Name Redacted 11/11/2025 09:33 PM	Formal Objection to North Tyneside Council's Proposal to Close Langley First School. I wish to formally object to North Tyneside Council's proposal to close Langley First School and "merge" it with Appletree Gardens First School. This response outlines my serious concerns regarding the inaccuracies within the consultation materials, the absence of sound educational justification, and the potentially damaging impact on pupils, families, and the wider community. 1. Misleading and Inaccurate Information in the Proposal A number of claims within the consultation documents appear to reflect a predetermined outcome, rather than a fair and transparent evaluation of the facts. My key concerns include: Incomplete and Misleading Birth Rate Data The Council's projections appear to rely solely on birth rates within Langley's catchment area. This ignores the well-established trend of families moving into the area specifically to access Langley First School. Such selective use of statistics presents a distorted picture of real demand and fails to capture the school's broader appeal. Langley Operating Within Acceptable Capacity Langley First currently operates at less than 10% below capacity—fewer than 30 pupils short, which the Council itself deems acceptable. In contrast, Appletree Gardens is 14% under capacity, making Langley the more viable school by the Council's own measures. Questionable Financial Assertions The proposal suggests Langley faces a worsening financial position. This is unsupported by evidence. Langley's stronger pupil numbers and higher parental preference indicate financial stability, yet the Council has provided no transparent modelling to justify its projections. Without this, such assertions cannot be considered credible. Errors and Inconsistencies in Data A serious data error was identified by a Langley parent during the first consultation meeting, prompting the Council to replace a graph. This incident, along with multiple inconsistencies across

documents (pupil forecasts, budget data, and comparative analysis), raises serious doubts about the reliability of the entire dataset. Misrepresentation of Facilities The proposal falsely claims that Langley pupils must cross fields for PE or playtime. In reality, Langley has two large halls and a spacious on-site field used daily. The nearby field is used only once a year for Sports Day. Such misrepresentations appear to unfairly disadvantage Langley in comparison with Appletree. Overlooked Transport and Safety Issues The Council's claim that the schools are "less than half a mile apart" fails to acknowledge that children would need to cross two major roads—Seatonville Road and Bromley Avenue. No traffic or safety assessment has been undertaken. Appletree already suffers from congestion, whereas Langley benefits from a Council-led "Safe Street" scheme and accessible nearby parking. Disregard for Parental Preference Only 44% of families within Appletree's catchment choose that school, compared with 73% who actively choose Langley. This clear difference in parental trust and satisfaction undermines any justification for closing a more popular and higher-performing school. 2. Building Capacity and Class Size Concerns The Council has not provided clear information on how Appletree could accommodate additional pupils from Langley. While the consultation claims Appletree can hold 432 pupils, official government figures list its capacity at just 293—a discrepancy that fundamentally undermines the Council's case. This lack of clarity risks overcrowded or temporary classrooms, which would harm teaching quality, learning outcomes, and pupil wellbeing. For example, Langley's current Year 2 cohort would increase to 118 pupils under the proposed merger—a wholly unrealistic figure for effective education delivery. No details have been given on expected class sizes. With no statutory limit for pupils over age seven, there is a real danger of excessively large classes, reducing individual support and negatively affecting both progress and wellbeing. 3. SEND Provision and Inclusive Education Langley currently supports 40 pupils with identified SEND needs, and a further 24 receiving additional support—approximately 24% of its total roll. The Council has provided no assurances about how these pupils' needs will be met if Langley closes. Rather than closing Langley due to its proximity to Woodlawn, the Council should explore a dual-registration or partnership model, aligning with national inclusive education policy and ensuring that children with additional needs remain integrated within mainstream settings. Moreover, the proposal to relocate 32 post-16 pupils from Marden High to the Woodlawn site would displace roughly 300 younger pupils, benefiting a small minority at the expense of the wider school community. Expanding SEND provision must not come at the cost of mainstream education quality or stability. Alternative Proposal – Retain Langley First School and Review the Future of Appletree Gardens First School Given the evidence, it would be more logical and beneficial for the community to retain Langley First School and instead review the viability

of Appletree Gardens First School. Langley consistently demonstrates stronger performance, higher parental preference, and greater community confidence. 73% of families within Langley's catchment area actively choose the school for their children—a clear indicator of its popularity and reputation. By contrast, only 43% of families within Appletree's catchment choose Appletree, suggesting lower parental confidence and satisfaction. This difference is also reflected in local housing trends: property prices within the Langley catchment are higher, showing that families are willing to make a significant financial commitment to secure a place at a better-performing school. Historically, the quality gap between the two schools is clear. Over the past two decades, Langley has achieved 19 years rated 'Outstanding' and just 2 years rated 'Good', whereas Appletree has had 9 years rated 'Satisfactory' and 11 years rated 'Good'. Both schools are currently good, but Langley's long-standing record of excellence demonstrates a sustained and higher level of educational quality. On this basis, it would be far more reasonable—and in the best interests of pupils and families—to retain Langley First School and consider Appletree Gardens for potential consolidation or reorganisation instead. The proposal to close Langley First School and merge it with Appletree Gardens First School is fundamentally flawed—in evidence, reasoning, and process. The inaccuracies within the Council's documentation, the absence of transparent justification, and the erosion of community trust render this proposal untenable. Langley First School is a thriving, inclusive, and high-performing institution that plays a vital role in the local community. Its closure would cause unnecessary disruption, reduce parental choice, and remove a valued and trusted educational environment. For these reasons, I strongly oppose the proposal and urge North Tyneside Council to withdraw or reconsider it in light of the substantial evidence and community concern presented.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 10:04 PM

My suggestion will be submitted by others with full context on how they can be obtained.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 10:13 PM

I am writing as a parent and member of the local community to express my strong concern about the proposal to close Langley First School and merge it with Appletree Gardens First School. It is deeply worrying that this decision appears to be based on inaccurate and incomplete data. The consultation documents contain several errors, including misleading statements about Langley's finances, playing fields, pupil numbers, and accessibility. Important areas such as early years provision, wraparound childcare, and the impact on children with special educational needs have also not been properly considered. My suggestion is that the council pauses this process

and undertakes a full, transparent review using accurate, up-to-date information. This should include genuine consultation with parents, governors, and the wider community to explore fairer alternatives. If changes are necessary, a true merger, where both schools close and a new school is created with shared input from both communities would be a fairer and more transparent option. This could be achieved by engaging both school leadership teams to co-design the new setting, ensuring children, staff, and families from both schools have a voice. Our children deserve decisions based on facts and fairness, not convenience.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 11:44 PM

Defer Major Decisions Until 2032 (Post-PFI Period) No irreversible action should be taken until 2032, when the PFI agreements at Coquet Park and Marine Park come to an end. Financial forecasts indicate that further structural changes or closures are likely once these agreements conclude, which will directly affect pupil numbers (PAN) across the NEPA area. Acting now risks creating instability and potential shortages of places later. Furthermore, the council's justification based on declining birth rates appears unreliable — these figures level out by 2026 and then begin to rise slightly, and they are largely derived from pandemic-era data, which is not representative. Waiting until 2032 would allow for more accurate, up-to-date projections before making long-term educational changes. Pause the Process for at Least Two Years A minimum two-year delay would allow larger cohorts currently in the system to move through both Langley and Appletree naturally. This would significantly reduce pressure on class sizes, protect children's mental health, and maintain the availability of essential SEND spaces (such as sensory and calm rooms). During this period, the council should work collaboratively with school leaders, governors, and parents to explore alternative, sustainable solutions. Pursue a Genuine Amalgamation Rather Than a Closure The current proposal constitutes a closure, not a merger. A true amalgamation — while more complex — would create a new school with a shared ethos, blending the best practices, staff expertise, and educational values from both Langley and Appletree. This approach would build unity, avoid the loss of valued staff, and ensure continuity for pupils rather than simply absorbing one community into another. Explore an Alternative SEND-Integrated Model at the Langley Site Government policy encourages expanding SEND provision within mainstream settings and reducing reliance on EHCPs. Langley's proximity to Woodlawn presents an excellent opportunity to develop an Additionally Resourced Provision (ARP) or inclusive mainstream model on-site. This would strengthen local SEND capacity, foster integration, and align with national priorities — without dismantling an effective mainstream school. Any such development could be coordinated alongside the closure of a less viable site (such as Appletree) or timed with the end of PFI

arrangements for a more informed, strategic outcome. Retain the Langley Site for the Mainstream Provision If the council insists on proceeding with a merger, the Langley site should be retained rather than Appletree's. A delayed implementation date of September 2029 would enable larger year groups to transition smoothly and minimise disruption. Financially, Langley is far more efficient — with utility costs of approximately £4 per square metre compared to £29 at Appletree. Repurposing the Appletree site for the expansion of Woodlawn would make far more sense: it is within 600 metres of the main Woodlawn campus, has its own kitchen facilities, and could provide a natural transition point for older Woodlawn students, supporting independence and life skills. In contrast, moving all pupils onto a single shared site would keep some children in the same small environment from age 4 to 18, limiting social development and preparedness for adulthood. Consider a Federation Model Langley and Appletree could form a federation rather than a forced merger — potentially on the existing Monkseaton Middle School site (if that closure proceeds). This would allow for shared leadership and resources while preserving the individual identity, ethos, and community spirit of each school. Explore Academisation as a Strategic Option Academisation could offer both schools greater autonomy, financial flexibility, and access to shared resources through a Multi-Academy Trust. This may present a more stable, long-term alternative to local authority restructuring. Review the Viability of Coquet Park Instead Coquet Park is already in a weak financial position, and its debt is expected to continue growing even after the PFI period. The council should investigate whether an early settlement or closure could be negotiated to prevent further financial strain. Closing Coquet Park would reduce PAN by 30 per year group, easing local capacity pressures without disrupting thriving schools like Langley. The Coquet Park site could then be repurposed as a secondary base for Woodlawn, potentially with access to the nearby Waves pool for life-skills and physical education — reducing the need for transport to the main Woodlawn site.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 12:24 AM

The NEU would like to protect as many jobs as possible, and to me, the local authority hasn't to me explored alternative scenarios. The usage of the word merger is very misleading. You could just keep Langley open and make use of what they do well. Some ideas though: 1 Partnership Without Merger Langley and Appletree remain separate schools but share leadership and resources. This could include a joint Headteacher, shared administration, and collaboration on curriculum and SEND provision. Benefits: Reduces costs through shared management Keeps both schools open and part of their communities Avoids redundancies and major disruption for pupils 2 Specialist or Hybrid Site Repurpose Langley as a specialist education hub – for example, a SEND resource base, inclusion centre, or

mixed-age small school – while maintaining its role in local education. Benefits: Meets growing local SEND needs Retains the site, staff, and educational expertise Attracts additional funding and supports inclusion 3 Community Hub and Extended Services Develop Langley as a multi-use community education space, combining early years provision, wraparound childcare, and family learning programmes alongside a reduced school offer. Benefits: Generates new income through community use Strengthens family and community links Keeps an education presence within the local area 4 Phased Roll Management Gradually reduce pupil intake (PAN) over time instead of closing the school outright. This allows numbers to adjust naturally as demographics change. Benefits: Avoids forced job losses Maintains school identity and community trust Keeps flexibility if pupil numbers increase again 5 School Improvement and Investment Provide targeted support to make Langley more sustainable — such as funding for energy efficiency, curriculum partnerships, or inclusion projects. Benefits: Positive alternative to closure Protects jobs and educational quality Strengthens long-term sustainability for the school

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 08:15 AM

I am writing as a resident of North Tyneside to express my strong opposition to the proposed closure of Langley First School. I am deeply concerned that this proposal, described by the Council's own Head of Children's Services as "careful and robust," contains significant inaccuracies and omissions which undermine its credibility and fairness. The documentation used to justify this consultation includes several factual errors. It incorrectly claims, for example, that Langley lacks an accessible playing field when the school, in reality, has a well-used field adjacent to the site and additional outdoor learning spaces, including a forest school area and sensory garden. It also misrepresents the school's financial position, stating that it is "in deficit" when, in fact, Langley has only projected a possible deficit for 2025/26, its first ever, and is already working proactively with an independent financial adviser to manage this. I am equally concerned by the claim that most families could reach Appletree Gardens without crossing major roads such as Seatonville Road or Cauldwell Lane, a statement that anyone familiar with the area knows to be untrue. These are busy routes, and the assumption that children could safely walk to Appletree without additional risk is deeply flawed. I also have friends with children at Langley, and I have seen first-hand how those children have thrived thanks to the school's forward-thinking, inclusive, and nurturing approach. The environment there is one that celebrates individuality, supports children with additional needs exceptionally well, and promotes kindness and confidence. It is a model of what a modern primary setting should be, and closing it would be a significant loss to the area. On a personal note, my young nephew lives within Langley's catchment area and would attend the school in the near future given the chance. Like many local families,

we value the school's inclusive ethos and strong community reputation, and the thought of that opportunity being taken away is deeply disappointing. The Council's proposal fails to consider the wider impact on families, local employment, road safety, environmental impact, and educational continuity. It also appears inconsistent with the Council's stated commitment to inclusive education and community-led decision making. Langley First is a thriving, well-supported school that continues to serve its pupils and community exceptionally well. I urge the Council to withdraw this proposal and instead work constructively with the school community to address any long-term challenges collaboratively and transparently. Closing Langley First would be a short-sighted decision with long-lasting consequences for children, staff, and the wider North Tyneside community. [redacted]

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 08:28 AM

Yes. I believe there are alternative options that should be properly explored before any merger or closure is considered. 1. Time-limited financial support and collaborative planning. Langley First is not currently in deficit and is working proactively with independent financial advisors to manage future budgets. Rather than closing a financially sustainable school, the council should provide temporary targeted support and facilitate collaboration between both governing bodies to explore joint resource-sharing (e.g., shared specialist staff, joint procurement, or federated leadership models) while maintaining both sites. 2. Explore federation, not closure. A federation model – where two schools share leadership and governance but remain open on their current sites – would achieve many of the council's aims (efficiency, collaboration, shared expertise) without the significant community harm, traffic impacts, and loss of childcare provision that closure would cause. 3. Reassess catchment and new housing impact. With the Murton Gap development bringing up to 3,000 new homes and an estimated need for 748 new primary places, closing a high-performing, well-used local school within walking distance of many families seems premature. Pupil projections should be re-run once updated local housing data and internal migration patterns are factored in. 4. Proper consideration of wraparound care and community impact. The council has acknowledged that neither wraparound nor early years provision has been assessed. Given the heavy reliance of local working families on "Schools Out" childcare, the school's closure would directly harm employment stability and childcare access. Any sustainable alternative must guarantee comparable childcare provision before proceeding.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:00 AM

I object to the proposal to close Langley First School in favour of retaining Appletree Gardens. Langley is a highly sought-after school

with a strong reputation and large class sizes, reflecting its value to the local community. Many families move to West Monkseaton specifically to access Langley, which plays a vital role in shaping the area's demographic and sustaining its community spirit. Retaining Appletree Gardens, which has lower class numbers and less community draw, would not have the same positive impact. The proposed expansion of Woodlawn would not compensate for the loss of Langley, as it would likely attract pupils from outside the area, increasing car traffic into residential streets and undermining the local character. Closing Langley risks damaging the cohesion of West Monkseaton, reducing property values, and eroding the sense of community that the school helps foster. It is essential that Langley remains open to preserve the integrity and vitality of the area. I would like to express my deep disappointment in the approach taken by the local council regarding this proposal. It appears that accurate and transparent data has not been adequately gathered or presented, and for the first time, I feel that democratic principles are not being upheld in our local decision-making. As a taxpayer and resident who chose to live in this area specifically because of Langley First School, I urge the council to make the right decision for the children whose formative years are shaped by an outstanding educational environment. While the closure of Appletree Gardens is regrettable, it represents the least harmful option, as it would allow more children to benefit from the exceptional standards and community value offered by Langley. The decision-making process appears to be based on flawed and incomplete data, and fails to recognise the vital role Langley plays in the West Monkseaton community. Inaccurate Deficit Forecast The financial deficit forecast presented by the council appears wholly inaccurate. It includes figures from Appletree Gardens' early years provision, which skews the data and misrepresents the financial position of Langley. This undermines confidence in the council's analysis and decision-making. Wraparound and Nursery Provision Langley offers nursery and wraparound care that is essential to working families in the area. These services are deeply embedded in the community and provide continuity and support beyond the school day. It is inexcusable that the council has failed to factor this into its assessment. Community Role Langley is the last remaining community hub in West Monkseaton. It hosts events such as children's performances and adult quiz nights, fostering a sense of belonging and togetherness. With the loss of community halls and other gathering spaces, Langley is irreplaceable in maintaining local cohesion. Support for Children with Special Needs Langley excels in supporting children with special educational needs. Its inclusive environment and tailored support make it a valuable asset to the borough. The council's failure to recognise this contribution is deeply concerning. Misrepresentation of Birth Rate Impact The council cites falling birth rates as a justification for closure, yet Langley continues to maintain healthy pupil numbers.

Families actively move to the area to access the school, and there is no clear data to support the claim that Langley is under-enrolled. Future Housing Growth There are planning proposals for approximately 2,700 new homes in the vicinity of Langley. The council has not acknowledged the impact this will have on future school demand, which makes the proposal to close Langley short-sighted and poorly aligned with long-term planning. Class Sizes The suggestion that class sizes of 26 pupils are problematic is unfounded. Many of us were educated in classes of this size and thrived. If financial pressures exist due to council mismanagement, they should not be resolved at the expense of children's education and community wellbeing. Flawed Projections Both the projected pupil numbers and the financial forecasts used to justify the closure are inaccurate. Decisions of this magnitude must be based on reliable data, and the current proposal fails to meet that standard. Disregard for Local Voices Finally, it is clear that the views of local residents, those who live here, vote here, and pay taxes, have not been given due weight. Langley is more than a school; it is the backbone of our community. Its closure would be a devastating loss.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:13 AM

The only reasonable outcomes are: 1. To withdraw the proposal and keep Langley First School open, or 2. To delay the consultation until accurate information is available and the process can be redone transparently.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 11:12 AM

I disagree entirely with calling the proposal a merger. The reality is, its simply the closure of Langley First School, and is based on mistruths. The comment for example that there is no dedicated eating area/canteen in Langley first school is simply not accurate.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 11:46 AM

While I believe the current proposal should be cancelled, I recognise the council's stated aims of ensuring financial sustainability, reducing surplus places, and maintaining high standards of education. These objectives can be achieved without closing Langley First School. Below, I outline practical, evidence-based alternatives that address these concerns while protecting children, families, and community cohesion. They should not be viewed separately but as a number of options which can work in tandem to meet both the council's and the community's needs. Each option is designed to: • Minimise disruption for pupils and parents. • Preserve parental choice and the unique ethos of our schools. • Support inclusive education and SEND provision in line with national policy. • Offer financially sustainable solutions, including innovative ways to generate additional income. Option 1: Federation/Shared Leadership with Inclusion Hub • Summary: Federate Langley and Appletree (and potentially other

local schools), sharing leadership, specialist staff, and resources, while keeping both sites open. Langley could act as a “hub” for inclusive/SEND provision, supporting other schools (“spokes”) in the area. This could include an Additionally Resourced Provision (ARP) and formal links with Woodlawn Special School. • Benefits: Delivers economies of scale, strengthens SEND support, preserves parental choice, and maintains community identity. Financially sustainable when combined with right-sized PANs and shared resources. Option 2: Phased Transition to a Single Site • Summary: Merge Langley and Appletree into one legal entity, operating across both sites for a transitional period to allow large cohorts to move through before consolidating onto the stronger Langley site. This avoids overcrowding and loss of specialist spaces, and allows for split-site funding during transition. • Benefits: Resolves the “bulge” issue, utilises the stronger site, less disruptive transition, cost-effective, and meets council objectives for PAN and Woodlawn expansion. Option 3: True Amalgamation (New School) • Summary: Close both Langley and Appletree and open a new school with a new DfE number on the Appletree site, integrating the strongest aspects of both schools’ ethos, staff, and practices. • Benefits: Community and staff integration, enhanced parental appeal, educational and financial stability, aligns with council’s aims for PAN and Woodlawn expansion. • Challenges: Requires Secretary of State approval and is a longer, more complex process but ultimately better for social cohesion. Option 4: Repurposing Surplus Space for Community and Financial Benefit • Summary: Use surplus classrooms and facilities for early years provision, SEND support, wraparound care, community services, or as rental space for local organisations. • Benefits: Offsets financial losses from falling birth rates, meets unmet local needs, keeps the school at the heart of the community, and provides a sustainable, innovative model for the future. Option 5: Community Trust Model • Summary: Establish a community-led trust to run Langley First School, involving parents, staff, and local organisations. • Benefits: Empowers the local community, has been successful elsewhere, could access grants and funding streams not available to maintained schools.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 01:33 PM

Close Coquet School. A smaller school that is in debt. The smaller number of children will be easier to distribute into other schools . We know it has PFI and would need to pay a small fine to be closed. The school is not sustainable and according to figures would need to be closed within the next 8 years anyway. This will affect less childrens education as it’s a single form entry school.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 01:39 PM

Close Coquet School. It is smaller and is in debt.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 01:42 PM

• Use Langley to integrate more children with SEND into mainstream school. Use the resources, expertise and staff to facilitate this, rather than lose them in North Tyneside. The same goes for MMS. Possibly open an ARP at Langley. This would align with government priorities and address sociodemographic trends. • Allow Langley to address any deficit and enrol more children. This is achievable. It would look better for NTC to be advocating and supporting with this, rather than just closing a perfectly good school. • Address the whole picture at the same time and avoid the stress on parents not knowing if their child will have a place at any school anywhere near them in NT. Do you need to increase capacity at WBHS? Can you come up with solutions to do that? Potentially involving VGMS and the soon-to-be disused site of MHS? • Increase MMS to post-16. The Woodlawn post-16 provision could use that rather than Langley. If this is the reason? I am unsure as the council have given so many contradictory reasons. • Implementing this merger in 2027 would mean disrupting the largest cohorts of pupils currently moving through the system. If this merger is to go ahead, a far more logical approach is to wait until the smaller birth-rate cohorts are in the schools. • If it is all about cost (which was one of the reasons given by you at the meeting at WBHS) – NTC should find alternative ways to save money, rather than massively affect the education of the children you are supposed to be supporting.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 01:46 PM

I strongly oppose the council's proposal to close Langley First School. However, if the council is determined to proceed with some form of reorganisation, I advocate for a true merger rather than the proposed closure. Core Proposal: True Merger (or 'amalgamation') Close both Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School and open a genuinely new school with a new DfE number on the Appletree Gardens site. This differs fundamentally from the council's proposal, which is actually a closure dressed up as a merger. Why This Approach? - Fairness and community integration: The current proposal completely erases Langley's identity, ethos, governance, and staff. A true amalgamation would preserve valued elements from both schools, creating a fresh start that respects both communities rather than forcing one to absorb the other. - Enhanced parental appeal: Langley enjoys 73% catchment uptake versus Appletree's 44%. A new school blending Langley's popularity with Appletree's larger site could attract more families from both catchments, reducing surplus places more effectively than the current proposal and addressing projected deficits faster. - Staff retention and smoother transition: Retaining expertise from both schools through familiar staff members would provide continuity for children and maintain the high-quality inclusive practices that Langley is known for, particularly in SEND provision. - Educational and financial stability: Higher

enrolment driven by genuine parental appeal (rather than forced placement) would increase funding and support quality education more sustainably. - Alignment with council objectives: This proposal still achieves the council's aims of capping NEPA First School places at 390 and freeing the Langley site for Woodlawn expansion, but does so in a way that builds community support rather than division. How to Achieve This This would require the council to publish proposals to close both schools and seek approval from the Secretary of State to open a new community school. While the council has stated this is a longer process, I believe the extra time is justified when reorganising a school that has served our community for over 70 years. The case for Secretary of State approval is compelling: this approach aligns perfectly with the three-tier NEPA system, creates a more stable long-term solution, and addresses community concerns about fairness while still achieving the council's strategic objectives. Alternative: Delayed Phased Transition If a true amalgamation proves impossible, I would support a phased approach that delays implementation until the current 'bulge' cohorts have moved to middle school (by 2029). This would: -Avoid forcing 403 pupils (118 in Year 4 alone) onto a single site in 2027 -Allow the merger to occur with a manageable school roll of approximately 320-330 pupils -Provide time for proper planning and community adjustment -Still free the Appletree site for Woodlawn expansion, just on a more sensible timeline Critical Issues with the Current Proposal The council's proposal is fundamentally flawed: - Inaccurate data: The initial cabinet documentation contained multiple factual errors about Langley's facilities, financial position, and accessibility. The consultation documents continue to contain inaccuracies in projected pupil numbers and deficit forecasting. - Capacity confusion: The council claims Appletree can accommodate 432 pupils, yet the gov.uk website states capacity as 293. No clarification has been provided, and there are no plans for how 403 pupils would be safely accommodated. - Ignoring parental choice: Of surveyed Langley parents, 88% did not choose Appletree as any preference when applying for school places. Only 11% would choose it if Langley closed, with 38.5% preferring South Wellfield and significant numbers considering home-schooling. - Closing the more popular and resilient school: Langley has 73% catchment uptake versus Appletree's 44%. Analysis shows Appletree is the most sensitive NEPA first school to falling birth rates, while Langley has medium sensitivity due to its proven popularity and wider geographic draw (last place offered at 6 miles versus 3.6 miles for Appletree). - Loss of SEND provision: Langley supports 24% of pupils with SEND needs through extensive adapted facilities including a sensory room, outdoor classrooms, neurodiversity-affirming practices, and proximity to Woodlawn for dual registration. No guarantees have been provided about equivalent provision at Appletree. - Wraparound care ignored: The consultation completely failed to consider wraparound provision. Schools Out at

Langley provides 7:30am-6pm care from 9 months to 9 years with holiday provision. Appletree's Little Pips offers shorter hours (7:45am-5:30pm) and only from age 2. Of surveyed parents, 60.5% regularly use Schools Out, with 35.6% saying they would need to cut work hours if unavailable. - No community impact assessment: The council has not conducted a community impact assessment for this specific proposal. - Questionable pupil projections: The council's projections use an unpublished methodology extending beyond the National Pupil Projection Model's 2030 limit. When corrected for apparent errors (unexplained pupil losses/gains between year groups), Langley's 2030 surplus projects to 14% (only 4% above acceptable) while Appletree's reaches 34%. Birth Rates and Future Demand While birth rates have declined, the Office for National Statistics predicts they will level off from 2026 and then increase. The council has not adequately considered: - Internal migration: More young children move into North Tyneside than out, with many families specifically relocating to the coast for the three-tier system. Of surveyed Langley parents, 58% moved to the area specifically to send their children to Langley. - New housing development: The Murton Gap development will bring up to 3,000 new homes by 2032, with developers estimating a need for 748 additional primary school places and proposing a new two-form entry primary school. A considerable portion of this development would be closer to Langley and Appletree than to the designated New York Primary School catchment. - The North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 contradicts the closure rationale, stating: 'Net inward migration from neighbouring areas, primarily Newcastle, helps to sustain the overall working age population and limits the fall in the number of children in the borough.' The Year 2 Crisis The timing of this merger in 2027 would affect the largest cohorts currently in the system. For current Year 2 pupils (who would be in Year 4), this creates an impossible situation: - 118 children in one year group with no clarity on class sizes (legislation only limits infant classes to 30) - Only 2 spaces currently available at Appletree across all NEPA schools for this cohort - No alternative options as all other NEPA schools are full for this year group A far more logical approach would be to wait until smaller birth-rate cohorts are in the schools before implementing any merger.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 01:46 PM

This is not a merger as you have explained. This is closure of Langley why have you still weeks after the proposal still got false and misleading information on your website? If this is a merger why are you closing the better performing school. A true merger would keep the best of both schools, building, head teacher, curriculum etc. You have caused unneeded stress to many teachers, staff, pupils, parents which is disgusting to be honest. Some of the answers in the public forums have been horrendous and show a real lack of care for the people I have named.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 01:48 PM

Langley is a thriving popular school at the heart of the community. Therefore the proposal to close Langley First School is plainly wrong. The proposal to merge Langley and Appletree Gardens is not a merger but quite simply the closure of Langley. A true merger would be to close both schools and create a new school with a new name and a new DFE number. The preferred option of children, parents and staff is for Langley First School to remain open. Has the expansion of Woodlawn Special School into the Langley building been fully explored and costed? Surely these pupils deserve a new purpose built school not a hotchpotch of hastily make do and mend classrooms. [redacted] I believe we should be investing more money in the education of our children, after all they are the future. We should be looking to smaller class sizes and not to to teaching children in class sizes of 30 plus. It is a fact that children taught in smaller classes get a better education resulting in better exam results. What happened to Education, Education Education? These are true Labour values. In these days of political turmoil and upheaval I fear for the future of the Labour councillors in North Tyneside. I truly believe that the decision to close a much loved Langley is the wrong one.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 01:58 PM

Langley is an outstanding school that has been a major part of the community in West Monkseaton for many years. They provided a great environment for both of my boys and have some excellent staff. Given Langley is currently not in deficit and there are several years of large enough years in the NEPA system already (to support the current First School base) I suggest deferring any decision on Langleys closure for at least 2-3 years. This will allow the new Director of Education to make an unbiased assessment of the NEPA pyramid, properly consider the house building happening over the next 10-15 years nearby (and the promise of a new school to be built in the Murton Gap) and properly involve the local community in consultations.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 02:16 PM

Leave schools as they are, my children went to Langley and they were taught to respect each other and staff.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 02:29 PM

I would like to strongly state my support for the alternative provided by Friends of Langley. Langley First School is the heart of a thriving community, having never slipped into deficit even without the additional funding that Appletree Gardens receives, and should not be closed simply as the quickest and easiest option.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 02:31 PM

- Hold off doing anything until 2032 when PFI agreements come to an end at Coquet park and Marine park as looking at the financial forecasts there is likely going to be further school closures of some description once the PFI's end which will further impact the NEPA PAN and could potentially cause too few spaces in the NEPA. The dip in the birth rates which is heavily referenced also appears to be temporary levels off in 2026 and then increases slightly (and is also based on COVID date therefore how reliable is this?) Waiting until 2032 will allow further, more representative data to be gathered (current data indicates there is virtually no risk of the total first school intake number increasing over 390 therefore the changes do not need to be made as quickly as is being proposed) The issues are with the children who are currently in the system. -Delay this process for at least a further two years. This will allow for the larger cohorts to move through both schools which will reduce the impact of large class sizes on children's learning and mental health as well as reduce the need for expansion of any kind/ reduction in SEND provision (spaces e.g. sensory rooms) -A true amalgamation of the two schools. Just because this is a lengthier process, this should not be discounted as this would ensure that a new school would be created with a new ethos, shared interest and the best of both schools (thinking about staffing/ education principles/ interventions etc) rather than relying on hoping that Appletree will retain some of langley staff, create a new ethos etc. -Government agenda is to increase SEND provision within mainstream schools and reduce the number of EHCP's. There should be consideration of utilising the position of Langley being on the same site as Woodlawn to create opportunities for mainstream access/ and consideration of an ARP type provision at the Langley site. This proposal would have to consider the closure of another site e.g. Appletree or wait until the PFI schools have ended to have a better insight into what impact that will have on PAN -Current proposal but use the Langley school site rather than the Appletree site with a delayed merge date of September 2029 (to allow the largest cohorts to move through the schools). Appletree is significantly more expensive per square metre on utilities (£29 vs £4) Appletree site could then be used for Woodlawn expansion (has its own kitchen/ is within 600metres of Woodlawn's main site - easy access) and would allow a transition for the children attending Woodlawn which mimics mainstream peers transition to secondary school. This would promote independence, and would be good to develop their skills to support adapting to change. The proposal to move all children to the Woodlawn site means some children could be within the same small space from 4 years until they leave sixth form which does not prepare individuals for independent life after school and could have negative impact on social development (e.g. children of 16 years of age being taught in the same building as 4 year olds). -Langley and Appletree create a federation on the Monkseaton middle school site (assuming

	the closure of this school goes through) -Academisation -Close coquet park (it is in a poor financial position anyway and the debt will continue to grow regardless of PFI can this be settled early preventing any further debt). Closing Coquet park would reduce PAN by 30 per year group the reduction in another 30 children could then either come at a later date (when Marine Park's PFI ends) or by reducing PAN to 45 in two first schools that are currently 60PAN. Coquet Park site could then be used as secondary base for Woodlawn (could an agreement be made with Waves for the use of their small pool to negate the need for travelling to main Woodlawn site if this is a significant issue)
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 02:32 PM	I understand that falling birth rates are one of the reasons for the proposed merger! However I don't believe that one school can accommodate the pupil number without greatly increasing class numbers! My own children have recentley complete secondary education at Whitley Bay high school and before the new school was opened they both said that there were too many children in the school! Causing problems when moving form class to class between lessons and lunch time.
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 03:00 PM	Leave the schools as they are presently for high quality teaching environment.
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 03:52 PM	Keep Langley as it is currently. It is an amazing school
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 03:57 PM	Either don't merge or become an accadamy.
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 04:02 PM	How you think it's appropriate to ask us to come up with a viable alternative when you haven't provided accurate data, or further data that has been asked of you, is beyond me. However, I do have a few suggestions. Firstly, choose Langley over Appletree. Yes, of course a Langley parent is going to say that! But actually when you look at the data, and the overwhelming outpouring of support from the community, Langley is much more future-proof than Appletree. Your consultation document showed clear bias towards Appletree in the way you presented your data. For example, you referred to 'a similar trend' in unfilled places at Langley compared with Appletree. There is not a similar trend. Appletree has a much greater surplus. You also said "a quarter of catchment parents and carers are choosing other schools". Another way of writing this could have been 73% of catchment parents choose Langley, as opposed to 44% at Appletree.

Given Appletree is serving less than half of its catchment whilst nearly three quarters of catchment parents choose Langley, it makes more sense to keep the more popular school. There are also already children on the nursery waiting list for the next two years, and there is scope to extend the nursery provision further. Your data focuses on birth rates, but you don't appear to have considered the number of families - mine included - who move to Monkseaton specifically for Langley, and that families are already moving into the Murton Gap development to send their children to Langley, with further housing planned directly behind the school. I have never heard of anyone moving into the area to attend Appletree. Whilst in the short-term you may not want Murton development children impacting the 390, long-term this won't be an issue due to the falling birth rate. You appear not to have taken the Murton Gap development into consideration because you have planned this as being outside of NEPA. That development is proposing a new school but actually this school won't be required if the other schools nearby took the pupils, especially if the numbers are as low as your officers suggested when we met them at Whitley Bay High School. Instead, that money could be put into the local schools via section 106 funds. If the birth rate continues to fall as you predict, then you will need families outside of NEPA to choose our schools. Therefore, keeping the more popular school presents an opportunity to protect NEPA. You also can't guarantee that parents will send their children to Appletree if Langley closes. A parent survey conducted by Friends of Langley (carried out in the absence of qualitative data being provided by yourselves) showed the majority of parents would prefer to send their children to South Wellfield, Marine Park or Whitley Lodge if Langley closed. A large number of parents also said they would consider home-schooling their child if Langley closed, placing further burden on yourselves and, ultimately, the tax payer. This means Appletree is not secure long-term. The hours provided by the wraparound provision, both in term-time and during school holidays, at Langley also better meets the needs of working parents than Appletree. Of course, you don't have any data around wraparound as you have failed to consider this, or nursery provision, in your background information. A serious flaw in your considerations, and a slap in the face for the hard-working working parents who pay your wages. Had this been a true merger - where you had been proposing to close both schools and reopen them as a new one, taking the best bits of both - together with properly thought out plans of what a transition could look like, taking into account the physical and emotional needs of our children and demonstrated that you had considered wraparound provision, I don't think I would have had an issue with the idea in principle. You claim not to be able to do this, but it's simply that it will take longer and provide additional scrutiny on your decision-making process. Surely if you are confident you are taking the right decision, additional scrutiny is to be welcomed? It also makes more sense to wait at least a year,

if not two, to carry out this plan as that would allow the larger classes to pass through the first school system and avoid capacity issues, which would also allow this proposal to be considered by the DFE.. However, if you insist on going with the type of merger you currently have, I fail to understand why, when Langley has more pupils and is clearly the more popular school, you have chosen to close Langley. Given what I have said above, surely it would have made more sense to take Appletree's DFE number and governing body away, and move Langley into the Appletree building like you're doing with the Forest Hall merger. Is that not something you could consider here? I'm also not sure having all the children on the Appletree site is the right option. On paper, I can see how using this site seems like the obvious - and certainly easiest option; you think the building is bigger and you need to expand Woodlawn. However, contrary to your consultation information, a recent FOI response revealed that Langley's building is actually larger than Appletree in terms of square feet. Although Appletree has more classroom space (your FOI showed there are actually 14 not 17 as set out in your consultation document), they are all smaller than government guidance sets out. This may not be an issue currently where there are so many surplus spaces, but if you fill the class sizes this will be an issue. Although Langley currently has fewer classrooms, the building could be reconfigured to accommodate more classroom space if required (and if you delay by a year or two, there would be less pressure to reconfigure). Langley also has a larger school hall and a similar sized dining hall. Contrary to your consultation documentation, the school has a field immediately adjacent to the building, which is well-used by the children for play and PE in all weathers. Although there is a playing field across the road, this is only used once a year for sports day, and has potential for growth. We could look to build on part of the field to further expand the school if required, for example to expand the early years provision in order to enable reconfiguration of the classrooms. The Langley building is also safer. The school is part of the safer street initiative, with Langley Avenue closed every morning for the school run - something not available to Appletree due to being on a major bus route. Again, in the absence of any data provided by you, the survey carried out by Friends of Langley found 78% of parents currently walk to school, but only 37% said they would be able to walk if their child attended Appletree. Of those parents who do need to drive in order to get to work (of which we know only 18% drive), there is a convenient car park nearby, thereby having minimal impact on the local community. In comparison, Appletree has consistent traffic issues and I have heard of numerous near misses where children have almost been hit by cars around that area. You now expect nearly 300 additional children to travel there on what is an already congested route without any consideration of what impact this will have on traffic. In the absence of any traffic assessments being carried out (another flaw in your proposals) I am to assume you are

again ‘hoping for the best’. I appreciate none of this solves the issue around Woodlawn’s need for expansion, but it was unfair for you to present that expansion as part of this consultation; this consultation should only be about whether this is the right school to close, not conflated with Woodlawn’s expansion requirements, which should be a consultation in its own right. Picking on Langley simply because it’s next to Woodlawn is lazy, and is it really fair to displace 300 children for what would appear to be 32 at the Marden site? You’ve provided no data about what Woodlawn actually needs, which makes it hard to offer you an alternative suggestion. I don’t know how many children would suitably be able to have some lessons within mainstream school for example. Given the education minister recently said councils are to be encouraged to use surplus places to encourage SEND provision within mainstream provision rather than special schools, the placement of Langley and Woodlawn provides you with a perfect opportunity to get ahead of the game. [redacted]

Another option is repurposing Coquet Park for Woodlawn. Unlike Langley, Coquet Park is far from future-proof. Aside from being a one-form entry school, which your own consultation document says is not sustainable, the yellow circles in your consultation document show closing Coquet would not massively impact that area as there are other schools nearby, especially Whitley Lodge, where the current PAN is also unsustainable. Due to its proximity to the beach, there are no growth issues caused by developments planned for that area which would impact its future. Furthermore, once the PFI contract ends in 2032, I am concerned that you will be left with another Monkseaton High School issue and that this school will have to close. Whilst I understand that the current PFI deal makes closing Coquet financially unviable, repurposing it would potentially solve this issue. Surely it’s better to get ahead of this now rather than waiting for it to hit you in seven years’ time? I know the hydropool is an issue at Woodlawn but I understand this pool was actually paid for by fundraising held by the local community. It would be very easy to do this again on another site, especially given how much money the Langley campaign has raised to fight your proposals. The school’s proximity to the beach and the town centre would also potentially give Woodlawn an advantage for wellbeing as well as helping older pupils integrate into society. Another option could be using the co-location of Langley and Woodlawn to your advantage and repurposing all four schools within our area - Langley, Woodlawn, Appletree and Monkseaton Middle - to do something unique, allowing North Tyneside Council to be a trailblazer when it comes to special and SEND provision. You could have a first school model on the Langley/Woodlawn site and middle/high school model on the Appletree/Monkseaton Middle site. Both sites could enable pupils to

access targeted interventions and therapies as needed while continuing to participate in mainstream classes and interact with a diverse peer group. Currently the schools aren't working together - despite Langley trying to reach out to them - because they are understandably looking after their own interests. It currently makes sense not to work with Langley because they are safe under these proposals. However, if parents don't choose Appletree then that places further financial burden on the council, compounded by changing government policy which suggests special schools should be phased out. Therefore, neither schools are actually safe long-term. With support from the council, and an understanding that it's not an either/or, I truly believe the schools would be willing to work together for the benefit of the community. And if they're not willing to do that, surely they're not in the right job? You have a unique opportunity to do something amazing here, which would provide a longer-term solution. You're also at risk of fracturing the local community at a time when community cohesion has never been more important. Please choose doing the right thing over doing something short-sighted just because it seems easy.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 04:45 PM

Instead of Woodlawn expanding into Langley First School, keep Monkseaton Middle open as mainstream SEND provision for ages 5-11 and utilise those places instead of increasing the numbers on roll at Woodlawn.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 05:22 PM

Work with head teachers to find a solution. How have you come to this decision without taking into account the opinions of staff/atudents/families etc

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 05:24 PM

Close Coquet School. A smaller school that is in debt. We know it has PFI and would need to pay a small fine to be closed. The school is not sustainable and according to figures would need to be closed within the next 8 years anyway. This will affect less childrens education as it's a single form entry school.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 05:27 PM

Keeping both schools open as they are vital to the community.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 05:46 PM

Keep the schools as they are!!! The evidence/statements given are false. Someone with north tyneside council needs to learn how to budget or address things before they become an issue. You are destroying childrens lifes.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 05:48 PM

Don’t close Langley. It is without doubt the first choice for parents within and without the catchment area

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 06:19 PM

My 3 children attended Langley during the late 80's and 90's and during that time there was a fall in the birth rate. There was no question of closing the school but the classes were reduced from 4 over 2 school years to 3. this helped sve money and keep the school open. this only lasted for 2 years as the birth rate rose and numbers were filled. If this was implemented now then when numbers increase the school would be ready to take them.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 06:55 PM

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed merger of Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School. I urge the council to reconsider this proposal based on the following concerns: 1. Flawed Process and Incomplete Consultation The initial documentation presented contained factual inaccuracies about Langley’s facilities, finances, and catchment area. Crucially, there has been no community impact assessment specific to Langley, and early years and wraparound provision have been excluded from the consultation. Key stakeholders, including the leadership of Langley’s out-of-hours care provider, have not been consulted. 2. Not a True Merger This proposal is not a genuine merger but a closure of Langley. A true merger would involve closing both schools and forming a new one, allowing for shared input into the new school’s identity and ethos. This would be a fairer and more inclusive approach, especially given that both schools are rated as good. 3. Building and Capacity Concerns Appletree’s stated capacity is inconsistent with government data, and there are no assurances about class sizes or safe accommodation of Langley pupils. Larger class sizes could negatively impact children’s education and wellbeing. Additionally, Appletree is significantly more expensive to run than Langley. 4. Traffic and Safety Risks Langley benefits from a safer street closure policy and nearby public parking. Appletree’s location on a bus route and lack of parking raises serious concerns about traffic congestion and child safety. Parent survey data shows a likely increase in car usage if children are moved to Appletree. 5. Financial Misrepresentation Langley’s projected deficit is being used to justify closure, despite it being the first forecasted deficit in its history. The school is actively working with financial advisors, yet the council has not engaged with its leadership to explore solutions. Appletree receives additional funding that Langley does not. 6. Loss of Inclusive SEN Provision Langley offers exceptional support for children with special educational needs, with adapted spaces, trained staff, and a neurodiversity-affirming culture. No guarantees have been made about maintaining this level of provision at Appletree. Langley’s proximity to Woodlawn Special School also supports

inclusive dual registration, which would be lost. 7. Questionable Pupil Projections The council's pupil projections extend beyond the published methodology and contain unexplained discrepancies. Langley's projected surplus is within acceptable limits, while Appletree's is significantly higher. The merger does not address the real issue of current cohort pressures at Whitley Bay High School. 8. Disregard for Parental Choice Langley is the more popular school, with a wider geographic draw and stronger parental preference. Survey data shows that most parents would choose other schools over Appletree if Langley closed, and many would consider home-schooling. Closing Langley undermines parental choice and long-term demographic stability. 9. Impact of New Housing The Murton Gap development will bring thousands of new homes and hundreds of new primary-aged children. Langley is geographically well-positioned to serve this growth, yet the proposal ignores this strategic advantage. 10. Wraparound and Early Years Provision Langley's wraparound care is more flexible and extensive than Appletree's, supporting working families with longer hours and broader age coverage. Its loss would significantly impact parents' ability to work and manage childcare. 11. Wider System Risks The proposal displaces 300 children to repurpose Langley's site for 32 post-16 pupils, creating a false choice between mainstream and SEND provision. Meanwhile, Coquet Park First School faces structural financial issues but remains open due to contractual obligations, raising questions about fairness and long-term planning. In conclusion, this proposal is not in the best interests of our children, families, or community. I urge the council to reject the current plan and instead pursue a fair, transparent, and inclusive process that genuinely considers all stakeholders and long-term implications. Alternatively, after reviewing the alternative proposals submitted by Friends of Langley, I wish to express my strong support for a phased transition to a single site at Langley. This proposal offers a balanced and forward-thinking solution that meets the council's objectives while preserving the integrity and strengths of both schools. Key advantages of this proposal include: - Effective management of pupil numbers: By delaying full consolidation until 2029, the proposal allows larger cohorts to exit naturally, avoiding overcrowding and ensuring the Langley site can accommodate the final roll of approximately 320–330 pupils. - Utilisation of the stronger site: Langley First School has consistently demonstrated higher parental preference, stronger attendance rates, and more compliant facilities, making it the more sustainable long-term location. - Minimised disruption: The phased approach avoids the "double move" scenario and provides families and staff with a clear and stable transition timeline. - Cost-efficiency: This plan avoids unnecessary capital expenditure at Appletree and qualifies for split-site funding during the transition period. - Alignment with council goals: It still delivers a single 60 PAN first school and enables the future expansion of

	Woodlawn School, albeit on a slightly adjusted timeline. I urge the council to give serious consideration to this proposal. It represents a fair compromise that protects educational quality, community cohesion, and financial sustainability. Langley First School has been a cornerstone of our community for over 70 years, and it deserves a solution that reflects its value and legacy. Thank you for your attention to this matter.
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 06:55 PM	Engage with the Campaign for Langley first School, who have developed a range of suggestions for going forward. They have put a lot of thought and research into their proposals, much more than the council apparently did.
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 06:59 PM	Alternative solutions Use Langley to integrate more children with SEND into mainstream school. Use the resources, expertise and staff to facilitate this, rather than lose them in North Tyneside. The same goes for MMS. Possibly open an ARP at Langley. This would align with government priorities. Allow Langley to address any deficit and enrol more children. This is achievable. Support them to do this. You have offered no support to either school. Address the whole picture at the same time and avoid the stress on parents not knowing if their child will have a place at any school anywhere near them in NT. Do you need to increase capacity at WBHS? Can you come up with solutions to do that? Wait until the smaller birth-rate cohorts are in the schools, rather than disrupt the largest cohorts of pupils currently moving through the school. The current year 2 is full. Why move them to somewhere that lacks the space to accommodate them? . Find alternative ways to save money. The council should step up and provide a viable alternative. It is your responsibility to explore all options thoroughly and present a plan that works for the community.
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 07:18 PM	I am aware that there are flaws in the proposal and I believe alternatives could be arranged. The knock on effect of this will be catastrophic and other schools in Northumberland have cancelled similar plans.
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 07:28 PM	Apple tree financials are incorrect and unfairly bias by including profit from little pips. It should be a fair comparison like for like from 3 plus not including little pips. If you remove the profit from little pips the school deficit would be substantially worse, combine this with their additional falling rolls funding which Langley is not in receipt of. Appletree is smaller than Langley, it has more classrooms, but the building footprint is smaller is clearly dated and old and needs work. There are signs outside of the school by residents with fowl language.

|I have images of these signs which have been here for the entire consultation process. Traffic is a serious issue as is parking this has been raised by ward councillor dave numerous times with articles in the chronicle about the serious concerns. On Wednesday 5th of November an accident occurred, and numerous metal bollards were knocked over. This could have quite easily have been a child. Appletree gardens has a much higher running cost than Langley first school at £44,000 in comparison to Langley at £7,000 The persistent absence rate is above average for the area Appletree gardens persistent absence rate is 15% compared to Langley which is 5.9% which raises concerns. Out of a potential pan of 60 the current reception class is only 30, this shows that this is not a popular school and is not chosen by parents in that area. 44% of children in Appletree gardens are not from the catchment area. I feel like this school should close and the children in catchment given a space at Langley first. Langley is and has always been the better school. It is the heart of a community with consistent applications every year. By closing this school that is a reduction in 60 pan which is required. This is not taking into account when the current PFI at Croquet ends in 2032, this school is already in a deficit it cannot recover from according to the council during the consultation meeting, the closure of this school reduces the pan by a further 30. The issues regarding birth rate seem short sighted considering the office of national statistics predicts this year to be the lowest year with it levelling off and increasing. I cannot understand why the decision to keep Appletree gardens open has been made when you look at all figures and makes me question why and who benefits from this proposal because it is clearly not the children in any facility. This proposal is completely unjustified and bias, the data and information provided by the council is false and manipulated. I will be homeschooling my chid if this closure goes ahead.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 07:55 PM

Our children deserve stability, a nurturing education and a school that values them. Langley First School already provides that, and it should remain open. An alternative, purpose built site should be found for Woodlawn School which is more fit for purpose and which will cost a lot less than having to convert existing spaces in Langley School for the needs of Woodlawn students. If the council insists on making changes, then the process should at least be fair. A genuine merger - where both schools close and a new one is created - would mean both communities have equal input and proper oversight. What’s being proposed now is not a merger at all. It’s simply closing Langley and calling it something else, and that’s not right for our children, our teachers or our community. I also ask that there should be a reception intake in 2026 at Langley so that younger siblings, like my son, can start school where their older brothers or sisters already attend. This would allow families like us to manage one transition

	instead of two and would make the process far less disruptive for everyone and more manageable for working parents. I also ask that parents be given a choice of where else they send children to school in this circumstance, rather than Appletree being presented as the only option.
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 08:00 PM	Keep the schools separate and ensure smaller class sizes keep a thriving school
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 08:02 PM	To ‘merge’ both schools in the true sense of the word. Give all staff equal opportunity to apply for jobs and create a ‘new’ school in Appletree building, with new name and a combination of both staff so that all children have familiar adults to assist them with the huge change.
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 08:05 PM	I am writing as a concerned member of the local community to express my strong opposition to the proposed closure of Langley First School. This decision appears to be based on flawed information, inconsistent data, and a lack of meaningful consultation with those most affected. It does not serve the best interests of local children, families, or the wider community. Inaccurate and Misleading Information The council’s decision to move to consultation was built on a report containing numerous factual inaccuracies. Langley was wrongly described as having no accessible playing field, being in financial deficit, and serving an easily transferable catchment. In reality, Langley has its own well-used playing field, outdoor learning spaces, and gardens immediately adjacent to the site. The school is not in deficit and is already working proactively with independent financial advisors to maintain stability. The consultation documents also contain inaccuracies around projected pupil numbers and school capacity. No community impact assessment specific to Langley has been undertaken, and neither early years nor wraparound childcare provision have been adequately considered — despite their importance for working families. Impact on Local Families and Daily Life Removing Langley’s Reception intake for 2026 has already created unnecessary disruption for local families. Many now face managing two school drop-offs and separate events, which is both impractical and stressful. This change erodes the strong sense of stability and support Langley has always provided for its families. A Stronger, More Efficient School Langley is a thriving and well-managed school with a positive reputation, inclusive values, and a larger, more energy-efficient site than Appletree Gardens. According to government data, Langley spends just £4 per square metre on utilities compared to Appletree’s £29 — clear evidence of better use of public funds. Appletree, meanwhile, has struggled with falling pupil

numbers, higher operational costs, and lower parental demand. The council's own figures show that the majority of families in Langley's catchment do not choose Appletree. It is concerning that the headteacher of Appletree has not engaged in any dialogue with the community throughout this process — this lack of transparency does not inspire confidence in its leadership or future stability. Support for Children with Additional Needs Langley's commitment to inclusion is a major strength that should be preserved. Around a quarter of its pupils receive additional support, and the school has built an exceptional range of facilities including sensory rooms, outdoor learning areas, and adapted classrooms. Its location next to Woodlawn Special School provides unique opportunities for shared resources and dual registration — aligning perfectly with government priorities on inclusive education. The Case for a Fairer Approach If change must happen, the council should pursue a true merger, where both schools close and reopen as one. This would ensure fairness, shared community input, and external oversight from the Office of the Schools Adjudicator. The current plan — closing one successful school while retaining a less stable one — feels unbalanced and risks creating lasting division in our community. Long-Term Planning Concerns The justification of "falling birth rates" is shortsighted. Official ONS data shows that while births have declined in recent years, they are projected to stabilise and rise again after 2026. The North Tyneside Local Plan also notes inward migration, particularly to coastal areas like ours, helping sustain the child population. Langley's projected surplus remains within acceptable limits, whereas Appletree's is significantly higher. Conclusion Langley First School is not a failing institution — it is an asset to our community, offering inclusive, high-quality education and representing excellent value for money. The proposed closure is based on incomplete evidence and fails to account for the social, educational, and economic impact on local families and the area as a whole. I urge the council to reconsider this proposal, reinstate Langley's Reception intake for 2026, and take a fairer, evidence-based approach that genuinely reflects the needs and voices of the local community.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 08:11 PM

Keeping both schools open to enable good quality education for children in the community.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:03 PM

I feel strongly about Langley School. The school has a brilliant reputation. It should be kept open. Talk of a merger with Appletree School is false. The majority, if not all Langley staff will lose their jobs. Merge means to " cause to combine unite or coalesce". This is not the case. Closure is " the act or purpose of closing something" A true description. Langley are being cast aside to facilitate the expansion of Woodlawn. An excellent school no doubt with specialised staff. But

Langley have many children who also have additional needs. These children are flourishing but little seems to have been mentioned about this. Much seems to have been made about the falling birth rate as a reason for closure. But this not an exact science. Things change. It seems to me that Langley are handicapped greatly because of the need to expand Woodlawn. This is purely geographical because the schools are so close together. A consultation period is only any good if it is fair. Had Woodlawn been adjacent to Appletree would the same rationale be applied and Appletree closed? I see mention has been made of "financial deficit". How much deficit is Langley in? I mean is this a current deficit or a projected one? I assume it would not be as great as ihe deficit incurred by Monkseaton High School. Little concern appears to have been given to the children and the devestating affect closure might have on them. Also no consideration appears to have been given for the current Langley staff who are extremely dedicated and professional. On a minor point mention has been made of children havig to cross a public highway. This would cover every school in North Tyneside. In any event the majority of children travel by car. Would it not be feasible to have Langley and Woodlawn working in tandem. As I've already said Langley already have a number of children with additional needs. I suggest this is looked into. Consultation or not I do not feel all avenues have been explored.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:04 PM

True Merger If closure proceeds, at least make it a genuine merger—close both schools and create a new one, combining the best teachers and practices. This approach has not been considered because it requires effort, but decisions should prioritise children, not convenience. A true merger would: • Prevent community division and allow both schools—and their pupils—to contribute to a new school’s name, ethos, and uniform. • Retain the best aspects of both schools, including staff, and ease the transition for children. • Increase scrutiny by requiring approval from the Secretary of State and the Office of Schools Adjudicator. • Ensure decisions are made carefully, not rushed. Langley is not yet in deficit, so why the urgency? Woodlawn The Langley field is earmarked for development—why not build a purpose-built school for the 32 children who need it? This would be cheaper than closing and redeveloping Langley and Appletree. Current plans displace 300 children for the benefit of 32, creating a false choice between mainstream stability and SEND provision. Coquet Park The council considered closing Coquet Park but deemed it unviable due to a PFI contract until 2032. The school ended 2024/25 with a £0.325m deficit and cannot balance its budget within three years. Classified as in structural deficit, it faces long-term financial issues. With one-form entry and high PFI costs, its future viability is questionable. Without proposed solutions, closure after 2032 seems inevitable. Close this school and pay the fees again

cheaper than current proposals. Stop this Process This proposal should be withdrawn, and a full review of North Tyneside education undertaken. At consultation stage, accurate and complete data should be available. Parents deserve clarity on their child's full educational journey. When Monkseaton High closed, the council should have outlined future pathways for all children. Data has not been properly analysed and these plans not thought past a number a figure and lack detail. A full review should be engaged, and there should be engagement with schools and governors. SEN provision, proposed class sizes, and other critical factors must be addressed thoroughly. You haven't shared all the data you have and we haven't had all the data for the full 6 weeks in order to have a fair chance at considering options and working on feedback. The online information has constantly been changed and updated which is makes forming an argument difficult, we haven't had the same opportunity to look at the data the council has. There is also data you don't have which I feel is important for example, if its local people moving into the new housing development, who is moving into those houses, in the rings you have drawn around schools how many children live in those streets impacted and many more. Also take a leaf from Northumberland's book and listen to the people who vote and pay council tax and stop this process.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:21 PM

I wish to express my strong opposition to the proposal to close Langley First School and to the Council's ad-hoc approach to school closures. [redacted] I will not repeat arguments made elsewhere regarding Langley's strengths relative to other schools in the area, but instead highlight how South Korea's systematic approach could inform a fairer process here. In South Korea, local governments have managed school closures for decades and developed objective, capacity-based criteria to guide decisions. A school operating at 10% below capacity would not be considered for closure, whereas one operating at 25% below capacity and projected to reach 35% below by 2030 would be. This structured approach removes perceptions of bias or hidden motives— such as the belief that a particular school is being unfairly targeted because the Council want to repurpose their buildings— and ensures decisions are impartial, transparent, predictable and evidence-based rather than arbitrary. I recognise that school closures can be necessary, but I urge North Tyneside Council to learn from Korea's decades of experience: withdraw the proposal to close Langley and adopt a clear, trigger-based framework for future reviews. Such a system would reduce uncertainty and naturally align outcomes with parental choice, as the schools closest to capacity would remain open.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:26 PM

I strongly disagree with the closure of Langley First School. By looking at the information provided by both the council and the save Langley campaign. Its abundantly clear that Langley is the stronger of the two schools both financially, academically and within the community. I feel Langley first school is most likely to succeed following a merger, 73% of Langley catchment parents chose Langley in comparison to 44% of Appletree. Projected pupil numbers of Appletree indicate and average of 26% surplus places from 2025-2034, in contrast to 15% for Langley despite Appletree having 44 homes per planned place compared to Langley's 40 homes. Appletree has statistically shown to be the NEPA first school most sensitive falling birth rates, with the current NEPA birth indicating a requirement of 145 children to attend from outside of NEPA. They will be the most at risk of being under subscribed and susceptible to falling into deficit. 73% of respondents in the catchment moved to the area for Langley, 88% of respondents did not choose Appletree as any of their preferences when they applied for a school place. The persistent absence rate at Appletree is 15% compared to Langley's persistent absence rate of 5.9%. Absence data is a critical indicator of pupil engagement and school effectiveness, particularly under Ofsted's updated inspection framework. Appletree has a higher running cost for their building of circa £44,000, in comparison to Langley's circa £7,000. Only 2 of the proposed 13 Appletree classrooms meet the government guidance of 62m2 for 30 reception children and 55m2 for 30 KS1+ where as 10 of the 11 Langley classrooms exceed the guidance. Government guidance recommends a hall of a minimum 140m2 for P.E and assemblies and KS2, Appletree assembly hall is below guidance at 130m2, Langley has an assembly hall of 190m2.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:28 PM

If changes have to occur then a thorough, and fair, process needs to be completed. If there is a desire to close a school and bring together another in the area, then a true merger should occur. Whereby both schools and their identities close, and a new beginning and a new school for all starts. This is to be fair for ALL pupils, ALL teachers and ALL parents across both of those schools. What I have not seen in this process is an actual merger. It is strictly the closure of Langley First school and shifting pupils to another. That is not right or fair on the Langley community, the pupils, parents or teachers. And is also unfair to the Appletree community too. An additional element that I require is a reception intake at Langley in 2026, so that my son and younger siblings of current Langley pupils, can start school with siblings in older years and already attending. This is to reduce any disruptive elements for all involved; it will allow families to manage just one transition instead of two. We are working parents, and this potential change is challenging enough without multiple transitions and multiple factors and decisions to be made. Within I would like to

see the element of choice. Choice for parents to decide themselves and make their own call as to where they want to send their children to learn at such an early age and important stage of their development. Only having Appletree as an option removes all fairness from this process and should not be the only choice available to us.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:35 PM

1. Extending proposal timeline to benefit families and transition I believe the proposal timelines to be rushed. Given the numbers across all first schools my first alternative would be to allow Langley to remain open until a later date, such as 2029, so children currently enrolled can complete Year4 and finish their current educational pathway. Closure at September 2027 means larger class sizes throughout the borough and expense to temporarily expand Appletree to accommodate all the children (if they all decide to go there). This timeline should be explored no matter what the outcome to ensure smoother transition for all families. Here are some suggestions I'd like to be considered; 2. Full Relocation of Woodlawn Given the increasing SEND population across North Tyneside, we should consider a future-proof solution. Relocating Woodlawn entirely to a new site would allow the creation of a high-quality, purpose-built facility that could accommodate both the sixth form and features such as a hydrotherapy pool, ensuring the needs of all students are met. One potential site could be the Monkseaton Middle School site, possibly in combination with Appletree. My understanding is that Monkseaton Middle alone may be large enough to accommodate Woodlawn, allowing the council to repurpose or sell the Appletree site. Other sites should be explored also. Alternative A If Monkseaton Middle School remains open, it may still be possible to relocate Woodlawn Sixth Form to the Appletree site. This could also provide an opportunity to expand SEND sixth form provision, keeping all services on a single site. The Appletree site is quite large and could accommodate more than just the Woodlawn Sixth Form. For example, the remaining space could be used as an Additional Resource Provision (ARP) or as a Learning Hub for children currently not attending school, including those who are home-educated (EHE) or experiencing emotionally-based school non-attendance (EBSNA), estimated to be around 300 children. This hub could offer a flexible, supportive educational environment with shorter days, forest school activities, or 1:1 and small group teaching. Some teachers from Appletree could staff the hub or ARP, ensuring continuity and expertise while providing a setting tailored to the needs of these students. Meaning less redundancies. If this approach were feasible, it would allow Langley to remain open. The timeline for Appletree's closure could either be extended so that all children currently at the school complete Year 4 (2029), or Langley could receive funding for additional classrooms to accommodate students until enrolment

numbers across North Tyneside stabilise. Alternative B Woodlawn could be relocated to one of the other two primary schools you are proposing to close within North Tyneside. Most families travel to Woodlawn anyways and there is no set catchment. 3. SEND Federation Has anyone considered the possibility of Langley and Monkseaton Middle forming a SEND federation? I raise this idea because I understand that Wellfield First and Middle Schools are moving toward a federation model, and I wondered whether a similar approach could work for SEND provision. Monkseaton Middle provides outstanding support, particularly for neurodiverse children. I am unsure what impact this might have on Woodlawn, mainstream numbers, or operational logistics, but I believe it is worth exploring as a potential option. Could this be split as primary and secondary? Woodlawn sixth form could also possibly form part of the site. Could this work online with learning hubs/ ARPs etc? Alternative A If easier this could work with Appletree and Monkseaton, leaving Langley to be mainstream. One site, future proofed SEND provision and relocation of Sixth form. Alternative B Should we be looking more closely at SEND provision as a whole. Could Southlands and Woodlawn align? One head over two sites. Use the one site for primary and one for secondary. Southlands is a large site. The number of assistant heads at Woodlawn is potentially unnecessary expense. 4. Full Merger One option could be a full merger, with both Appletree and Langley closing and a new school established on the Appletree site. This would involve new governance, new leadership, and all staff applying for positions within the new school. It's sad that this hadn't been the first proposal, as I feel this wouldn't be well received by Appletree, and like you said you would need their agreement. The reputation of both schools and possibility for rebranding should have been a consideration when putting together this proposal, which sadly it wasn't. 5. Primary School Option The council could keep Langley open until a new primary school is built on the Murton Gap site. Langley would then relocate to this new site and transition into a primary school, moving away from the three-tier system. This approach would also free up the current Langley building for Woodlawn to move their sixth form into. Implementing this option would require working closely with the developers to establish a clear timeline. It would also allow children and families currently at Langley to remain in place until the move. 6. Langley as the Lead School If a school closure is necessary, Appletree could be the site to close, with Langley taking the lead in shaping the new provision. Langley's staff, leadership, and governors would transfer to the Appletree site, effectively creating a new school under Langley's leadership. The reputation of Appletree within Whitley bay leaves it being the least popular first school in the borough. A new identity, leadership etc would mean that it could be relaunched as Monkseaton First School included everything that is successful from both schools. Leaving Appletree as it is means that nothing changes. Yes the children will

attend there (if their parents wish) but ultimately its reputation remains the same. The data clearly shows that is it the least popular first school and having lived here all my life this is the general consensus amongst parents. This is an excellent opportunity to change that. 7. Reducing PAN and Creating ARPs A potential option would be to reduce the Published Admission Number (PAN) at both Langley and Appletree by 30 children each, creating a total of 60 additional spaces across the borough. This approach would help manage school population pressures while still maintaining strong local provision. The freed capacity could then be repurposed to establish Additional Resource Provisions (ARPs) at both schools, providing specialist support for children with SEND or those who require targeted interventions. This would allow the schools to better meet diverse learning needs without needing to expand into entirely new sites or buildings. I understand that the current places offered by first schools is 450 but the uptake for reception his year is 310 approx. We are well under the 390 set goal and will be across most year groups except a couple. Whilst I appreciate the need to reduce OAN across all first and middle schools the reality is that even if there were 390 places available only 310 are taken within the NEAP. Leaving a surplus year upon year. Same as now with 450 places available. The proposal doesn't address this and will likely involve a further school to close in the near future. Let's not upset the community further and address this as an entire borough. Benefits of this approach include: • Enhanced SEND support: ARPs would provide dedicated spaces for children who need extra support, allowing them to access mainstream schooling while receiving specialist assistance. • Flexibility for local families: By maintaining the majority of existing places, families would have continuity for their children while still offering targeted support for those with additional needs. • Optimised use of existing infrastructure: Rather than investing in entirely new buildings, existing classrooms and facilities could be adapted to support ARPs. • Borough-wide impact: The 60 freed spaces would create capacity for children elsewhere in North Tyneside, reducing overcrowding pressures and enabling a more balanced distribution of pupils. This option could also be combined with other proposals, such as creating a SEND federation or developing a Learning Hub, to provide a flexible, multi-layered approach to meeting the needs of all children across the borough and also reduces redundancies. Alternative A Given the white paper is set to highlight children with SEND being supported in mainstream, it would make sense for all first schools to reduce their PAN in order to support SEND children to remain in mainstream. Well funded ARPs or simply early identification of EHCPs allowing children to be in smaller class sizes within mainstream. Surely the addition money for EHCP allocation or ARP places would help with school budgeting once PANs were reduced. 8. Relocation of Woodlawn Sixth Form One possibility could be to relocate the Woodlawn Sixth Form to our (Langley) field across

the road. Separating it from the main Woodlawn site could support student transition while allowing the creation of a purpose-built building designed specifically for sixth form needs. My understanding is that students currently travel off-site for life skills and other activities; could this be incorporated into the design to provide the best possible provision? Having the two sites opposite each other would allow professionals to move easily between them, and the field offers excellent access for transport. This approach could mean that the closure of Langley School would no longer be necessary to provide a suitable building for Woodlawn. This would align with Langley being the lead school on the Appletree site or a full merger or any other proposal. 8. Coquet park closure Rather than closing Coquet and leaving the site underutilised or surplus, we propose that the building is repurposed to meet current and growing community and SEND needs within North Tyneside. Repurpose the Coquet site as a specialist ARP (Additionally Resourced Provision) and Community Learning Hub to support: • Children and young people who are unable to attend mainstream school full-time(e.g., medical needs, anxiety, SEMH). • Pupils requiring short-term intervention to support reintegration into mainstream settings. Or • Woodlawn Sixth Form, providing them with a community-facing, real-life transition environment that is better aligned with adult life and accessibility needs. 9. Rockcliff closure Given the age and condition of the existing Rockcliff building and the limited outdoor space available, we propose that instead of investing in a full rebuild, the school is closed and pupil places are reallocated to nearby schools with stronger site capacity and development potential. I understand this building is on the list for a new build within the next 5 or 7 years. Whilst I appreciate it’s from a separate budget. That money would be saved and would go a long way. 10. Southridge closure Within Southridge reception classes only approx 8 children live within catchment. If I were a parent of a child in Langley knowing this I’d expect that catchments to be stricter to not allow this. Why should a child who is within catchment if Langley, and it closes be forced to a school they don’t want, when children living outside of the borough are getting into schools like Southridge. Southridge has a small catchment area. Half could be absorbed by Whitley Lodge and the other half by Appletree or Wellfield. Rationale for both: • Rockcliff or Southridge currently admits 45 or 60 pupils per year, and this intake could be absorbed locally without reducing access to school places; • Cullercoats Primary or Marine Park has the capacity to accommodate additional pupils. • Whitley Lodge or Wellfield also within reasonable proximity and would be a suitable alternative. • Langley could reduce its mainstream intake by a further 15 places if necessary and use this capacity to develop a specialist ARP (Additionally Resourced Provision) focused on supporting pupils with communication, interaction, and/or moderate learning needs. • This supports inclusive education, meets rising local SEND demand, and increases specialist provision within the borough without

requiring new build developments. • Langley could work with Woodlawn (see below) 11. Build Langley a New building with a set up like Benton Dene Given Langley is the more popular school by parents and the level of campaign I would suggest to build a new first school in Monkseaton. Merge Appletree over to the Langley site in sept 2027 for a year. We could accommodate the extra children easily with cabins. During academic year 27-28 transform/ extend/ develop the Appletree site. This could be changed to a model that looks like Benton Dene with mainstream inclusion for SEND at the forefront. Rebranded as a NEW school. Langley to lead with governors and leadership. To be honest of adapting current buildings this could begin sooner. No reason why this couldn't also include a community hub of learning also to reintegrate children being home educated. It was also interesting to discover this week that Southlands will be repurposed, in 3/4 years time, to be used for children with Severe Learning Difficulties and that children with Moderate Learning Difficulties will be in mainstream. There is obviously a bigger plan to be put in place that the council is not being transparent about. Which is sad because this leads to mistrust from the community. If this is the case then some of these proposals would actually allow for this to happen successfully, as well as being well thought out and not rushed. Thank you for your time and I hope this has given the you something to investigate.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:38 PM

True Merger If closure proceeds, at least make it a genuine merger—close both schools and create a new one, combining the best teachers and practices. This approach has not been considered because it requires effort, but decisions should prioritise children, not convenience. A true merger would: • Prevent community division and allow both schools—and their pupils—to contribute to a new school's name, ethos, and uniform. • Retain the best aspects of both schools, including staff, and ease the transition for children. • Increase scrutiny by requiring approval from the Secretary of State and the Office of Schools Adjudicator. • Ensure decisions are made carefully, not rushed. Langley is not yet in deficit, so why the urgency? Woodlawn The Langley field is earmarked for development—why not build a purpose-built school for the 32 children who need it? This would be cheaper than closing and redeveloping Langley and Appletree. Current plans displace 300 children for the benefit of 32, creating a false choice between mainstream stability and SEND provision. Coquet Park The council considered closing Coquet Park but deemed it unviable due to a PFI contract until 2032. The school ended 2024/25 with a £0.325m deficit and cannot balance its budget within three years. Classified as in structural deficit, it faces long-term financial issues. With one-form entry and high PFI costs, its future viability is questionable. Without proposed solutions, closure after 2032 seems inevitable. Close this school and pay the fees again

cheaper than current proposals. Stop this Process This proposal should be withdrawn, and a full review of North Tyneside education undertaken. At consultation stage, accurate and complete data should be available. Parents deserve clarity on their child's full educational journey. When Monkseaton High closed, the council should have outlined future pathways for all children. Data has not been properly analysed and these plans not thought past a number a figure and lack detail. A full review should be engaged, and there should be engagement with schools and governors. SEN provision, proposed class sizes, and other critical factors must be addressed thoroughly. You haven't shared all the data you have and we haven't had all the data for the full 6 weeks in order to have a fair chance at considering options and working on feedback. The online information has constantly been changed and updated which is makes forming an argument difficult, we haven't had the same opportunity to look at the data the council has. There is also data you don't have which I feel is important for exampe, if its local people moving into the new housing development, who is moving into those houses, in the rings you have drawn around schools how many children live in those streets impacted and many more. Also take a leaf from Northumberland's book and listen to the people who vote and pay council tax and stop this process.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:39 PM

Phased transition to a single site at Langley Overview This proposal establishes a single legal school entity by merging Appletree Gardens First School into Langley First School, effective September 2026. The merged school will operate across both the Appletree and Langley sites during a three-year transition period (Sept 2026 – July 2029) before fully consolidating onto the Langley site in September 2029. Vacating the Appletree site at that point will enable the Council's planned expansion of Woodlawn School. Key Proposal Details Legal Merger: One headteacher, one governing body, one DfE number. Transitional Operation (Sept 2026 – July 2029): Two campuses (Langley and Appletree) to accommodate current 'bulge' cohorts (Years 2 & 3) until they move to middle school. Admissions: Reception PAN set at 30 per site (total 60 pupils per year across the merged school). Full Consolidation (Sept 2029): Total roll expected to reduce to ~320–330 pupils, allowing all pupils and staff to move to the Langley site. Benefits ✓ Resolves "Bulge" Cohorts Effectively: Delays merger until large cohorts move on, ensuring manageable pupil roll fitting Langley's capacity without overcrowding. ✓ Sustainable Long-Term Location: Langley site shows stronger parental preference and demographic resilience, ensuring long-term viability. ✓ Minimises Disruption: Avoids a "double move" scenario; provides a clear and stable timeline for staff and pupils. ✓ Cost-Effective Transition: Avoids unnecessary capital spend on temporary Appletree expansion; eligible for split-site funding during transition. ✓ Delivers

Council Objectives: Creates a unified 60 PAN first school, frees the Appletree site for Woodlawn expansion, and achieves strategic aims on a stable, realistic timeline. Challenges & Considerations Deferred Savings: Operational efficiencies of single-site delivery realised from 2029. Langley Site Investment: Some capital works may be needed to ensure readiness as the permanent site. Stakeholder Management: Clear, proactive communication with parents and staff required to support confidence and engagement through transition. Conclusion

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:46 PM

I strongly oppose the closure of Langley First School outlined in this proposal under the premise of a “merger”-type. The proposal is rushed, contains many errors, poor extrapolations and omission of data as justification. The consultation messily conflates multiple issues: Too many children in the area for high school, not enough children in the area for first school, Private finance initiative obligations and special needs provision. The consultation does not provide adequate source data to which factual evidence-based decision can be made. Furthermore, during the initial stages of the consultation data held by the council was veiled and inaccessible in the public domain due to website access. This has been confirmed by the information governance team during my attempts to access disclosure logs for example. Our youngest child currently attends Langley First School, as did our oldest child. Langley was our first choice for both children. We migrated to the NEPA catchment from Newcastle and performed school visits therefore not captured on birth-rate based figures being the sole predictor in the consultation. Proximity to Langley First school was a key part of the decision to choose our home. Appletree was not a consideration after our arranged visit to the school where we entered with the head teacher to an unattended classroom of children without any adult present. Should this proposal go ahead then my child’s education will be heavily impacted with the attrition of staff, students (with associated funding), community, ethos, morale and ambition from the school. The detriment to his education would likely result in us homeschooling for the remainder of first school. The council presents a case based on falling birth rates. Whilst there is undoubtedly a downward trend, birthrates are cyclical and the UK as a whole has started to see an increase in 2024 of 0.6%. Unlike Appletree Gardens, Langley First School is directly adjacent to a large housing development. Families purchasing these homes will favour houses in close proximately to this highly desired school (like we did). It is inappropriate to use average figures of the number of children entering an area from new housing without also considering proximately to schools. The councils own data supports that Langley First School is highly desirable, unlike Appletree Gardens. With the large majority of in catchment children choosing the school compared to that minority case in Appletree

Gardens, many of whom preferentially choose Langley. It is noteworthy that the council's prediction of the future surplus places at Langley First School shows that even by 2033 Langley First School will have a surplus below what currently exists at Appletree Gardens. These data however should be questioned as to why, despite Langley showing a greater historic parental preference and having the same birth rates, does Appletree Gardens shows an initial reduction in surplus places that is not shown in the Langley data? The councils weird 800m map circles, not representing catchment, omits housing plans from the Murton Gap fields. This presents a distorted view of future demand. The validity if these theoretical circles are also quickly rebuffed by the large numbers of Appletree gardens children who already travel to Langley from outside these areas. In short, the reality already shows parents are happy to travel that distance to Langley despite a closer proximity of Appletree Gardens. The proposal also states that Appletree has more homes in catchment. The 800m circle used by the council will cover between 2/5 to ½ of the Murton gap development equating to approximately 1200-15000 new homes. One of the proposals key points is the commuting distance of the most easterly point of the Appletree gardens catchment. To the east, the furthest point of catchment for Appletree Gardens lies within only 500m of Rockcliffe first school and 600m of Cullercoats primary. Many of the easterly dwellings also sit within 500m of Marine Park first school. Rockcliffe First school has a 1.5 form entry due to a small catchment area and could accommodate the most easterly portion of Appletree catchment in conjunction with filling spare capacity at Marine Park. Alternatively, moving student catchments to Cullercoats primary would further alleviate pressure on the 3 tier system to align PAN to Whitely Bay High. Langley First School has served the community of Monkseaton for almost 75 years, often with multiple generations of the same families passing through the school. It is a cornerstone of our community and generates a respectful ethos that permeates through the area and local school system. Multiple independent businesses have formed immediately around the location (withn 200m) including gyms, sandwich shops, garages, a doctors surgery, pharmacy and cafes. These community businesses, frequented around pick up and drop off times by parents, will suffer significant loss of trade if a move to Appletree was to take place. Appletree Gardens has no such businesses in the surrounding 200m vicinity. Langley First School is served by a large carpark a short walk from the school. This car park is immediately off a major transport route. This has multiple benefits: There is limited traffic impact on and through residential streets, a traffic restricted "school street" has been implemented to promote active travel and child safety at the schools daily entrance and parents requiring a car commute have efficient access. Conversely, no such facilities exist at Appletree Gardens which is centred in a residential area without parking provisions nor any "school street" safety implementations.

There have been countless community reports of traffic issues and dangers in the area for many years. The additional distance to travel for existing Langley parents to get to Appletree has shown by parental survey to increase car usage in order to fulfil their working hours. This will put further strain on a residential area that is not equipped to cope. Importantly, it will place more children in danger of traffic, reduce the health benefits of active travel and expose them to the harmful effects of idling engines at the school gates. Together this positions Langley as a more robust physical location and desirable school to both mitigate against recent low birth rates as well as to benefit from growth from housing development, inward migration or if national birthrates continue to rise. The proposal also speaks of limiting parental choice. A key unanswered question is why, despite Appletree Gardens having a “larger catchment”, “a larger site”, “better financial viability”, does it have a high number of surplus places with a minority of their catchment choosing the school. Indeed, the surplus capacity and reputation of Appletree gardens brings in 61 students from out of NEPA and displaces 63 students from its catchment out of NEPA. Appletree Gardens leadership and governance have been at the helm of this decline and yet, under this current proposal, they will remain in place and unchecked to continue this performance level whilst the higher student attainment fostered by the leadership and governance of Langley First School will be lost. Appletree gardens have provided no reassurance or commitment to accept governors, leadership or ethos from Langley First Schools. If limiting parents’ choice is required, then logic demands that the “more chosen” school is retained i.e. Langley First School. Failing that, a full amalgamation with the closure of both schools and a reopening would give some influence of the Leaderships and governing body of Langley to steer their ethos and successes. An argument is presented from the council on costs stating that that Appletree Gardens is a more financially viable school based on a prediction that it will not enter a financial deficit for several years. These costs have been extrapolated out from budgets that the council had no involvement in setting nor any oversight. It is somewhat simplistic and error prone and has not been subjected to scrutiny for accuracy as confirmed in the parent information sessions. With the hugely damaging consequences of the proposal on children’s education and wellbeing this is highly inappropriate. Langley First School has not yet entered a deficit despite a small number of surplus places. Whilst this is also true of Appletree Gardens, Appletree is eligible for failing rolls funding due to its unacceptable surplus capacity to leverage additional funding from the council to financially prop up it up. How would the financial viability compare if the councils’ subsidies were removed with Appletree Gardens having a larger student surplus places? The UK governments benchmarking reveals that the Appletree gardens site has high priority utility costs greater than 100% of similar schools. This is concerning for onward financial and environmental stability.

Furthermore, no data or models have been presented in the consultation to demonstrate how the closure of Langley First School produces a financially viable solution when merged Appletree Gardens. Considerations would need to be made adjusting failing rolls funding and changes in the proportions of children eligible for pupil premiums. Furthermore, Langley First School has recently been through a period of change with a new Head Teacher who has not yet had fair opportunity to steer the school towards greater financial viability. No detail is given to how all the children could be accommodating in this “merger” as some current year groups at Langley are at or near maximum capacity. Accounting for vital nursery provision, the total number of rooms required within Appletree would exceed the school’s space provisions if class sizes were kept as standard. Adjustments such as removing Library and SEND provisions may be required which would be of huge detriment. Furthermore, unlike Langley, the majority of classrooms in Appletree gardens are smaller than government guidelines and are therefore less suited to high capacity teaching. Similarly, Government guidance is that a hall suitable for use by KS2 children should be 140m2. Appletree has a hall of 130m2, less than the recommendation. Langley has a hall of 192m2. Even if Langley temporarily partitioned 55m2 to provide another teaching space to increase the overall capacity of the building to 12 classrooms, it would only be 3m2 short of the recommended hall size (and still larger than the Appletree hall). Government Strategy is to encourage SEND provision in mainstream schools. By congesting children within the Appletree Gardens site and limiting space that can be utilised for additional needs then SEND provision in mainstream school will be severely impacted. Importantly, The proposal does nothing to address more pressing, larger and longer term issues in first school financial viability across NEPA. Coquet Park has single form entry , Whitley Lodge and Rockcliffe have 1.5 form entry, at PAN of 45, requiring undesirable split year teaching. Coquet represents a particular concern in that it is in debt to >£300K and an annual deficit of approx. £125k. Again, Langley First school has maintained two form entry, single year group teaching, high in-catchment desirability and excellent educational standards without yet entering a deficit. Despite this it is being targeted for closure. Alternative proposals Coquet Park is in close proximity to both Whitely Lodge and Marine Park First schools. An alternative proposal would include closure of Coquet in conjunction with other measures such as utilisation of the school for Special School provision . Closure of Coquet would redistribute students between Whitley Lodge (to allow two form entry) and Marine Park which would, in turn, gradually reshuffle more students to Rockcliffe which also has a 1.5 form entry. Correctly managed and gradually introduced this would present longer term educational stability beyond the end of PFI deals with a reduced impact on children’s education. This also works towards the councils goal to reduce the total PAN

within NEPA even if not doing so entirely. Although the council does not provide sufficient information on all schools in the proposal, Coquet Park's building could provide an excellent location for Special School SEND provision (e.g. Woodlawn). Special school's children primarily arrive and depart in taxis with them currently filtering and congested through residential streets. Coquet is positioned off major roads with well maintained access and parking via Waves Leisure Centre. This provides a better access route for these children compared to their current route through residential streets to their joint site with Langley. The children would also benefit greatly from the leisure facilities at Waves during times where the centre is under utilised. Any required adaptations within the centre would also be available for use by the wider community with additional needs creating an improved resource for disabled adults and SEND children in mainstream schools. It is also on the doorstep of a accessible beach access for greater enrichment. This would retain utility of Coquet Park site without it being vacant and still liable for PFI repayments. This may present an opportunity for Woodlawn to relocate (making more space at Langley First School to accommodate current high year group numbers who would struggle to be accommodated at Appletree Gardens.) Along with the above improving the onward viability of the school system proposed above there are several alternative proposals to the council's that retain Langley First school values, ethos and experience but work towards reducing surplus capacity. Primarily: A merger of Appletree Gardens into Langley First School. i.e. close Appletree Gardens First School and move students to Langley First School site As detailed above, Langley First School provides better future-proofing: Ideally positioned for Murton Gap development, high level of parental choice across both Langley and Appletree catchment (converse situation is true for Appletree) and existing lower surplus capacity. Langley First school is also a more cost effective site with lower utility costs (7% of Appletree gardens according to government financial benchmarking data). Langley First School has larger class room sizes: only two of the proposed 13 Appletree classrooms meet the government guidance of 62m2 for 30 reception children and 55m2 for 30 KS1+. Whereas 10 of the 11 Langley classrooms exceed the guidance. Langley First school has a larger Assembly/PE hall (approximately 45%% larger) as well as a separate dinner hall. Langley has two school fields (one large field contained within the boundary fence and a large "sports day" field across a very quite minor road) as well as two yards for reception and rest of school. Langley is served by a large council car park for commuting parents immediately off a main road without need to navigate residential streets. The entrance to Langley first school is served by a successful flagship "school street" for improved child safety. Langley Leadership have fostered a greater level of student persistent attendance well below regional and national averages. Appletree gardens have, by far, the highest a

persistence absence rate of first schools in NEPA; higher than local and national averages (Langley First school persistence absence rate 5.9%, Appletree gardens 15%). This proposal may require a longer phased movement of students to the Langley site until the high-capacity years have moved to the middle school system. Alternatively, if coupled with a movement of Woodlawn (as detailed above with the closure of Coquet for example) or a reduction in their occupancy then a large capacity school would be realised for current and future proof usage. Langley First school was originally built as a first and middle school on one site: Langley occupies only half the site accommodating almost 300 pupils with the remaining half (a mirror of the first school) being used by Woodlawn. The area used by Woodlawn has an equal sized dining space, hall and an equal number of classrooms An assessment should be performed as to the full utility of that space. Utilising all or just some of the space (even on a temporary basis) for a merged school would eliminate concerns over capacity and loss of provision for specialist SEND space, computer rooms, libraries and dinner hall space. Woodlawn could retain access to the Hydrotherapy and specialist rooms if required and not served better served by Waves as suggested above. Better usage of the Woodlawn space and retaining Langley First on it's site also provides a unique opportunity to provide greater SEND support in mainstream schools with hybrid access to specialist provisions currently existing at Woodlawn. Although a commitment exists for a 3 tier system, the larger site would provide resilience should a change to 2 tier education happen within NEPA as the school site is large enough to serve as a Primary (similar to the school's original conception with first and middle school on one site). If moving Woodlawn to a more suitable site was not deemed feasible as a long term solution then utilising a number of their classrooms and spaces in the short term whilst high capacity year groups move through the system without investment in temporary buildings could be arranged.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:47 PM

Coquet should be closed. I understand that the situation currently is difficult, but once we get to 2032, surely Coquet would make the most sense to close. So many houses are currently being built on the land surrounding Murton Gap - when the majority of these houses are built, surely families that move into these homes will need first school places for their children? Langley First would be in catchment for these places so should therefore remain. I understand the council is facing financial difficulties, but the current proposals seem very short-sighted. With Murton Gap and possible housing being built on the land between West Park and Seaton Sluice, even more places will be required for young children. Young families are very attracted to the local area, so the demand for places will only go up.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:51 PM

I am completely for and back the alternative proposals which have already been submitted by the campaign to fight against the closure of Langley First School. I would also like to comment on the lack of timing which has been given to us as parents as part of this consultation stage to gather information come up with alternative proposals.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:55 PM

General issues with the process ● The initial documentation given to the council's cabinet, which the decision to move to consultation was based upon, contained several inaccuracies, including: ● Langley has a field separated by a public highway, meaning groups of children are escorted 'off site' for each PE/sporting activity and have no access to playing fields for lunch and dinner breaks (This isn't true. The school does in fact have a well-used playing field immediately adjacent to the building, with a separate field across a minor road which is used once a year for sports day. Langley also has an outdoor space in the reception garden, which follows a forest school ethos and is also used for children with SEND as well as a potting garden and an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming) ● The school is in financial deficit (This is incorrect. The school has only predicted a deficit for the year 25/26, for the first time ever and is working with an independent financial advisor to see where the budget can be improved) ● The majority of dwellings [currently in Langley catchment] can access [Appletree] without crossing major roads (This is incorrect. Many of our children would need to cross Seatonville Road and/or Cauldwell Lane) ● There were briefings and reports with headteachers (Whilst there have been meetings, this has been very brief and Headteachers could not include Governors which meant there was little options for them to act or come up with solutions) ● There were also several inaccuracies published in the consultation documents, including (but not limited to): ● Projected pupil numbers ● Deficit forecasting ● Inaccuracies in pupil data at other schools ● There has been no community impact assessment done in relation to the closure of Langley First School. A community impact assessment was done in December 2024 but this was in relation to the Monkseaton High School closure. ● Neither early years provision nor wraparound provision have been considered as part of this consultation ● No governing body or senior manager of 'School's Out' (out of hours provision) at Langley has been contacted as part of external communication. Merger vs closure The campaign's position is that we don't believe Langley is the right school to choose for closure. However, if we cannot persuade the council on this, we would like it to be a true merger. It isn't currently. Under department of education guidance, there are two ways to amalgamate two or more schools: 1. Close one school and move the children to another school 2. Close both (or more) schools and publish a proposal of its intention to do this. This option requires consent from the Secretary of

State and then final approval from the Office of Schools Adjudicator (OSA), not the council. The council argues that this takes decision making away from the local area and is a longer, more complex, statutory process which would lengthen the process and increase uncertainty. The campaign's position is that a true merger is the fairer way to approach this for the following reasons: ● The current consultation has already created divides within our community which are unhelpful. Both schools are good schools, it's not fair to penalise one over the other. A true merger would mean both schools - and most importantly the children - could have an input into a new school's name, ethos, uniform etc and would mean we could keep the best bits from both schools, including staff. It would also make the transition smoother for the children. ● The requirement to ask permission from additional routes (the Secretary of State and then final approval from the Office of Schools Adjudicator) increases the scrutiny over the decision making process, which we see can only be a good thing ● This should be about doing the right thing, not the easier thing. Surely if we want to get this right for our children, we shouldn't be rushing the process. Given Langley isn't yet in deficit, why does it matter that it will take longer? Building space ● The council's consultation document says Appletree "can accommodate 432 pupils, which is more than the amount of both schools combined when future birth rates and admission numbers are adjusted". However, when we checked on the gov.uk website for the capacity of Appletree, the capacity is stated as being 293. The campaign has asked for clarification on this ● As yet, the council has offered no assurance about how the Langley children could be safely accommodated on the site ● Nor has it given us any assurance on class sizes. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, there is a concern amongst us that our children will be placed in larger class sizes, which could have an adverse affect on their education and wellbeing. ● According to the government's school spending comparison tool Appletree is a more expensive building to run. Appletree spends £29 per square metre on utilities, compared to Langley which spends £4 per square metre. Traffic ● No evidence has been provided in the supporting documents in relation to traffic impact as a result of these proposals ● Langley currently closes the street outside school every morning to make it safer for the children. Appletree cannot close the street to cars in the mornings or at collection times due to it being on a bus route. ● Langley also has a free public car park very close by, which Appletree Gardens does not have. ● The assumption appears to be that children will walk to school. ● The parent survey carried out by Friends of Langley asked parents how they currently travel to school: ● 78% (150) said they walk ● 18.3% (35) said they drive ● When asked how they they would travel is their children attended Appletree: ● 55% (104) said they

would drive ● 37.6% (71) said they would walk Finance Within its consultation documentation, the council states: While currently both schools are in surplus (they receive more funding than they spend), Langley First is predicting a deficit (spending more than they receive) in 2026 which is projected to grow to £0.751m by 2028. At the same time Appletree Gardens is predicting it will enter deficit by 2028. School leaders have made changes and worked hard with the Council to make the financial situation better, but because low pupil numbers mean less funding, the situation is not improving. If left unchanged, the risk is that the two schools would continue to grow in deficit, and this in turn would limit their ability to sustain high quality education. Whilst these figures are not inaccurate, they are somewhat misleading. Appletree Gardens is in receipt of additional funding, known as Falling Rolls funding, to help it make up for its surplus places Langley is not in receipt of this funding, as its surplus figure is within the council's acceptable range. The council has not met - nor offered to meet - with the leadership or governing team at Langley to address its forecasted deficit. Children with special educational needs (SEN) ● There are 40 children out of 297 on the SEN register, equating to 13.5%. However, there are an additional 24 children who are receiving additional support following early identification, which takes this figure up to 24%. ● Whilst [redacted] carries the overall responsibility for SEN as SENCO, there are several other key members of staff across school with additional training and roles as both mental health ambassadors and thrive specialists ● Langley offers the following support for children with additional needs: ● The building is all on ground level with ramp access, accessible toilets and a specially adapted changing space with bed for a child with a catheter ● The sensory room has no windows allowing a fully darkened experience if needed, and has a padded wall and floor ● The outdoor space in the reception garden follows a forest school ethos, used for children with SEND through their time at Langley, and there is a potting garden to offer gardening opportunities for small groups of children. ● The teachers offer a lunchtime club away from the dinner hall ● There are three specially adapted spaces - The Nest in Nursery, The Sensory Room (Hive), which offers an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming, and a specifically adapted KS2 space. These spaces allow for breathing space as well as targeted intervention for children who struggle with the demands of the classroom and are well used. ● Every classroom has a 'haven' area which children can use to regulate and re-set. ● The following classroom adaptations are regularly used throughout the school; flexible seating arrangements, visual timetables (both universal and bespoke), use of 'Now and Next', incorporating special interests, movement breaks, 'soft landings' and additional support/intervention for reading. ● The school presents as 'Neurodiversity Affirming' with subtle adaptations to the environment; soft lighting, clear visuals, adapted seating

arrangements, resources for movement and heavy work in place, strategies for regulating emotions throughout ● No guarantees have been given about what, if any, adapted provision, SEN specific places or breakout spaces would be available at Appletree following the closure of Langley ● It is also unclear how all children will be accommodated into classrooms before even considering the need for SEN specific spaces. Appletree was in the process of applying for the development of an Additionally Resourced Provision (ARP) to accommodate SEN but we understand this plan has been put on hold due to this consultation. ● The Inclusive culture and staff expertise have been developed over time at Langley. This culture is authentic and reliant on the staff team – their strong relationships, communication skills, connection and dedication to the children. ● Rather than being viewed as a candidate for closure simply because it is located next to a special school, Langley's position represents a strategic opportunity. Its proximity to Woodlawn Special School allows for dual registration, enabling pupils to access targeted interventions and therapies as needed while continuing to participate in mainstream classes and interact with a diverse peer group. This approach supports the government's key priority of inclusive education, keeping children with additional needs in mainstream settings wherever possible Birth rates This consultation relies heavily on the argument that birth rates are falling. ● Whilst there is no denying the downward trend in birthrates throughout North Tyneside up to 2023, the Office for National Statistics predicts that birth rates will level off from 2026 and then begin to increase again. ● Birth rates within the NEPA have been declining since 2008. However, despite this, the numbers within NEPA schools have been resilient to this downward trend, with the majority of schools* being within the council's 10% acceptable surplus range on average since 2020. ● Internal migration has also not been taken into account for this consultation. Aside from a decline in 2022, the Office for National Statistics shows more young children move into North Tyneside than out of it. Although these statistics don't go down to NEPA level, we do know many families move specifically to the coast to take advantage of the three-tier system. ● The parenting survey conducted by the Friends of Langley showed 58% of respondents (out of 185 responses) moved to this area specifically to send their children to Langley First School, with a further 3% who had been planning to move to the area to send their children to Langley. ● The North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 also contradicts the rationale for closing Langley due to falling birth rates as it states: "Net inward migration from neighbouring areas, primarily Newcastle, helps to sustain the overall working age population and limits the fall in the number of children in the borough" *Appletree Gardens has had a 23% surplus level on average over the last five years.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:56 PM

Do not go ahead with the closure of Langley First School. Find a better solution for the increasing needs of the children in this area.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:58 PM

While the council have previously made a commitment to continuing to support the three tier system, closing a high school, proposing to close both a middle school and a first school goes against this. The council should take this as an opportunity to review the education offering across the borough as a whole, to assess the long-term viability of the three tier system. This feels like further tinkering rather than a long-term sustainable option. The same children would be affected if the three-tier system comes under threat in the future. A number of these children are already having their catchment area middle school taken away at the same time as the closure of their current school. If the closure of Langley goes ahead, affected parents at Langley should be given the opportunity, under an extraordinary round of applications to apply for a new first school, rather than all pupils being moved automatically to Appletree gardens. Parental choice of school is being removed entirely under these proposals, despite what is said in your FAQs. More than that, you are disenfranchising parents who have already made a choice and chosen which school they prefer to send their children to - many children who are in the catchment area for Appletree gardens attend Langley, including my own. That was my preference which you are now removing from me. The data supports this clearly. Proposals which have been rejected by the council should be put out to consultation for the public to comment on. A number of proposals that have been rejected have been done so without the appropriate checks and balances. The finances of each school within NEPA should be analysed independently of the council and school finance teams, with regards to forecasting for the future. Langley is forecast to go into deficit one year earlier than Appletree, however Appletree receives additional funding at the moment due to their low numbers. Langley does not receive this funding and it is not clear how this additional funding is costed into Appletree gardens numbers and if this additional funding is what is stopping them from falling into deficit. A number of school closures have been discounted because of their location, however, most of those schools are within 2 miles of another school, which the statutory guidance says is the reasonable distance for children under eight years of age to travel. Indeed the use of distance with the consultation documents is disingenuous, as you could throw a circle with a diameter of 2 miles over the NEPA and it would cover more than 90% of the area. One of the reasons cited for the closure of Langley was the lack of a playing field, which is not true (maybe it would be a good idea to visit a school before writing reasons why you are going to close it!!), however, Rockcliffe First school does not have a playing field and is within 2 miles of Langley. Yet their lack of facilities hasn’t been considered. Schools like

Rockcliffe with 1.5 form entries also pose other issues around the teaching of mixed year groups. This is not something that is an issue within a two form entry school. While the move to move Woodlawn into a single school is an understandable and admirable one, the Langley school building is not fit for this purpose. Any work needed to upgrade the building will come at substantial cost. Your own FAQs discount the use of the Monkseaton High School building as not being suitable for SEND pupils - ”the building is specifically focused on Key Stages 3 and 4 - ” but the Langley building is designed for EYFS and key stage 1 and 2, but you will bringing older teenage pupils into that building from the existing site off Hartington Road. You can’t have it both ways over the suitability of your existing buildings. Your appalling rate (well below the national average) of processing EHCP applications should show you that the SEND system within the authority is already at breaking point. Our children with SEND DESERVE better - a purpose built building that can meet all of their needs. Rather than a hodge podge of a building that will not be suitable for their needs. The council should consider the real-estate they already have and cost a proposal for a purpose built building against making amendments to existing school infrastructure. The drop in birth-rates is a national issue not just a local one, and the secretary of state has said that there should be national solutions to this rather than local ones. You appear to be pushing ahead at speed without considering the national picture of education. These decisions will have a lasting impact on the children in our community. This is not a decision that should be rushed and if a true merger of the schools can take place, even if it will take longer, due to the need for involvement from the secretary of state, then so be it. Surely it is best to get the decision right rather than quickly. The wrong decision will end up costing our children more in the long run.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:00 PM

ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS THAT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED Rather than closing Langley First School, the council should explore the following alternatives: 1. ADDRESS LANGLEY'S FORECASTED DEFICIT THROUGH SUPPORT, NOT CLOSURE Langley is not currently in deficit - it has only predicted a deficit for 2025/26 for the first time ever and is working with an independent financial advisor. The council has not met with Langley's leadership or governing team to address this forecasted deficit. Appletree Gardens receives additional "Falling Rolls" funding to help with surplus places, but Langley does not receive this funding as its surplus is within the council's acceptable range. How to achieve: The council should meet with Langley's leadership team and independent financial advisor, consider providing Falling Rolls funding or similar support to Langley, and allow Langley to implement its financial improvement strategies. Given Langley isn't yet in deficit, there is time to address this proactively rather than reactively through closure. 2. CLOSE OR

MERGE APPLETREE GARDENS INSTEAD OF LANGLEY The evidence suggests Appletree is the less viable school and closing it would be more logical: Evidence: - Appletree has had a 23% surplus level on average over the last five years (more than double the council's 10% acceptable range), while Langley's surplus is within acceptable limits - Only 44% of catchment children attend Appletree compared to 73% at Langley - 12% of Langley pupils attend from the Appletree Gardens catchment area, showing Langley's wider appeal - Appletree is ranked as the most sensitive school in the entire planning area to falling birth rates (based on analysis of six years of reception offers data mapped against birth rates), while Langley has medium sensitivity, cushioned by its proven popularity and wider draw - In the two highest birth rate years (2020 and 2023 reception intakes), Appletree was the only NEPA first school with surplus spaces in admissions (14 and 6 respectively) - For the two lowest birth rate years (2024 and 2025 intakes), Appletree had the largest portion of surplus places against PAN in the entire area: 32% and 45% respectively - When looking at 2025 admissions data, the last place offered at Langley was nearly 6 miles away compared to 3.6 miles for Appletree, demonstrating Langley's far wider geographic draw and greater ability to attract families from further afield - Appletree spends £29 per square metre on utilities compared to Langley's £4 per square metre, making it more expensive to run - Government data (gov.uk website) shows Appletree's capacity is only 293, not 432 as claimed in council documents - Friends of Langley parent survey (187 responses) found 88.2% said Appletree was not one of their school preferences when they applied for places - When asked which school would be first choice if Langley closed: only 11.2% (21 parents) chose Appletree, while 38.5% chose South Wellfield, 20.3% chose Southridge, and 11.2% chose Marine Park - 43 parents said they would refuse a place at Appletree if offered - When corrected for inaccuracies in the council's pupil projections, Langley's 2030 surplus is projected at 14% (only 4% from acceptable level), whereas Appletree's surplus is projected at 34% How to achieve: If capacity reduction is needed, close or merge Appletree based on popularity, financial stability, demographic resilience, and parental choice. Langley's building is more cost-effective, the school is more popular, and it is more resilient to falling birth rates. This would be the logical choice based on evidence rather than convenience. 3. IMPLEMENT A TRUE MERGER (NOT A CLOSURE) What is currently proposed is not a merger but a closure. Under Department for Education guidance, a true merger involves closing both schools and creating a genuinely new school. How to achieve: Close both schools and establish a new school requiring: - Secretary of State consent and Office of Schools Adjudicator (OSA) approval, not just council approval - Input from both school communities on the new school's name, ethos, uniform, and staffing decisions - Preservation of the best elements from both schools, including staff

expertise - A governance structure that represents both communities equally Benefits: This provides additional scrutiny over decision-making (which can only be a good thing), ensures fairness for all children and families, prevents the current divisive approach that penalises one school over another, and makes transitions smoother by creating something new that all children join together rather than Langley children being absorbed into Appletree. Both schools are good schools - it's not fair to penalise one over the other. The requirement for Secretary of State and OSA approval means this should be about doing the right thing for children, not just the easier or quicker thing for the council. 4. DELAY IMPLEMENTATION UNTIL SMALLER BIRTH-RATE COHORTS ARE IN SCHOOLS Current Year 2 children (who would be Year 4 in 2027) represent the largest cohort moving through the system. All NEPA schools are currently full for this year group except Appletree (with only 2 spaces, we understand). The problem: Implementing the merger in 2027 would create: - 118 children in Year 4 at the merged school with no guarantees on class sizes - No legislation caps class sizes for ages 7+, creating risk of severely overcrowded classrooms - Massive disruption to the largest year groups - Logistical impossibilities for safely accommodating all children in the Appletree building (which the gov.uk website shows has capacity of only 293, not 432) How to achieve: Wait 3-4 years until the smaller birth-rate cohorts are in the schools. This would: - Reduce disruption to children and families - Make capacity management far more feasible - Allow time for proper planning and consultation - Mean smaller class sizes and better educational outcomes - Give time to address Langley's forecasted deficit through support rather than closure Rationale: Given Langley isn't yet in deficit, why does it matter if the process takes longer? Rushing to implement in 2027 appears to be about convenience for the council rather than what is best for children. 5. UTILISE LANGLEY'S STRATEGIC POSITION FOR SEND DUAL REGISTRATION Rather than viewing Langley's proximity to Woodlawn Special School as a reason for closure, it should be developed as a strategic asset for inclusive education. How to achieve: - Create formal dual registration arrangements between Langley First School and Woodlawn Special School - Allow pupils with SEND to access specialist interventions and therapies at Woodlawn while maintaining their mainstream placement at Langley - Enable children to participate in mainstream classes and interact with a diverse peer group while receiving targeted specialist support as needed - Leverage Langley's exceptional existing SEN provision (supporting 24% of pupils - 40 on SEN register plus 24 receiving early identification support) as a foundation for this model - Maintain and enhance Langley's specialist facilities including sensory room, forest school outdoor space, adapted spaces (The Nest, The Hive, KS2 space), and neurodiversity-affirming environment Benefits: This approach: - Supports the government's key priority of inclusive education, keeping children with

additional needs in mainstream settings wherever possible - Benefits both mainstream and specialist provision without compromising either - Creates a model of best practice that could be replicated elsewhere - Provides genuine innovation in SEND provision rather than simply displacing mainstream pupils - Maintains the inclusive culture and staff expertise that have been developed over time at Langley This is far more strategic than the current proposal to displace 300 mainstream children for 32 post-16 SEND students. 6. EXPAND WOODLAWN ONTO A DIFFERENT SITE The current proposal bundles the alleged need to close a mainstream school with the need to expand Woodlawn, effectively creating a false choice: asking the community to accept a suboptimal and unstable mainstream solution in exchange for a desirable SEND solution. Alternative sites for Woodlawn expansion: - Coquet Park First School site: The council acknowledges this school is not financially viable (ended 2024/25 with cumulative deficit of £0.325m, cannot submit budget plan showing return to balance, classified as structural deficit). It is only being retained due to PFI contract until 2032. This site will likely need repurposing in 2032 and could be planned for Woodlawn expansion - Purpose-built accommodation: Design new facilities specifically for specialist SEND provision with appropriate features from the outset - Woodlawn's current site: Explore expansion possibilities on existing site if feasible - Shared facilities: Investigate arrangements with other schools in the area How to achieve: Conduct proper assessment of alternative sites, engage with Woodlawn's leadership about their actual needs and preferences, plan for long-term sustainability rather than quick fixes, and separate the SEND expansion issue from mainstream school organisation to ensure both receive proper consideration. The long-term health of the mainstream school system should not be compromised to solve a logistical problem for SEND provision, however important that provision may be. 7. REDUCE APPLETREE'S PUBLISHED ADMISSION NUMBER (PAN) If surplus places are genuinely the issue driving this proposal, a less disruptive solution exists. How to achieve: Reduce Appletree's Published Admission Number rather than closing an entire school. Appletree's projected surplus of 34% (versus Langley's 14% when council figures are corrected) suggests it should be Appletree's intake that is reduced, not Langley that is closed. This would: - Gradually reduce surplus places as smaller cohorts move through - Avoid the massive disruption of school closure - Maintain parental choice in the area - Allow both schools to continue serving their communities - Be reversible if circumstances change (e.g., Murton Gap development increases demand) 8. ADDRESS THE REAL CAPACITY ISSUE AT WHITLEY BAY HIGH SCHOOL The council's stated concern about WBHS capacity potentially reaching 390 pupils is being used to justify these proposals, but this concern is misplaced. The reality: Based on the council's own methodology and pupil projection data, numbers from current Reception onwards are unlikely to reach 390. The

capacity issue relates to children already in the system - particularly current Year 2 and Year 5 groups - not future pupil projections. How to achieve: Focus solutions on managing current cohort transitions more effectively through: - Temporary capacity solutions for the bulge years already in the system - Working with middle schools on transition planning - Ensuring adequate facilities for the specific year groups affected - NOT closing first schools based on a problem that won't affect future intakes Closing Langley will not solve the WBHS capacity issue because that issue is caused by cohorts already beyond first school age. 9. ACCOUNT FOR MURTON GAP DEVELOPMENT GROWTH The Murton Gap development will see up to 3,000 new homes built between now and 2032. The development proposal estimates a need for an additional 748 primary school places and proposes to build a new two-form entry primary school to provide an additional 420 primary school places. The problem: According to the council's school catchment checker, the development is covered by New York Primary School. However, a considerable proportion of the development would be closer to both Langley and Appletree than to New York. Closing Langley now is extremely short-sighted when significant housing growth and associated demand for school places is planned. How to achieve: - Factor in realistic growth projections from Murton Gap development - Consider that portions of the development are geographically closer to Langley/Appletree catchments - Maintain existing school capacity to accommodate future demand - Recognise that families move to this area specifically for the three-tier system and quality schools like Langley (Friends of Langley survey showed 58% of respondents out of 185 moved to this area specifically to send their children to Langley, with further 3% planning to do so) - Plan for long-term population changes rather than making irreversible decisions based on a temporary dip in birth rates The Office for National Statistics predicts birth rates will level off from 2026 and begin increasing again. North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 states: "Net inward migration from neighbouring areas, primarily Newcastle, helps to sustain the overall working age population and limits the fall in the number of children in the borough." Internal migration shows more young children move into North Tyneside than out of it. Closing schools now based on a temporary birth rate dip ignores these factors. 10. CONDUCT PROPER ASSESSMENTS BEFORE ANY DECISION The current consultation is fundamentally flawed due to missing assessments and inaccurate data. What must be done before proceeding: - Complete a community impact assessment specifically for Langley First School closure (only a general assessment for Monkseaton High School closure was done in December 2024) - Properly assess early years provision impacts (23 children already on Langley nursery waiting list for 2026, 9 for 2027, 1 for 2028) - Properly assess wraparound provision impacts: Schools Out at Langley provides 7:30am-6pm care with flexible booking, day care

from 9 months to 9 years, and holiday provision 8am-5:30pm Mon-Fri all holidays except Christmas. Little Pips at Appletree provides 7:45am-5:30pm (4:30pm for nursery), from age 2 only, and holiday provision 8am-5pm Mon-Thu, 8am-3:30pm Fri. The council has admitted it has not considered this. Friends of Langley survey found 60.5% (115 parents) regularly use Schools Out, with 4.2% using for emergencies. If unavailable: 52.8% don't have alternative plans, 35.6% would be forced to cut work hours - Assess the impact on Appletree's current pupils, particularly those with SEND who would be significantly disrupted by sudden influx of 300 additional children - Correct all inaccurate data in consultation documents regarding Langley's facilities, financial position, travel routes, and projected pupil numbers - Provide transparent, verifiable information on building capacity at Appletree (gov.uk shows 293, council claims 432 - which is correct?) - Provide guarantees on class sizes at any receiving school - Provide guarantees on SEN provision, adapted spaces, and specialist support at any receiving school - Consult on catchment area changes (none currently proposed despite school closures) - Engage with Schools Out governing body and management (not yet contacted according to consultation) - Correct inaccuracies about Appletree's ARP development being put on hold - Provide traffic impact assessment (none provided in supporting documents) How to achieve: Pause the current consultation, conduct these proper assessments, correct the inaccurate data, and then re-consult with complete and accurate information. Making irreversible decisions about children's education based on flawed data is unacceptable. ADDITIONAL CRITICAL POINTS Inaccuracies in Initial Council Documentation: The initial documentation given to the council's cabinet, which the decision to move to consultation was based upon, contained several significant inaccuracies: - False claim about Langley's playing fields and PE provision - Incorrect statement that school is in financial deficit (it is not - only forecasting first-ever deficit for 25/26) - False claim about travel routes and major roads - Misleading financial information (not mentioning Appletree receives Falling Rolls funding while Langley does not) These inaccuracies undermine confidence in the entire consultation process. Why Langley Should Not Be Closed: - NOT in current deficit, only forecasting one for first time in 25/26 - Higher proportion of catchment children attend (73% vs 44%) - More popular with parents (88.2% of surveyed parents did not choose Appletree) - More resilient to falling birth rates (medium sensitivity vs Appletree's high sensitivity) - Wider geographic draw (6 miles vs 3.6 miles for last place offered) - More cost-effective building (£4 vs £29 per square metre on utilities) - Exceptional SEN provision supporting 24% of pupils - Strategic location next to Woodlawn for dual registration opportunities - Active travel initiative with street closure for safety - Strong wraparound care provision with Schools Out Why Appletree Is Less Viable: - 23% average surplus over 5 years (vs council's 10% acceptable range) -

Only NEPA school with surplus places in high birth rate years - Largest surplus in low birth rate years (32% and 45%) - Most sensitive to falling birth rates - Lower catchment retention (44%) - Less popular with parents - Smaller geographic draw - More expensive to run - Capacity confusion (293 vs 432) - ARP development put on hold - Cannot close street for safety due to bus route Multiple viable alternatives exist that would better serve children, families, and the community than the current proposal. The council should explore these alternatives with proper assessments, accurate data, and genuine consultation before making any irreversible decisions about school closures.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:03 PM

: Merge Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School and move pupils from Appletree Gardens to the Langley First School site. Benefits: ● Langley First School is more likely to succeed following the merger; ○ 73% of Langley catchment parents choose Langley in comparison to 44% of Appletree. ○ Projected pupil numbers of the existing schools indicate an average of 26% surplus places at Appletree from 2025-2034 in contrast to 15% for Langley despite Appletree having 44 homes per planned place compared to Langley's 40 homes ○ Appletree is statistically shown to be the NEPA first school most sensitive to falling birth rates, with the current NEPA birth indicating a requirement of 145 children to attend from outside of NEPA (at the reduced 390 NEPA PAN) they will be most at risk of being undersubscribed and susceptible to falling into deficit. ○ There is a risk to the financial stability of the middle schools and Whitley Bay High School if the first school places aren't filled and the location of Langley at the edge of the NEPA catchment and it's ease of accessibility by car along with nearby parking provides a strong advantage over Appletree ○ The parental survey undertaken by Langley highlights the points above with the following responses; - 73% of respondents in catchment moved to the area for Langleyh - 88% of respondents did not choose Appletree as any of their preferences when they applied for a school place - If Langley was not an option only 11% of respondents said Appletree would be their first choice - 33% of respondents would consider home schooling their children if Langley were to close ○ The persistent absence rate at Appletree is 15%, Langley persistent absence rate is 5.9% (the North Tyneside average is 13.7%). Absence data is a critical indicator of pupil engagement and school effectiveness, particularly under Ofsted's updated inspection framework which has been recently broadened to include grading of 'attendance and behaviour' ○ "Schools Out Northern" at Langley First School provides childcare services from 7.30am to 6.00pm from term time from the age of 9 months and allow for flexible booking, Appletree Little Pips provides childcare from age 2 years, 7.45am – 5.30pm (4.30pm for nursery children), this is a significant time difference for working parents and

could even cause a requirement to change employment ● Appletree Gardens Building is only more suitable than Langley First School for two years; ○ The larger number of classrooms at Appletree is only an advantage during the merged year groups stage, subsequent to this, the building has higher running costs of circa £44,000 in comparison to Langley circa £7,000 and lower space efficiency for the return to a 300 PAN school. ○ Only two of the proposed 13 Appletree classrooms meet the government guidance of 62m2 for 30 reception children and 55m2 for 30 KS1+. Whereas 10 of the 11 Langley classrooms exceed the guidance. ○ Government guidance recommends a hall of a minimum 140m2 for PE and assemblies for KS2, Appletree assembly hall is below guidance at 130m2, Langley has an assembly hall of 190m2. Both have separate suitable dining halls.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:03 PM

I think you need a Citizen's Assembly comprised of parents, students, teachers and community members to look at the evidence around the decline in birth rate, the demographic projections around any new housing developments, and the financial as well as educational implications of prospective closures and mergers. We need to see the evidence the council is examining in order to be able to give informed opinions.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:11 PM

The proposal outlines a phased transition to a single site at Langley First School, through the legal merger of Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School to create one unified first school. This merger would establish a single head teacher, governing body, and DfE number. During a three-year transitional period, the newly formed school would operate across both existing sites, allowing for a gradual consolidation process. The PAN for Reception would be 30 pupils at each site, resulting in a total annual intake of 60 pupils across the merged schools. Implementing the merger over three years would enable larger year groups to progress naturally to middle school, ensuring that the eventual move to the single Langley site can take place smoothly, with manageable pupil numbers and without causing overcrowding or the loss of specialist teaching areas.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:13 PM

1. Wait for bumper years to pass through schools (current year 2,3 and 4) where merging is going to significantly affect pupils education, then close conquet park after 2032 as you've said this school is not financially viable as a one form entry first school. Then either reduce Marine, Rockcliffe or Whitley lodge numbers to reduce to make up to 60 (once marine park out of PFI). I'm concerned that you're going to reduce spaces now to 390 then in 2032 coquet park may need to close if not financially viable then will be 30 places short within area.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:16 PM

There should be an urgent review due to the inaccuracies and lack of consideration to key issues such as wrap around care and impact on the local community. It is written in black and white that a one form entry school is not financially viable yet coquet park which is in debt (langley isn't) has not been considered. This should be the school to close and repurposed for the special school. Closing a popular school but keeping the school open which is the least popular in the area makes no sense! Appletree isn't bigger, langley is not in deficit and parents will not choose to send their kids to Appletree on the whole so this will lead to untenable surplus and closure of appletree and then a huge area unserviced by first school and not enough first school places to support whitley bay high!! Very poor decision making but this happens when you don't gather the correct information.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:25 PM

Instead of closing Langley First School and expanding Appletree Gardens, I suggest merging Appletree Gardens with Langley First School. Moving the entire operation of Langley First School to the Appletree Gardens site. Langley First School would need to agree to a ‘Firm Commitment’ to adopt the best of both schools on the Appletree site including: A change of school name A staff consolidation between Langley and Appletree gardens A change of uniform A change of governance A new ethos incorporates the best of both school This proposal will allow the potential to retain some of Langley’s ethos, governance, and branding, preserving valued elements from both schools while minimising disruption to staff morale, children and communities. The current proposal loses all of what makes Langley Langley. This is a fairer solution for both parents and children, enabling a smoother transition between schools through the involvement of familiar staff which otherwise would be lost under the current proposals. This provides enhanced parental appeal when compared to the current proposal: A new school blending Langley’s high parental preference (75%+ uptake) with Appletree’s larger facilities could attract more families from both catchments, reducing surplus places (currently 14% at Appletree, projected to worsen) and mitigating deficits faster than a standard merger. Potential for higher enrolment (when compared to the council’s proposal) would increase funding, addressing projected deficits and supporting quality education. The proposal aligns with the Council’s aim to cap NEPA First School places at 390, ensuring smooth transitions to aligned Middle Schools and Whitley Bay High School (390 places). The proposal allows for Woodlawn expansion, again aligning with the council's proposal If a merger has to happen, I believe that it is in everyone's interest to have an amicable and fair arrangement for both schools involved. The leadership of Appletree Gardens First School have now had five weeks to engage with Langley First School in an effort to reach an amicable arrangement, this has not happened. I am

	hugely worried that the leadership there does not appear to be prioritising the wellbeing of all children involved in this unfortunate process or the concerns of Langley parents. Therefore a 'Firm Commitment' could only reasonably be provided by Langley First School, whose leadership has consistently shown that the wellbeing of all affected children is at the centre of their decision-making.
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 10:26 PM	Leave it as it is. There is nothing wrong with having flourishing schools. Why fix it if it isn't broken?
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 10:28 PM	While I'd demand that Langley not to close, I can only see one strong alternative that would suit both schools, the council, and the community in a way that makes sense for the long term, and not just the short, should the "merger" be inevitable. As it stands, the current proposals do not feel thought through enough, which is not a comfort to the parents of either school. Phased transition to a single site at Langley: This proposal creates a single legal school entity (by merging Appletree into Langley) effective from September 2026. This new school would operate across both the Appletree and Langley sites for a three-year transitional period before fully consolidating onto the Langley site in September 2029. This meets council objectives, secures an easier transition, utilises a stronger site, and is more cost effective.
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 10:31 PM	First of all, you have not provided a textbox for me to explain why I disagree with the proposals. I want to express just how strongly I am opposed to the current proposals for the following reasons: 1. The information in the consultation has been inaccurate in many areas throughout the process, including but not limited to, the size of the buildings, the outside space available to children, the phonics programme at each school (which took over a week to correct), the projected numbers in the coming years the distance children would have to travel and the fact that there are main (and often dangerous) roads in the area, the financial position of the school. It is unreasonable and frankly, disgraceful that the public and elected officials are being asked to share their opinions based on so many inaccuracies. 2. You have failed to provide enough information to prepare evidenced alternative proposals. A large number of Freedom of Information requests have not been responded to within the legal time-frame, and before the end of the consultation. Questions and concerns submitted via our ward councillors have also gone unanswered. 3. You have unfairly linked the lack of space at Woodlawn, with the issue of having too many first school places. It is unreasonable to lump these two issues together - the needs of one set of children is being addressed at the expense of the needs of

another (larger) group of children. I don't dispute the need for more space at Woodlawn, but I do object to this being part of the proposal to close a successful and well-loved first school. 4. Closing Langley goes against parental choice in the area, closing a school that is more stable than others in the area in terms of pupil numbers and less sensitive to the drop in birth rates. The issue with the numbers of children in the NEPA 3 tier system is caused by the children already in the system, not with new children due to enter over the next few years. Rushing to close a successful, inclusive and popular school is unnecessary and hasty. Parents (including me, for my pre-school age child) are not going to suddenly choose Appletree Gardens, especially following the way the headteacher has cut all lines of communication with the Langley community. This proposal is going to make the least successful first school in the area even more at risk of falling rolls - the years of overcrowding immediately following the transfer of pupils from Langley will prevent parents from wanting to choose Appletree, damaging its stability further. 5. Langley First School is hugely successful at working with children with SEND. The school is exceptional at meeting the needs of children within a mainstream setting and reducing the demand for EHCPs. The reason Langley has lower levels of EHCPs is because the school is so good at mainstream inclusion, not because children at Langley have lower than average needs. 6. Coquet Park First School has huge and unsustainable levels of debt. You say you are stuck paying for the school due to the PFI, but that doesn't mean it should stay open at the expense of a school that is NOT CURRENTLY IN DEBT and has not had a chance to prevent its projected deficit. 7. The Murton Gap development is not currently within the Langley catchment, but only because those houses were not there when the catchments were drawn. Phase 2 of the development is to build houses DIRECTLY behind Langley First School. Families are not going to choose a primary school over a mile away when there is a first school just behind their house. It's incredibly short sighted to close a school next door to a large housing development, especially when the numbers of children in NEPA is dropping to a level which risks destabilising Whitley Bay High School. It's irrelevant that you believe the numbers of children generated by this development will not be significant. It is important however that families moving into the development have a school within walking distance, which they will not if you close Langley. Here are my proposals for alternatives which would be better than the current ridiculous proposal. I have ranked them in order of preference and I understand that the versions of these proposals with more details have been submitted by other people: 1. Delay the proposals by 2 years, to allow the largest year groups through first school, reducing the impact on these children. Allow nursery and reception intakes at Langley during this period and then move Appletree children to Langley, closing the less popular school, and allowing Woodlawn to move to Appletree (and potentially also

Monkseaton Middle School next door). Some of the additional space left by Woodlawn would then allow Langley to expand its Early Years provision, which would be very popular with local communities. The space available at Langley is actually more suitable than at Appletree - the school hall is significantly bigger and nearly all classroom spaces are bigger than at Appletree. 2. Close Coquet Park First School as it is a financially unsustainable school, with a one form entry, which you state in your own consultation documents that you do not support as a model for schools. This building could be used for alternative provision - perhaps children or young adults with SEMH. Its location next to Waves and the beach would be ideally suited for children with this kind of needs. Alternatively you could move the Woodlawn children who use the space at Marden High School there. Reduce the PAN at another Marine by 30 or at Appletree by 15 and Langley by 15 to allow for an ARP or dual registration for some children at Woodlawn 3. Use the position of Langley and Woodlawn on the same site strategically and create a partnership between the two schools, which could be a regional leader for inclusive education - children could be dual registered or part of an ARP. This would also require the closure of another First school, but as stated above, the rush for this is unnecessary, due to the low numbers of children due to enter schools over the next 5 years. 4. Allow for a true amalgamation of Langley and Appletree, with a new identity and shared governing body. This would allow for better community cohesion. Delaying the process for 2 years would give more time for this process to be carried out, with community support to strengthen your application to the DfE and OSA. A delay would also allow the biggest year groups to complete first school without disruption, and would then ensure plenty of space for the move to Langley, rather than Appletree, a building with larger classrooms, more suitable for early years.

Screen Name Redacted

11/12/2025 10:34 PM

I'm a parent not a policy maker so my suggestion isn't qualified with years of political, budget or relevant legal experience, however I find the council's proposal short-sighted and it's rationale for closing a Langley lacking in detail. The Council's proposal is a short-term fix for what is a broader problem nationwide with declining birthrates, cost of living pressures and a lack of investment in the North East. The timelines proposed by the council don't take into account a longer-term view to maintain parent/carer choice, attract more people to the area and maintain quality educational standards. Instead of this, the proposal seems solely focused on forecasted deficits yet to eventuate and concerning rather than unacceptable surplus places, and is premature. While I agree that SEND students at Woodlawn should have the opportunity to continue to thrive and expand, this should not be at the expense of a School that has operated for over 70 years, has high educational and student well-being standards, has excellent

and well-loved staff and is a much-loved part of the Whitley Bay area.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:44 PM

Alternative Solution 1: Merge Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School and move pupils from Appletree Gardens to the Langley First School site. This would be my preferred solution to the issue, Langley First School is the more popular option for a school with 73% of catchment parents choosing Langley compared to only 44% of Appletree Gardens catchment parents choosing Appletree Gardens. This is further backed up by a larger projected surplus at Appletree than at Langley, despite the Appletree catchment having more homes per planned place than Langley. The ethos and curriculum at Langley First School is hugely popular and successful and should be preserved, especially its strong inclusion and SEND provision for the local area. This is clear in the significantly lower than average persistent absence rate at Langley of 5.9% (compared to the Appletree rate of 15% and the North Tyneside average of 13.7%). Many parents move to the area to access Langley First School and many do not choose Appletree as one of their three choices. It is not a popular choice and is often undersubscribed and reliant on out of catchment children to remain open. There is a risk to the financial stability of the middle schools and Whitley Bay High School if the first school places aren't filled and the location of Langley at the edge of the NEPA catchment and its ease of accessibility by car along with nearby parking provides a strong advantage over Appletree. As a current Langley parent, living within 1 minute of the school, I would struggle to walk my children to school at Appletree and would also be very concerned at driving and adding to the already overly congested roads during the school run, not to mention to the vehicle restrictions being put in place around Appletree. The facilities at Appletree are not suitable to be the location of one school. While there is a larger number of classrooms, this is only of use during the "merging" stage. More of a concern is the fact that only two of the proposed 13 Appletree classrooms meet the government guidance of 62m2 for 30 Reception children and 55m2 for 30 KS1+ children. In contrast, 10 of the 11 Langley classrooms meet this government guidance. Additionally, the Appletree assembly hall is under the size in the government guidance, while Langley's hall is significantly larger than the guidance. When considering finances, it is also important to note that keeping Langley open rather than Appletree would mean annual running costs of £7000 per year rather than the £44000 per year it costs to run Appletree. This would also address the major concerns about the accessibility of wraparound care. Schools Out at Langley provide an exemplary and flexible childcare service, which one of my children has attended and known the staff at since age 1. There is a big question as to whether this would be available at Appletree which would have a significant impact on working parents. Even if the capacity were there, the hours are shorter and with greater travel

time involved to Appletree this would have an impact on my working day. With Langley remaining open, this would allow continued access to this essential childcare service. While this solution would not provide more space on the same site for Woodlawn, using a school site designed for 300 children for a small fraction of that to expand Woodlawn is not space efficient and would significantly disadvantage the 300 current students and their families in order to provide an easy solution for a much smaller number. Alternative Solution 2: Langley Inclusion Hub This proposal is a forward-thinking, federation-based approach that aligns with long-term demographic trends and upcoming changes to other schools in the area. It advocates for a strategic reduction in Pupil Admission Numbers (PAN) across the local school system and repurposes the Langley First School site into a specialist Inclusion Hub. This hub would be created by formally federating Langley First School with the co-located Woodlawn Special School, serving both mainstream pupils and those with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND). This proposal would deliver the NEPA-wide reduction to 390 by reducing admissions at both Langley and Appletree from 2027. The PAN at both schools would be reduced to 45. This cuts the pair's capacity from 120 to 90 (-30) now, with the remaining -30 anticipated to be achieved through subsequent NEPA-wide adjustments, subject to consultation - for example, a future PAN review at Marine Park (which has previously operated at 75 PAN) and/or reorganisation aligned to Coquet's 2032 PFI breakpoint given its structural deficit. This keeps options open while matching actual cohort sizes. Langley and Woodlawn would be formally federated to share governance and leadership. This would allow the community to maintain a mainstream base at Langley alongside specialist facilities so pupils can access the right support on one campus, with clear pathways into mainstream lessons for all students, where appropriate. As part of this proposal, an ARP would open at Langley (Phase 1 c.12 places, scalable to 16-24) with specialist classrooms, intervention/sensory space and hygiene facilities. Pupils are on Langley's roll with timetabled inclusion and, where appropriate, dual/part-time arrangements with Woodlawn. This would be in line with the government's desire for SEND inclusion in mainstream schools rather than in special schools where possible. This proposal would leverage the unique co-location of Langley and Woodlawn to offer a full spectrum from mainstream to specialist support, mirroring successful UK co-located models and creating a North Tyneside Centre of Excellence for Inclusion. It would increase the local capacity for SEND need and reduce the reliance on costly out-of-borough placements by delivering specialist places with mainstream access on one campus, while simultaneously preserving Langley's popular, high-quality mainstream offer and supporting Appletree, which maintains community choice and walkable access. Furthermore, it is a financially sustainable model with correctly sized PANs that reflect local demand. The ARP places would attract

appropriate funding and shared estate and leadership would reduce capital and running costs versus a wholesale move/expansion. The move also keeps both sites open and avoids concentrating 403 pupils onto a single site in 2027, smoothing class sizes and transitions. This proposal would also maintain access to wraparound care. Schools Out at Langley provide an exemplary and flexible childcare service. There is a big question as to whether this would be available at Appletree which would have a significant impact on working parents. Even if the capacity were there, the hours are shorter and with greater travel time involved to Appletree this would have an impact on my working day. With Langley remaining open, this would allow continued access to this essential childcare service. Alternative Solution 3: Create a single legal school entity (by merging Appletree into Langley) effective from September 2026. This new school would operate across both the Appletree and Langley sites for a three-year transitional period before fully consolidating onto the Langley site in September 2029. Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School would legally merge to form one school with one headteacher, one governing body, and one DfE number. Initially, between Sept 2026-July 2029, the school would operate across two campuses: the Langley site and the Appletree site, to allow the large "bulge" cohorts (currently in Years 2 and 3) to move through and exit the school before the sites are physically consolidated The PAN for Reception would be set at 30 for each site, for a total intake of 60 pupils per year across the merged school. After the three-year transition, the “bulge” cohorts will have moved to middle school and the total school roll will have reduced to a manageable size (approx. 320-330 pupils). All pupils and staff will then be consolidated onto the Langley First School site and the Appletree Gardens site would then be fully vacated and available for the council to proceed with the planned expansion of Woodlawn School. This plan still achieves the council's key objectives of creating a single 60 PAN first school for the area and freeing up the Appletree site for the expansion of Woodlawn, just on a slightly delayed (but more stable) timeline. By delaying the merger by two years, the largest cohorts will have moved on, meaning the consolidated school will open with a manageable pupil roll (estimated ~323-325 based on current data) that fits the capacity of the Langley site without overcrowding or the loss of specialist teaching areas. This proposal moves the unified school to the Langley site, which has shown stronger parental preference and greater resilience to fluctuating birth rates. This ensures better long-term sustainability. It avoids the “double move” scenario of merging onto the Appletree site only to face immediate overcrowding and subsequent surplus. Staff and pupils have a clear two-year window to prepare for the final move. The proposal is cost-effective, avoiding the significant capital expenditure that would be required to temporarily (and inadequately) expand the Appletree site to accommodate 403 pupils, only for that space to become redundant

within a few years. This model also allows the school to access specific split-site funding from the local authority, making this transitional period financially viable. The facilities at Appletree are not suitable to be the location of one school. While there is a larger number of classrooms, this is only of use during the “merging” stage. More of a concern is the fact that only two of the proposed 13 Appletree classrooms meet the government guidance of 62m2 for 30 Reception children and 55m2 for 30 KS1+ children. In contrast, 10 of the 11 Langley classrooms meet this government guidance. Additionally, the Appletree assembly hall is under the size in the government guidance, while Langley’s hall is significantly larger than the guidance. When considering finances, it is also important to note that keeping Langley open rather than Appletree would mean annual running costs of £7000 per year rather than the £44000 per year it costs to run Appletree. This proposal would also maintain access to wraparound care. Schools Out at Langley provide an exemplary and flexible childcare service. There is a big question as to whether this would be available at Appletree which would have a significant impact on working parents. Even if the capacity were there, the hours are shorter and with greater travel time involved to Appletree this would have an impact on my working day. With Langley remaining open, this would allow continued access to this essential childcare service. Alternative Solution 4: Merging Appletree Gardens with Langley First School by moving the entire operation of Langley First School to the Appletree Gardens site. Langley First School would agree to a ‘Firm Commitment’ to adopt the best of both schools on the Appletree Gardens site including but not exclusive to the following conditions: a change of school name, a staff consolidation between Langley and Appletree gardens, a change of uniform, a change of governance, a new ethos which incorporates the best of both schools. This proposal supports community and staff integration, allowing the potential to retain some of Langley’s ethos, governance, and branding, preserving valued elements from both schools while minimising disruption to staff morale, children and communities. The council's current proposal loses all of what makes Langley Langley. It offers a fairer solution for both parents and children, enabling a smoother transition between schools through the involvement of familiar staff which otherwise would be lost under the current proposals. It has enhanced parental appeal when compared to the current proposal given that Langely is the more popular school and alsol aligns with the Council’s aim to cap NEPA First School places at 390, ensuring smooth transitions to aligned Middle Schools and Whitley Bay High School (390 places). The proposal allows for Woodlawn expansion, again aligning with the council's proposal. The proposal remains in the Local Authority control - this is a benefit as it will be more attractive to the council and mitigates the potential for the proposal to be rejected by secretary of state or the Schools Adjudicator. It could persuade Appletree Gardens leadership to the table to agree to a fair

and amicable merger, as it should be noted they are currently refusing to engage on the matter. The facilities at Appletree are not suitable to be the location of one school. While there is a larger number of classrooms, this is only of use during the “merging” stage. More of a concern is the fact that only two of the proposed 13 Appletree classrooms meet the government guidance of 62m2 for 30 Reception children and 55m2 for 30 KS1+ children. In contrast, 10 of the 11 Langley classrooms meet this government guidance. Additionally, the Appletree assembly hall is under the size in the government guidance, while Langley’s hall is significantly larger than the guidance. When considering finances, it is also important to note that keeping Langley open rather than Appletree would mean annual running costs of £7000 per year rather than the £44000 per year it costs to run Appletree. This proposal would also maintain access to wraparound care. Schools Out at Langley provide an exemplary and flexible childcare service. There is a big question as to whether this would be available at Appletree which would have a significant impact on working parents. Even if the capacity were there, the hours are shorter and with greater travel time involved to Appletree this would have an impact on my working day. With Langley remaining open, this would allow continued access to this essential childcare service.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:54 PM

A formation of a federation between Woodlawn, Langley and Appletree. A Woodlawn and Langley shared site, expanded SEND services for Langley and a nursery services, reception; a slightly expanded site Appletree Gardens. Optimises use of all of costing assets with some small upgrades for safeguarding. No parts of any of the sites can be sold off by the council (ie fields currently highlighted on call for sites) for development.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:54 PM

Two suggetsions (read on for more): - ‘Rebranded’ Amalgamation - Coquet Phased Closure No matter the outcome, THE COUNCILS CURRENT PLAN REQUIRES A DELAY OF AT LEAST A YEAR. 120 children in one year at a school designed for 60 per year is completely unmanageable, especially in class bases which don’t fit current size guidelines (see above answer). The welfare and education of the children at the school are at stake as they’ll be crammed into unfit surroundings. The least acceptable outcome is a one year delay. Anything other than this would be a dereliction of duty by anyone within the council who claims to care for any child. They would clearly not do this to their own, so why is mine different? This issue has been created by short term planning on behalf of the local authority (LA). The decision to shut Monkseaton High School (while understandable with its unmanageable deficit) has created the 390 PAN issue at Whitley Bay Hish School (WBHS). Thankfully as birthrates have dropped as it means their issue can be resolved. I

believe the current proposal is short sighted, misses a key issue and does not benefit the region in the long run. “Rebranded Amalgamation” The main issue with any LA plan is the Appletree reception intake issue. Across the last 11 years, this is the % of reception intake against their PAN: 2025 – 55% 2024 – 60% 2023 – 90% 2022 – 63% 2021 – 85% 2020 – 77% 2019 – 88% 2018 – 98% 2017 – 70% 2016 – 98% 2015 – 100% Compared to Langley: 2025 – 77% 2024 – 88% 2023 – 100% 2022 – 78% 2021 – 80% 2020 – 100% 2019 – 102% 2018 – 100% 2017 – 97% 2016 – 100% 2015 – 100% Only in 2021 has Appletree had a higher intake than Langley. It is the lowest out of every NEPA school across every single year (bar 2021 against Langley). Even when you look at catchment (as I stated in the how will this effect you answer), Langley has a 66% catchment capture against Appletree’s 52% in the previous 11 years. The data shows parents aren’t picking Appletree. This creates a drastic issue and misstep created by the LA with their plan. As local births are projected to fall, there will not be enough children within NEPA to fill 390 spaces. Births attributing to reception applications from NEPA for the next few years are as such: 26/27 - 253 27/28 - 258 28/29 - 240 Even attributing for migration or out of catchment admissions, admissions are likely to be between 300 and 350, not the 390 the council needs. This leads the LA to an issue it hasn’t taken into account. As above, when there are less students than the PAN parental choice becomes more important. Parents will be able to move school catchments easily due to more spaces within first schools, picking the schools they want. The data shows, APPLETREE WILL NOT FILL ITS ROLL. I’m fairly certain it will never happen. Even when the whole NEPA region was full the past 11 years, Appletree filled its roll only ONCE. This leads to the continued issue it has now, as Appletree will continue to build on it’s projected deficit. This is made far worse when extra students are moved from Langley into Appletree as per the LA plan, and then the excess space created leads to grant issues in any algorithms the LA has. This deficit on top of the continued Coquet Park deficit (more to follow) will cripple the LA and its schools. Another issue comes when out of catchment parents don’t want to send their children to NEPA in worry they won’t get into Whitley Bay High School. All this combined means the council need to think carefully about next steps to preserve the image and health of NEPA school system. I therefore propose one of two options for a rebrand. MOVE APPLETREE GARDENS TO LANGLEY, or a TRUE MERGER (amalgamation). With either option, a new name is created (Langley Gardens perhaps?) As shown above, Langley is more popular with parents and has a larger square footage. The issue is with Langley’s deficit. As per Pre-16 grand funding, there are major issues being created by the LA which could help Langley move out of a deficit. Langley has fallen way way way behind the rest of the NEPA region on grants, creating a deficit that feels artificially augmented. The below is the percentage growth in

'Pre & Post-16 Grants' from the LA over the last five years (I took all financial data and modelled from gov.uk): South Wellfield First School – 27% growth Marine Park First School – 21% growth Rockcliffe First School – 20% growth Coquet Park First School – 22% growth Southridge First School – 21% growth Whitley Lodge First School – 20% growth Appletree Gardens First School – 32% growth Langley First School – 11% growth The LA controlled algorithm is giving Langley a shortfall in funding compared to elsewhere in NEPA. The lower amount in comparison to the rest of the first schools seems extremely unrealistic considering its high intake until the last two years. The Average increase is 23%, and if Langley received this it would have received another £159,523 last year. This would take it out of deficit this year as the revenue reserves would be far superior. The increase over the past year at Langley was actually only 4%, while Appletree was 15%. This is unexplainable when the year before this (when funding is surely calculated) Langley had a full reception intake, while Appletree didn't. Still, all schools have seen large increases in funding while Langley falls inexplicably behind. With a closure of Appletree, due to Langley being fuller (as proven by the parental choice above, over a prolonged period) this funding would be reallocated more evenly, which along with other money making initiatives would contribute to Langley receiving higher grants. As Langley is due to lose around £200,000 a year (as projected by the LA), even with conservative estimates a more understandable Pre-16 Grant would fill at least £100,000 of this. The next consideration would be wrap around, nursery and early years provision. This brings Appletree over £100,000 a year and is something that could easily be incorporated at Langley (and something I broached with the Langley head this morning at a meeting, something he was keen to explore). Langley nursery is currently two rooms which have been combined to one large one. Even if these rooms were separated again to create two, they would both be larger than the two current nursery spaces at Appletree. There is also Schools Out which could be taken internal instead of an external company, creating more space and funding avenues again. This would take the 15 hours a week at nursery to 30 hours possible, drastically helping in the above grants also. Lastly, with a one year delay Langley has the space to fit Appletree students within it. The LA's projection of not fitting into Langley is only applicable if it happens in 2027. This, as already stated, is the worst possible time to do this due to the size of the current year 2 cohort (99% full across year, only Appletree has space for more students). All these ideas combined create a proven MORE POPULAR SCHOOL, WITH LARGER BUILDING AND A SCHOOL WITH NO DEFICIT ISSUES. This I believe is better for the future of schooling in NEPA saving popular schools, while also getting ready for any intake from Murton Gap. This is not in current consideration, but Langley will be the closest school to the development in NEPA and most likely a popular way to get to WBHS. --- If the council ignores these facts and

Appletree is to remain, and Langley to close, a true merger is a must. The LA MUST reach out to the DfE and request the closure of two schools and a ‘new’ created or risk a deficit nightmare in future. Any basic look at previous parental choice proves this logic. It’s unfortunate but fairly undeniable. I am personally not against this happening anyway but on the larger Langley site. A true merger, where both schools are closed and a ‘new one’ created can be sold as the ‘best of both.’ Creating a ‘super school,’ ‘a new modern ethos,’ ‘providing the best of both through consultation with parents and teachers.’ Teachers can apply from both schools, a new governance structure created, a head teacher chosen through application and an ethos that can straddle both schools. This is fair, and most of all shows an ability to listen and work to create a better future for children. This can then be sold as a new space (even within an old), which can be explained as a compromise as part of this consultation. Without it, I fear for the future of schooling in NEPA. With it, this can create a school which better prepares itself for low birth rates into the future while showcasing strength. Both Appletree and Langley will be hurt after the optics of this whole consultation and this is needed. As well, a years delay creates time to get the largest cohort (current year 2) out of the first school system and gives time to implement anything needed with the creation of this school. This is a compromise I believe will work financially, logistically and will have parents blessing. While the initial Langley building proposal is a more preferable outcome for the region (even as a new school) the alternative at Appletree could work is sold correctly to help with its intake. --- COQUET PARK PHASED CLOSURE Let’s all be honest, the major issue in NEPA is Coquet Park. A current revenue reserve of -£324,966 and a projected deficit of -£127,435 this year, on top of a PFI contract that can't be stopped without major financial issues. This is unsustainable and in 2032, when the said PFI contract is finished this will need rectifying. Unfortunately, as I show in the other answer (how does it affect you), birth rates will be about to increase. We need a more resilient NEPA yet we will have one where Coquet Park can no longer close due to lack of space throughout first schools and the deficit will be a burden to all schools. An alternative I propose is shutting Coquet Park in summer 2032, but a phased plan. The building could be allocated for other things from this date (6th form, Woodlawn 6th form, apprenticeship training, whatever is needed) but I will aim to show how best to manage a structured closure, while protecting against an inevitable increase in births. The main issue is where to allocate a cohort of children with a closure like this. A well-managed way of doing this would be to utilise the closest school who is also part of their PFI contract. If Coquet Park can close in July 2032, we need space for their children with as little disturbance as possible. If they would agree, Marine Park could lower its PAN to 60 in 2027, in 2032 they can take every child that was in Coquet Park in one big intake on top of their current roll. This would then increase the

PAN back to 90 for Marine Park as of September 2033. It could actually happen sooner due to space within the school and it's capacity but this is the cleanest way in terms of roll out. For parental choice, I believe this works. Parents can choose Coquet Park knowing the date they would move across to Marine Park. As the schools are only 670 meters apart it fits with the current council plans around Langley/Appletree as a similar distance is mentioned as appropriate to the LA. In terms of catchment alignment between Coquet Park and Marine Park, the previous combined 6 years of reception intake would be: 2025 – 84 2024 – 70 2023 – 92 2022 – 103 2021 – 94 2020 – 95 The catchment would only slightly need to be redrawn to lower intake, most likely to help increase the catchment of Whitley Lodge and reception intake to help in their current deficit issues (due to be -£73,000 end of this financial year). The council then only need to reduce 30 places to fit their 390 PAN. I would suggest Appletree and Langley move to 45 PAN each. While the council state this is unsustainable, they currently are at these levels of reception intake and a smaller PAN leads to less funding struggle. This will then keep two buildings which can increase capacity in future years when births begin to increase. This plan will take careful management and will have slightly higher short term costs but is a far longer term view which will create a better future for education in NEPA than the current short sighted plan. --- If the LA would like to see any of my workings please contact Friends of Langley through the school and name the suggestions. They can reach me and I can then get any data I have compiled to you. Thank you for your considerations.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:55 PM

Focus on other unnecessary spending which the labour government have wasted money on. Stop targeting children.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:58 PM

I emphatically oppose the proposed closure and merger of Langley First School with Appletree Gardens, I have serious concerns about the accuracy, transparency, and fairness of the consultation process. 1. Flawed Consultation Process I believe the proposal is rushed, contains errors and missing data, and fails to provide transparent source evidence for decision-making. Access to council data was restricted during the start of the preconsultation, confirmed by the council's own information governance team upon requesting access to disclosure logs. The consultation conflates multiple issues, including birth rates, PFI obligations, high school capacity and SEND provision. 2. Personal and Educational Impact My family's choice of Langley First School was deliberate, and was a major factor in our choice of house having moved from central Newcastle after the birth of our first child. The school's ethos, kind and caring environment whilst maintaining high educational standards, made this our first

choice of school. Closure would harm my child's education due to loss of staff, community, and morale—potentially forcing us to homeschool as we would not consider a move during the remainder of his early school years education. 3. Inaccurate Data on Birth Rates and Housing The council's case relies heavily on falling birth rates, ignoring that birth rates are cyclical and have started to rise again nationally. Langley is adjacent to major new housing developments, making it better placed for future growth. Data shows higher parental preference for Langley than Appletree, contradicting claims about school demand. 4. Faulty Geographical and Catchment Analysis The council's 800m map circles distort reality by omitting new housing areas (e.g., Murton Gap). Many families already travel beyond those circles to attend Langley. If Appletree were to close instead of Langley, then alternative schools (Rockcliffe, Marine Park, Cullercoats) are in close proximity to the furthest points of Appletree's easterly catchment area giving these families a closer option than Langley. 5. Community and Infrastructure Considerations Langley is a 75-year cornerstone of the Monkseaton community, supporting local businesses. It has superior transport, parking, and safety infrastructure, unlike Appletree Gardens, which faces traffic congestion and safety risks. Moving pupils would increase car travel, harming sustainability and child safety. 6. Educational Quality and Governance Langley shows higher parental preference, attendance, and educational outcomes than Appletree. Appletree's leadership has overseen a decline in reputation and performance, yet would remain in control post-merger. Well-being is clearly not at the heart of their ethos. During this worrying time, no reassurance has been offered from Appletree governors or Head teacher to Langley parents, teachers or Governors. This shows a lack of willingness to work together, and frankly a bad attitude. 7. Capacity, Facilities, and SEND Concerns Appletree's smaller classrooms and hall fall below government space guidelines. A merger would overcrowd facilities, reduce SEND provision, and compromise learning environments. Langley has larger classrooms, two halls, two fields, and is physically better equipped. 8. Better Alternatives Close Appletree Gardens and move students to Langley instead: Langley has lower costs, larger and better-quality facilities, safer access, and higher educational performance. Use a large site created by the closure of Appletree Gardens and Monkseaton Middle School to accommodate Woodlawn Special School on a single site (access to Hydrotherapy pool would still be available for its usable life however it is in need of refurbishment). Use the current space occupied by Woodlawn at the Langley site to for more space to merge Appletree Alternatively Repurpose Coquet Park First School for the Woodlawn site with swimming facilities at Waves. Conclusion The proposal to close Langley First School is misguided, data-poor, and detrimental to students, families, and the wider community. Langley is better positioned academically, geographically, financially, and socially to

serve the area's future educational needs. The logical and evidence-based alternative is to retain Langley First School and instead close or restructure Appletree Gardens

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 11:01 PM

PROPOSAL 5 - LANGLEY INCLUSION HUB Summary: This proposal is a forward-thinking, federation-based approach that aligns with long-term demographic trends and upcoming changes to other schools in the area. It advocates for a strategic reduction in Pupil Admission Numbers (PAN) across the local school system and repurposes the Langley First School site into a specialist Inclusion Hub. This hub would be created by formally federating Langley First School with the co-located Woodlawn Special School, serving both mainstream pupils and those with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND). Proposal: 1. Reduce PAN at Langley and Appletree: Deliver the NEPA-wide reduction to 390 by right-sizing admissions at both sites from 2027. Cut both PANs to 45/45 (1.5FE each) - this cuts the pair's capacity from 120 to 90 (-30) now, with the remaining -30 anticipated to be achieved through subsequent NEPA-wide adjustments, subject to consultation - for example, a future PAN review at Marine Park (which has previously operated at 75 PAN) and/or reorganisation aligned to Coquet's 2032 PFI breakpoint given its structural deficit. This keeps options open while matching actual cohort sizes. 2. Create the Langley/Woodlawn Inclusion Hub: Formally federate Langley and Woodlawn to share governance and leadership. Keep a mainstream base at Langley alongside specialist facilities so pupils can access the right support on one campus, with clear pathways into mainstream lessons where appropriate. 3. Establish an Additionally Resourced Provision (ARP): Open an ARP at Langley (Phase 1 c.12 places, scalable to 16-24) with specialist classrooms, intervention/sensory space and hygiene facilities. Pupils are on Langley's roll with timetabled inclusion and, where appropriate, dual/part-time arrangements with Woodlawn. Benefits: ● Creates a Centre of Excellence for Inclusion: Leverages the unique co-location of Langley and Woodlawn to offer a full spectrum from mainstream to specialist support, mirroring successful UK co-located models. ● Addresses SEND Need: Grows local capacity and reduces reliance on costly out-of-borough placements by delivering specialist places with mainstream access on one campus. ● Retains Two Successful Schools: Preserves Langley's popular, high-quality mainstream offer and supports Appletree, maintaining community choice and walkable access. ● Financially Sustainable: Right-sized PANs reflect real demand; ARP places attract appropriate funding; shared estate and leadership reduce capital and running costs versus a wholesale move/expansion. ● Manages the "Bulge" Cohort: Keeps both sites open and avoids concentrating 403 pupils onto a single site in 2027, smoothing class sizes and transitions. Challenges: ● Federation Agreement: Requires the governing bodies of Langley and Woodlawn

to agree a hard federation with shared executive leadership and aligned policies. ● Logistics of Integration: Safeguarding, timetabling and shared-space protocols (halls, dining, therapies, outdoor areas) must be designed and implemented with clear accountability. ● Deviation from Original Plan: Moves the Council from a simple closure/merge to a phased inclusion strategy; requires Cabinet commitment to staged PAN changes and a 2032 review point.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 11:02 PM

If it is deemed impossible for Langley First School to remain at the centre of our community, providing an excellent, supportive school for our children, the only reasonable alternative is a true merger of LFS and Appletree Gardens First School. This would include a new name, uniform and governance, whilst merging the wonderful teaching staff of both schools. In this way, the school communities could look towards a more positive future together.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 11:04 PM

Absolutely! Here's a rewritten version in a more conversational and persuasive voice—ideal for a public-facing statement or community newsletter: --- Let’s Keep Langley First School Open—Together We Can Find a Better Way I believe the current proposal to close Langley First School should be withdrawn. While I understand the council’s goals—financial sustainability, reducing surplus places, and maintaining high standards of education—I’m confident these aims can be met without shutting down a beloved local school. Langley is more than just bricks and mortar. It’s a vibrant part of our community, and there are smarter, more compassionate alternatives that protect our children, support families, and strengthen community ties. These ideas aren’t isolated fixes—they’re a toolkit of practical, evidence-based solutions that can work together to meet both the council’s and the community’s needs. Each option below is designed to: - Minimise disruption for pupils and parents - Preserve parental choice and the unique ethos of our schools - Support inclusive education and SEND provision in line with national policy - Offer financially sustainable solutions, including innovative income streams --- Option 1: Federation & Inclusion Hub What it means: Langley and Appletree (and possibly other local schools) would share leadership, specialist staff, and resources—keeping both sites open. Langley could become a hub for inclusive and SEND provision, supporting nearby schools. Why it works: - Saves money through shared resources - Strengthens SEND support - Maintains parental choice and community identity - Financially viable with adjusted PANs and shared staffing --- Option 2: Phased Transition to One Site What it means: Merge Langley and Appletree into one legal entity, operating across both sites temporarily. Eventually consolidate onto Langley’s stronger site once larger cohorts have moved through. Why it works: - Avoids overcrowding and loss of specialist spaces - Allows for split-

site funding during transition - Smooth, cost-effective change aligned with council goals --- Option 3: True Amalgamation—A New School What it means: Close both schools and open a brand-new one on the Appletree site, blending the best of both schools' ethos, staff, and practices. Why it works: - Brings communities and staff together - Boosts appeal to parents - Offers long-term educational and financial stability - Supports PAN and Woodlawn expansion Note: This option requires Secretary of State approval and takes longer—but it's a bold step toward lasting cohesion. --- Option 4: Repurpose Surplus Space What it means: Use unused classrooms for early years care, SEND support, wraparound services, or rent them to local organisations. Why it works: - Offsets financial losses from falling birth rates - Meets real local needs - Keeps the school central to community life - Creates a sustainable, forward-thinking model --- Option 5: Community Trust Model What it means: Set up a community-led trust to run Langley First School, involving parents, staff, and local groups. Why it works: - Empowers the community - Proven successful in other areas - Unlocks funding streams not available to maintained schools --- Langley First School deserves a future. These options show that with creativity, collaboration, and care, we can build one—without closing the doors on our children's education or our community's

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 11:17 PM

The friends of Langley team have done an excellent job researching and developing alternative proposals. Whilst I am not outlining them here I urge strong consideration be given to alternative options which prevent the closure of Langley First School

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 12:11 AM

My submission proposes a two-part alternative: Option A is the withdrawal of the closure proposal based on inaccurate rationale and clear community preference; Option B is a statutory "True Merger" as the only acceptable alternative to closure. Option A: Withdraw the Closure Proposal The rationale underpinning the decision to move to consultation is demonstrably unsound and contains multiple inaccuracies. I urge the Council to withdraw the current proposal and revisit its decision based on accurate data and a full assessment of community impact. 1. Challenges to the Council's Rationale Inaccurate Site Information: The initial documentation falsely claimed Langley's field is separated by a public highway, requiring escorts for PE and denying access during breaks. In reality, the school has a well-used playing field immediately adjacent to the building. Financial Status: The claim that Langley is in financial deficit is incorrect. The school has only predicted a deficit for the year 25/26 for the first time, and is working with an independent financial advisor. Capacity and Finance: The stated capacity for Appletree of 432 pupils in the consultation document is challenged by the figure of 293 found on the

gov.uk website. Furthermore, Appletree is a more expensive building to run, spending £29 per square metre on utilities compared to Langley's £4. Pupil Projections: The Council's projection methodology is questionable, forecasting numbers beyond 2030 and including unexplained gains/losses. Corrected figures show that by 2030, Langley's projected surplus (14%) is significantly better than Appletree's (34%). 2. Ignoring Parental Choice and Demographic Stability The proposal ignores clear parental choice and is targeting the more popular and demographically stable school, increasing long-term risk. Preference and Draw: 73% of Langley pupils attend from the catchment area, compared to only 44% at Appletree. The distance of the last place offered at Langley was nearly 6 miles, demonstrating a wider geographic draw. Survey Data: An overwhelming 88.2% of parents surveyed did not list Appletree Gardens as a school preference when applying. Only 11.2% of respondents would choose Appletree as their first choice if Langley closed. Demographic Stability: Appletree is ranked as the most sensitive school to falling birth rates in the planning area, whereas Langley has a medium sensitivity, cushioned by its proven popularity. 3. Failure to Assess Critical Community Impacts The process is fundamentally incomplete without key impact assessments, which the Council has accepted are missing. Special Educational Needs (SEN): No guarantees have been given regarding adapted provision or breakout spaces at Appletree. Closing Langley would dismantle an established, Neurodiversity Affirming culture, losing crucial, proven support like the Sensory Room and the proximity to Woodlawn Special School for dual registration. Wraparound and Early Years: The Council has not considered the impact on the "Schools Out" provision. The loss of this provision (which operates 7:30 am–6:00 pm, compared to Little Pips' 7:45 am–5:30 pm) will have a significant detrimental impact. Survey data shows 35.6% of parents would be forced to cut their working hours. Traffic Impact: No evidence has been provided in relation to traffic impact. The parent survey indicates that the number of parents who drive to school would increase from 18.3% to 55% if children attended Appletree, exacerbating local congestion and safety issues, particularly as Appletree cannot close its street due to the bus route. Option B: A True Statutory Merger If the Council insists that amalgamation must occur, it must proceed with a True Merger (Option 2), rather than a closure masquerading as a merger. A true merger requires closing both schools to establish a new one. This statutory process demands consent from the Secretary of State and final approval from the Office of Schools Adjudicator (OSA). While this process takes longer, it provides increased scrutiny over the decision, which is essential for our children's future. A true merger is the only fair way forward, allowing both communities to contribute to the name, ethos, uniform, and staffing of the new school, ensuring the best outcome for the children involved. Conclusion: Given the significant inaccuracies in the supporting

documentation, the clear preference for Langley First School, and the catastrophic impact on SEN and wraparound provision, the Council must withdraw the current proposal (Option A). If amalgamation is deemed unavoidable, it must only proceed via the statutory True Merger route (Option B), to ensure a fair and fully scrutinized outcome.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 12:26 AM

Although I personally think we need all our excellent schools I understand should the predicted fall in the local birth rate be accurate, then changes need to be made. I believe that the two first schools, Langley and Appletree Gardens, should both close and reopen with a completely new identity. This will give opportunity for the best teaching methods and elements from both schools to be amalgamated fairly and the best elements focussed on. This may mean that the merger may take a little longer as it would need approval from the Secretary of State, amongst other challenges. Although Langley is a slightly smaller school, it is a very popular one, approximately 3/4 of new parents moving into the area or are living in the catchment area choose Langley as their first choice. The excellent teaching and nurturing values that the school offers must be considered and adopted in this proposed ‘new’ school. If predictions are correct regarding the falling birth rate, the slower merger may help to ensure that their are no local pupils finding themselves without a place at one of the local middle schools and later into the local high schools. Currently I believe their are more pupils than places available should these schools close and some students may find themselves needing to travel long distances to get an education causing all kinds of problems for working parents particularly those with other children studying in different schools. On a personal note, based on the current Council proposal my youngest child will be amongst the last to go to Langley first school. The two year groups below her would be broken up and moved to Appletree gardens. My concern means that the teaching staff who are now losing their jobs would have to seek more stable employment elsewhere leaving a small skeleton crew behind. The wealth of knowledge, expertise and general excellent support that the school currently offers my daughter would be lost. I fear her education and development might suffer also. This along with changes to the middle/ high school admissions may also effect her future. Every parent wants the best for their Child and I believe that Langley is one of the best schools. I know the Council is under huge financial strain, but I do believe that closing our schools could be a huge mistake that we all may struggle to recover from.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 12:47 AM

Executive Summary: The Langley-Led Split-Site Model This document outlines a collaborative alternative model for consideration. We believe this model achieves the council's stated objectives on a

timeline that mitigates significant operational risks associated with the current proposal's "bulge" cohorts. We propose a phased, three-year transitional merger that consolidates into a single legal entity led from the Langley First School site. This model operates across both school sites from September 2026 to July 2029 with a combined PAN of 60 (30 per site). This addresses the 404-pupil “bulge” challenge by allowing the largest cohorts to exit naturally, and ensures the final, consolidated school opens on the Langley site with a stable, manageable roll of ~325 pupils. This proposal achieves all of the council's key objectives (a 60 PAN school, a vacated site for Woodlawn) while promoting stability for pupils and ensuring long-term financial and operational viability. 1. A Data-Led, Collaborative Solution Our analysis of the current proposal identifies several key risks related to pupil capacity, site suitability, and long-term financial health. We offer this alternative model as a data-led, collaborative solution that directly addresses these challenges and works toward our shared goals. A. It Addresses the "Bulge" Cohort Challenge The council’s plan to accommodate a 404-pupil roll onto the Appletree site in 2027 creates a significant operational challenge. This places immense pressure on facilities (like the 130m2 hall) and staff, creating a difficult teaching environment. This pressure then subsides rapidly, leading to a large surplus by 2030. Our model addresses this challenge directly. By operating across two sites for a three-year transition: - The large “bulge” cohorts (current Y2 and Y3) are allowed to complete their first school journey without a disruptive move. - The total roll is distributed, putting no undue pressure on either site's facilities or staff. - The final, consolidated school opens in September 2029 with a stable, long-term roll of ~325 pupils, which the Langley site can comfortably accommodate. This approach offers a managed transition rather than a high-pressure consolidation. B. It Selects the Site Best-Positioned for Long-Term Sustainability The current proposal consolidates onto the Appletree site. Our data suggests this site may be more vulnerable to fluctuating birth rates and has facilities (only 2 of 13 classrooms meet guidance) that present long-term operational challenges. Our model proposes consolidating onto the Langley site, as our data indicates it is a strong anchor for the new school. - A Safer Anchor: Langley has shown stronger, more consistent parental demand (93% fill vs. 82%) and is more insulated from falling birth rates. - Site Facilities: The Langley site's facilities align well with government guidance (10 of 11 classrooms exceed guidance), and its communal facilities (e.g., the 192m2 hall) are well-suited for a full 60 PAN school. The consolidated school would require 11 class bases, which the Langley site can comfortably accommodate. There are clear, minimal-cost options for these rooms, such as temporarily repurposing the existing ICT suite or utilising part of the very large nursery space. Operational Efficiency: Consolidating on the Langley site saves ~£37,000 annually in running costs alone (£7k vs. Appletree's £44k). We believe that choosing the Langley site

best ensures the long-term financial and educational sustainability of the merged school. C. It Offers a Financially Sustainable Path The current proposal requires capital expenditure to temporarily expand Appletree for the 'bulge' years. This investment would become redundant by 2030 when the roll numbers fall. Our model is designed for financial viability. - It avoids the need for temporary expansion costs at Appletree. - By creating a single legal entity in Sep 2026, the school can immediately streamline leadership and administrative posts (one Headteacher, one SBM, one governing body). It also allows a unified leadership team to begin implementing further staffing efficiencies, as identified in the recent third-party Financial Review of Langley's deficit. - As a recognised split-site school, it becomes eligible for specific split-site funding from the local authority, making the transitional period (2026-2029) financially secure. - The stable 3-year transition provides the leadership team with the operational runway to develop and launch new, proven income streams on the Langley site. These opportunities include bringing wraparound care in-house and establishing a provision for children under 3, both of which would provide a sustainable revenue source to address the long-term deficit. This model invests in a permanent, stable, and sustainable solution. 2. Proposal Details: A Phased, Stable Transition This proposal is designed for clarity, stability, and a smooth transition. Phase 1: Legal Merger and Preparation (Sep 2025 – Jul 2026) The two schools legally merge to form a single school entity (e.g., "The New Langley & Appletree School") with one headteacher, one governing body, and one DfE number. The legal entity is formally based at the Langley First School site. This year is used for integration planning, curriculum alignment, and communication, led by a single, unified leadership team. Phase 2: Transitional Split-Site Operation (Sep 2026 – Jul 2029) The new school operates across two campuses: Langley Campus and Appletree Campus. The Published Admission Number (PAN) is set at 30 for each campus, for a total school intake of 60. This meets the council's 60 PAN objective. The large "bulge" cohorts pass through the system and move on to middle school. Phase 3: Final Consolidation (Sep 2029) With the "bulge" cohorts gone and the total roll reduced to its stable, manageable level (~325 pupils), all pupils and staff are consolidated onto the Langley First School site. The Appletree Gardens site is fully vacated and handed back to the council. 3. How This Proposal Meets All Council Objectives This proposal fully aligns with the council's stated goals and offers a data-driven pathway to achieve them while enhancing stability and sustainability. Objective: Create a single 60 PAN First School. ACHIEVED. Our model creates a single legal school with a 60 PAN, effective from 2026. Objective: Address the Long-Term Sustainability of the Schools. ACHIEVED. Our model fixes the long-term school on the Langley site - the demonstrably more sustainable, resilient, and popular "anchor" school. Objective: Free up a School Site for the

Woodlawn Expansion. ACHIEVED. Our model delivers the entire Appletree Gardens site to the council by September 2029, ready for the Woodlawn expansion. It simply provides a stable, 3-year timeline that mitigates the significant operational risks of the currently proposed timeline. This proposal is a constructive, collaborative solution. It provides the council with its desired 60 PAN school and a vacated site for Woodlawn. It provides parents and children with stability, a clear timeline, and a future at a well-equipped and sustainable school site. It addresses the pupil capacity “bulge” in a managed way, protects pupils from unnecessary disruption, and ensures the new school is built to last. We respectfully ask you to review this model as a logical and stable path forward for our community. --- Executive Summary: The Langley/Woodlawn Inclusion Hub This document outlines a forward-thinking, collaborative model that addresses mainstream capacity, specialist SEND provision, and long-term financial sustainability in a single, unified strategy. We propose a formal federation between Langley First School and Woodlawn Special School to create an “Inclusion Hub.” This model leverages the schools' unique co-location to create a centre of excellence for inclusion. To ensure long-term stability, this model proposes a data-led "right-sizing" of admissions by reducing the PAN at both Langley and Appletree to 45 (1.5FE) each, for a combined 90 PAN that more accurately reflects medium-term local birth rates. This approach achieves all key objectives: it retains two popular mainstream schools, creates critically-needed specialist SEND provision (via a new ARP), and establishes a clear path to financial sustainability through specialist funding and new income generation, all while avoiding the high-risk "bulge" cohort crisis. This model moves beyond a short-term merger to solve the long-term strategic challenges for the area. A. It Aligns Capacity with Actual Demographic Demand The council's 390-pupil (60 PAN) forecast is based on a model that we believe overestimates future demand. Our analysis, anchored to actual local births, shows a "right-sized" PAN is more sustainable. Our model proposes a 45 PAN (1.5FE) for both Langley and Appletree. - This combined 90 PAN aligns with long-term demographic realities, preventing a future "surplus place" crisis. - This is the critical first step in a necessary, NEPA-wide realignment of capacity. It provides the stability to allow for further strategic adjustments - such as returning Marine Park to its original 75 PAN by 2029/20230 and addressing the structural deficit at Coquet - to create a stable, long-term plan that matches actual demand. - It retains both popular, high-quality mainstream schools, preserving parental choice and community assets. B. It Creates a "Centre of Excellence" for Inclusion - Rather than viewing Langley and Woodlawn as separate logistical problems, this model sees their co-location as a unique strategic opportunity. - By federating the schools under a shared governance and leadership structure, we can create a seamless "Inclusion Hub." - This creates a full spectrum of support on a single

campus, from mainstream-only classes to specialist ARP provision, and full-time specialist places at Woodlawn. - It mirrors other successful co-located models in the UK (e.g., Hob Moor Oaks) and creates clear pathways for pupils to access mainstream lessons where appropriate, directly addressing the growing need for inclusive provision. C. It Delivers a Sustainable Financial and Operational Model This proposal directly addresses the financial deficits by creating new, sustainable income streams, not just by cutting costs. - New Specialist Funding: The creation of an Additionally Resourced Provision (ARP) of c.12 places at the Langley site brings in higher-tier, specialist funding, making a significant contribution to the school's budget. - New Income Generation: This model provides the stability for Langley's leadership to launch proven income-generating services, such as bringing wraparound care in-house and establishing a provision for children under 3 (mirroring the successful model at Appletree). - Uses Surplus Space Efficiently: The 45 PAN model frees up physical space at both sites. This surplus is not a liability; it is an asset that can be immediately repurposed for the income-generating ARP (at Langley and Appletree) or to free up more specialist space for Woodlawn, ensuring all sites are financially efficient. - Cost Efficiencies: A federation creates immediate savings through shared governance, leadership, and administrative posts, as well as efficiencies in site management. D. It Solves the 2027 “Bulge” Cohort Crisis The council's current proposal creates a high-risk scenario by concentrating 404 pupils onto a single site. Our model completely avoids this problem. By retaining both school sites, the "bulge" cohorts are managed within existing facilities. This prevents: - The need for costly temporary classrooms. - Overcrowding in substandard communal areas (like the 130m2 hall). - The educational disruption caused by a high-pressure, over-capacity school environment. 2. Proposal Details: A Phased Transformation This proposal is designed for a smooth, planned transformation. Phase 1: Legal Federation & Consultation (Sep 2025 – Jul 2026) - The governing bodies of Langley First School and Woodlawn Special School explore and establish a formal federation, creating a single governing body. - The council initiates consultation to reduce the PAN of both Langley and Appletree to 45, effective from September 2027) - Detailed planning and costing for the new ARP at Langley and Appletree (this was already being proposed at Appletree prior to consultation) are completed. Phase 2: Implementation (Sep 2026 – Jul 2027) - The new federated leadership structure is implemented. - The new 45 PAN comes into effect for the Reception 2027 intake. - The new ARP at Langley (Phase 1, c.12 places) is established, with pupils on Langley's roll. Langley begins development of in-house wraparound and under-3s provision. Phase 3: Steady State Operation (From Sep 2027) - The Langley/Woodlawn Inclusion Hub is fully operational. - Langley and Appletree operate as two sustainable, right-sized 1.5FE mainstream schools, both contributing to a more stable local

education system. 3. Built-in Flexibility: An Alternative if Both Schools Cannot Federate This model's core strength is its flexibility. We recognise that a full federation may not be viable if, for example, the severity of needs at Woodlawn makes shared governance impractical. If a full federation is not possible, the 45 PAN model still provides the optimal solution. - In this scenario, Langley and Appletree are still right-sized to 45 PAN, ensuring their long-term sustainability. - This still frees up physical space on the Langley site, which can be made available to Woodlawn as a separate satellite provision without federating. - This pathway allows Woodlawn to gain critically-needed expansion space on its existing co-located site. This can operate in parallel with a strategic satellite provision at Monkseaton Middle School - the logical and available site for this given its current consultation for closure as a mainstream school. This creates a powerful, multi-site solution for the authority. 4. How This Proposal Meets All Council Objectives This proposal aligns with the council's strategic goals by providing a more comprehensive and sustainable solution. Objective: Achieve a Sustainable, High-Quality Educational Estate. ACHIEVED. By right-sizing Langley and Appletree to 45 PAN each, this model creates two sustainable schools. It is the critical first step in a wider, logical re-organisation which must also include: - A review to return Marine Park to its original 75 PAN (from its temporary 90 PAN), aligning it with declining birth rates in 2029/2030. - A strategic review of Coquet given its structural deficit and upcoming 2032 PFI breakpoint. This system-wide approach aligns PAN with real demand, allowing surplus space to be repurposed for income-generating ARPs and/or to support Woodlawn. Objective: Provide Appropriate SEND Provision. ACHIEVED (AND EXCEEDED). This model doesn't just provide SEND places; it creates a Centre of Excellence for Inclusion, leverages an existing co-located asset, and provides a clear "flexible pathway" (Section 3) to support Woodlawn's needs. Objective: Resolve Financial Deficits. ACHIEVED. This model presents a viable, long-term financial plan based on new income generation (specialist ARP funding, wraparound, under-3s) combined with operational efficiencies and a right-sized system that turns "surplus" space into an asset. Conclusion This proposal is a constructive, collaborative, and forward-thinking solution. It addresses the interconnected challenges of mainstream capacity, specialist SEND provision, and financial deficits in one unified strategy. It provides a stable, data-led path to retain two excellent local schools, create a flagship Inclusion Hub, and build a financially sustainable future for the entire school community. We respectfully ask you to review this model as a robust and strategic path forward.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 12:53 AM

Do not close the school! Find a way by working with the school to encourage more parents to send their children there. Invest and Rent

out facilities to local clubs.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 02:48 AM

Firstly I want to address this Survey - which is problematic. Before entering this Survey it claims “we would welcome your feedback on proposals” - and then proposals are listed... When entering the survey, there are several questions, but none of which actually ask for feedback on the proposals: The only way to give feedback that is constructive is to: - Question 2, choose DISAGREE - Which opens Question 3, for which you must choose YES - This is a purposeful Dark Pattern, hiding any sort of relative feedback about the proposal behind multiple selections - This is structurally prejudiced to lever the responses towards an outcome that you clearly are preferring - The framing restricts the scope of legitimate responses, and will prevent many participants from offering their thoughts - This core element of the consultation process itself is prejudiced in its design and outcome analysis. - Responses collected will not accurately reflect community sentiment, as many who disagree will have no clear means to express that within the structured fields. - To frame back to the start “We would welcome your feedback on proposals”, indicating an open process that allows respondents to do that. -- Which many will be unable to do Leaving the Survey behind let me move onto further issues. There are so, so many concerns with the council’s process here. Because, as you know by now, the Langley campaign, and legal team, have gathered mountains of data and information. Not just the standard items, understanding the relationships and connections between some schools and organisations such as the North Tyneside learning trust... That aside there is an additional detail this is fascinating in that the council is claiming: - All documents and data needed to assess the proposal are provided. Now, you have informed us that 6 weeks is enough time to pull together responses, for working parents? What you also need to take into account is: - A six week consultation period, under guidance, is not supposed to fall over a school holiday - This consultation has fallen over the Half Term. Had the proposal been put forward at the start of term, or after half term, it would not be across this period. Question - why do you here also go against guidance, and make it harder for stretched, busy people to try to get the information desired? However then there is another problem - we haven’t had the data we’ve been requesting: FOIs have still not been received, even despite being chased Why would this be? I have heard back from the FOI team that “Due to the large number of FOIs due to the School” they have had trouble coping. - This was clearly going to happen - In such lofty, important positions being able to predict this response is crucial to allowing a fair process To summarise this point: -The 6 week period is not, and was never going to be long enough -You have insisted on the shortest period possible, while the council cannot fulfil FOIs to give the parents trying to find alternatives the information they need -As

such, you have not only gone against guidance for proposal time lines, more importantly... -You have set up a process that is impossible for parents to respond to -- The process is unfair To found off with one more problematic area of FOIs. Some have been returned with "No Data Held". This is worrying. It appears that, according to several FOIs, schools were not contacted, consulted before the plans were announced? This is, honestly, hard to believe - and it seems that there may be a deeper problem in regards to holding and retaining data and conversations here. How can so little have been shared or outlined for this consultation? One of two things is true. Either the FOIs are correct, and there is little in the way of planning, data, or communication. Or they are wrong and the data has not been kept. Either outcome here is far from ideal, however I suggest if this process goes further - there will be without a doubt legal calls into the FOIs returned as to why data doesn't exist. A full review, no doubt, into the council processes. Where we get to some of the meat of the issues, for which I am sure you have received from many others and perhaps the legal team - I should mention some here just to keep it us in order. - The process was called a merger, it is in reality a closure. - This shift reduces trust in the clarity and intent of the consultation. - The data used is incomplete, and often just plain wrong. - It contains acknowledged errors (see, plain wrong) - It does not fully align with DfE guidance or standard modelling practice. - Decisions of this scale need a stronger evidence base. - The proposal addresses short-term financial pressure. - It does not consider long-term capacity or community impact. - Closing a high-performing school is not a sustainable response. - Langley has not been stabilised or supported through its potential (only forecasted, it can be changed) temporary financial issues - which could be addressed instead of trying to close it. - Instead, the proposal appears to take advantage of a moment of difficulty - cynical and not balanced considering other schools in the area have had help. The thing is, I think you know all this by now. By the many other documents requests, emails , FOIs and responses you've so far received. So, from myself, what I see is there is something else at play here. I would like you to stop for a moment and consider this question. - What is Legacy? It is an important question. One to consider, deeply. To mull over and use some foresight. To begin to understand what this process will ultimately lead to. Now imagine further: - What is the result going to be, when hundreds, thousands of people are made aware of the inaccuracies. The delaying tactics. The breaking of guidance and, overall, fairness? I would myself imagine they would not remember those who drove this process with any fondness. Moreso they will hold tightly to the memory of anyone pushing it through after all this evidence is made public. Let us consider the following again again, to help us path the future: - What is Legacy? By thinking about this again, wider, and looking holistically at the statement, - we can start to understand Legacy further. -

Legacy is something that can define a company, a team, or a person. - Legacy can be a shield, it can open doors, and it can empower. - Legacy also can be a weight, an anchor - or something to hide from. So while communities remember how decisions like this are made, delivered, and pushed through. There can be further considerations at hand. Communities are people, and have you considered - should such an outcome as you are suggesting come to pass, how would people react to those who put this in motion? Imagine; every time a person talks in a shop. Meets another. Finds out more about them. They may go “I know you...” or “I remember...” - this is what people do if they recognise someone or recall something about them. This is always there. It often cannot be escaped. That feeling, that knowing. The feeling of Legacy. Because Legacy can pull as well as push. You know, though - people are people. I’m sure we’ve all met many, and they can be transient in our lives. Brief encounters, soon forgotten. However. Let us consider where Legacy really can be important. Not just for those tiny fragments of time in our lives, when our Legacy helps shape our lives. Our identity. Our very occupations. - Being an expert in your field? -- Years of work, grind, grit and delivery...it can all be undone by one poorly handled outcome -- The real danger of no longer being that expert, that go to person -- Striking out on your own in a leadership position, potentially more difficult - Applying for a new job -- Receiving an interview -- Having to discuss a Legacy decision that was so, so unpopular - and proven to not stand up to scrutiny -- The to-be employer further searches, and as we know - Google rarely forgets. It is a tricky spot for anyone. - Starting a new job! -- Perhaps you have a new job lined up -- Jobs are often beholden to probation periods -- Can you imagine how tough it might be to keep this new role? -- Imagine the worse case scenario, you do not pass your initial period and then - you need to apply for a new job -- Suddenly you have the last job to explain, and a legacy decision --- There is a worse, worse case scenario - what if this new company decides not to take you up for the job after all? A very difficult situation. These are all ‘maybes’, of course, They could happen. The thing to remember is that these days - they do happen. Notably when Legacy is so recently tarnished. It is not nice to admit or to consider, however we live in a connected world with 24/7 news and an internet that holds on for a long, long time. Sure - you or I have no real say over this, how people will react. How they will feel, how they will remember? Truly, who knows. I feel it only fair to remind of the potential, as everything mentioned here are scenarios that are more than possible in 2025 and beyond. Let’s summarise a few points. - Communities remember how decisions like this are made. - Professional scrutiny continues long, long after public debate ends. - Future colleagues and stakeholders do look back at key decisions. - This proposal risks becoming a defining moment for the wrong reasons. - A reconsideration would demonstrate care, transparency, and long-term thinking. So, to answer this box (because that’s what it’s asked me to

do) I now feel I have enough context to do so. My alternative proposal is as follows: - Cancel this proposal as quickly and as publicly as possible - Come out strong and show that things were not right - Shoulder the responsibility, stand up for the community, become the unlikely heroes of the story - Build a Legacy we all want, for ourselves, our families, and our children Thank you for reviewing these points. I ask that you reflect on the wider consequences for children, families, and the lasting legacy of this decision you are about to make.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 05:10 AM

Close Coquet First School and reduce the remaining PAN numbers. Coquet park is already significantly in deficit and they have not submitted a plan to overcome this. NTC clearly state that one class schools are not financially viable therefore its very unlikely this school is going to be able to remain open long term or when the PFI contract ends. This would then result in not enough first schools in Whitley Bay causing future problems for the middle schools and high school, closing schools has a catastrophic effect on children, proposals therefore need to have longevity. If Coquet is closed now, the other schools in Whitley Bay would gain more pupils helping them financially. The remaining PAN numbers could then be reduced between the schools or by introducing an ARP. Closing a smaller school like Coquet would affect less children as they have considerably less pupils than Langley and the parents have several very close options for other schools. The proposal shows each first school with an 800m radius circle around each school. It is very clear from this map that Coquet Park First School would be the most logical school to close. If Coquet Park was not there, all of the houses in the 800m radius are covered by other schools, if you take Langley away there are houses within their 800m radius that are not covered by other schools. Part of Langley's circle is fields (just like South Wellfields and Whitley Lodge etc) this is just behind the new housing development Robinson Fields which is still being built. NTC advise that new houses don't bring many new people/children as data shows that they are moving from within North Tyneside. This would only makes sense if people moving to these new houses are leaving vacant homes behind but they aren't. If I moved from Monkseaton to Robinson Fields (which we previously considered) a family would then move into our house in Monkseaton. Whilst its clear national birth rates are falling, more houses results in more people and these are being built very close to Langley not the other schools in Whitley Bay. I know several people that have moved to Robinson Fields, they are couples in their 30's hoping to have children in the future. The field may have more houses built on in the future however Coquet Parks circle includes the sea, there can be no future houses built there. Reduce PAN numbers slightly in all Whitley Bay first schools The proposal states that all schools were met with and no solutions

were brought forward. In reality these meetings were very brief and no governors were permitted to attend to allow suggestions to be acted upon. The problem regarding needing to reduce spaces within Whitley Bay should not be placed upon Langley staff, governors and parents which is what has happened. This is the responsibility of NTC and all Whitley Bay first school staff and governors to come up with the best solutions. The proposal states that the schools advised they could not reduce their PAN numbers slightly, surely NTC can enforce this if they have the power to close schools? This would be the best solution, none of the schools are full therefore this would have a positive financial impact on them and would resolve the problem without affecting hundreds of children who we should all be protecting, closing a school should always be the last resort! ARP/Dual Recognition The SEND support at Langley is outstanding, all of the staff understand my sons needs and implement these consistently every day. As a disabled child he has the right to an education and to access the curriculum like all children. Langley is literally his lifeline. Due to his needs, he is not looked after by anyone else outside of school apart from myself and his father therefore we have no support network however I fully trust the Langley staff to keep him safe every day. This enables us to be able to continue to work full time which we need to do to support our family. Prior to [redacted] commencing Langley we felt very alone with no support, however this changed when he started Langley, we now have consistent support and are guided by the staff. This level of SEN expertise that the Langley staff have can't be gained in a short period, this has been built through many years of training and experience. The dedicated staff have built the inclusive and nurturing environment at Langley. The building is all on ground level with accessible toilets and an adapted changing space with a bed for a child with a catheter. It has a darkened fully padded sensory room, the nest in nursery and the reception garden which is used for all SEND children. Arlo thrives from being outdoors and the Langley staff support him using the reception garden as an outdoor classroom and forest school even outside of breaktimes. [redacted] struggles with large group activities and likes to have time away from others to regulate. Each classroom has a 'haven' where children can sit and have quiet time, [redacted] uses these spaces daily and sits looking through books to regulate. Langley presents as a 'neurodiversity affirming' school with subtle changes throughout such as visuals, soft lighting, regulating emotions strategies and resources for movement. The current government aim is for SEND children to remain in mainstream schools with their peers in smaller classes. This proposal goes completely against this, it is very difficult to understand how NTC are not following these government guidelines. At my sons recent ASD diagnosis both the Consultant Paediatrician and the Specialist Speech and Language Therapist advised that from September 2026 there will be more ARP provisions in mainstream schools due to the demand for these and

they agreed that Langley's SEND provisions are ahead of other mainstream schools in the area. From speaking to other parents of SEND children in North Tyneside it is clear that not all schools provide the same level of support that my son receives at Langley, often parents have to struggle to receive support/adaptations, this is the complete opposite at Langley, they are always ahead for everything, they contact and meet with me regularly with updates and suggestions to help my son. Whitley Bay has no First Schools with an ARP. Langley currently fill this gap with their outstanding SEND provisions and expertise. As they are ahead in delivering SEND provisions it would make strategic sense for Langley to be a mainstream school with an ARP provision, reducing the number of mainstream school spaces in Whitley Bay as required. As Woodlawn is attached to Langley an option for dual registration would also be a great logistical move, SEN children at Langley and children at Woodlawn could benefit from this, again this supports the governments key priority of inclusive education. SEND children including those with moderate/severe disabilities should not be secluded from mainstream school, this does not represent society and would benefit all children. I always advocate for SEND people however I do not agree that 300 children at Langley including 64 children on the SEN register/additional needs should be displaced for 32 children at Woodlawn, all of these children are important. Close Appletree Gardens Closing schools should not be an option as this is too detrimental to children. If Langley has to close this should not be done until all of the children at Langley have completed their Langley education. By moving the children in 2027 you are including the current year 2 children, this year group is completely full throughout Whitley Bay, it does not make sense to move the largest year group. This gives these parents zero choice in terms of school. Appletree may not be able to meet the needs of all of these children. The proposal advises that Langley are in financial deficit, this is incorrect, they are predicted to go into deficit in 25/26 but have instructed a financial advisor to turn this around. Appletree is predicted a slightly later deficit however they receive falling rolls funding for their low pupil numbers, how is this fair to not consider this in the proposal? This again shows that Appletree consistently has lower numbers. I don't agree with any school closing including Appletree however if a school has to close surely this would be the less desired school? Langley costs significantly less to run than the Appletree building, closing Langley therefore does not make sense from an economical perspective. The projected pupil numbers provided in the proposal are incorrect, it shows current pupil numbers in 2025 reception numbers going down at Langley although parents have not expressed they are leaving? Appletree numbers for reception 2025 increase with no explanation how? Incorrect numbers should not be included in this proposal. It is clear looking at pupil numbers over the previous years that Appletree has consistently had lower pupil numbers and a larger

surplus whereas Langley has higher numbers and a lower surplus within the acceptable range deemed by NTC. Many children from the Appletree catchment attend Langley due to choice. This shows by clear data rather than opinion that between the two schools Langley is the more desired school. This will be detrimental to the community, many families move to Monkseaton for Langley First School, if this closed house prices would significantly drop and Monkseaton would no longer be a desirable area to move to, no community impact assessment has been completed regarding this. Langley has lots out outdoor space including a field, 2 large yards, reception garden and nursery garden. Some of this space could be used for temporary classrooms if Appletree children moved to Langley. Create a new school Throughout the proposal the closure is referred to as a ‘merger’. There isn’t anything about the closure that demonstrates a merger, the Langley staff and governors aren’t moving to Appletree and the Langley ethos and culture will be lost completely. When I first read the proposal letter my only positive thoughts were that at least Arlo will have his amazing Langley staff that know him and meet his needs so well however I soon learnt that this was not the case. At the meeting we were informed that a new school cannot be created however this is incorrect, this can be done with consent from the Secretary of State and approval from the Office of Adjudicator, this would take more time but Langley are not currently in a deficit therefore there isn’t an urgent need required. The running theme of the process is that it is rushed with no real consideration for the children, NTC should want the best school for our children and community. Creating a school with the best teachers, cultures and strategies would benefit both Langley and Appletree children and would be the fairest process. Some examples of how Langley is ahead/implements positive initiatives Langley are ahead many other schools in education strategies and wellbeing campaigns. The government have recently published national curriculum standards to prepare children with the world of work. Langley already teach most of these strategies. For example, the oracy strategy of equipping children to discuss, debate and present their views has been in place at Langley for many years. Langley have also had a poverty proofing strategy in place for many years including parents not buying presents for staff at Christmas and the end of term, not bringing in sweets for birthdays and limiting the number of charity days. As a parent of 3 children at 3 different schools this has a positive financial impact on our family as we can’t constantly afford all of these additional costs, this ensures that all children at Langley regardless of financial background don’t feel different from other children. Neither of my other children’s schools have this in place, again evidencing that Langley are ahead with this strategy during an ongoing cost of living crisis. Langley have a safe street initiative in place where the road outside Langley is closed off to cars. This encourages children to walk/scoot/ride to school, promoting positive and physical wellbeing.

When this was first introduced my older son [redacted] learnt to ride his bike for the first time due to this initiative and the encouragement from Langley staff. This initiative was initially patrolled by dedicated parents each day but wardens are no longer required, as the community fully support this great initiative. This could not be implemented at Appletree as the road is part of a bus route. Why would NTC want to close a school that is always forwarding thinking and ahead in terms of government strategies?

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 08:06 AM

I strongly support The Friends of Langley and am aware of proposals and options that have been put forward and I urge you to consider and look into all alternatives

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 08:32 AM

Retain Langley in it's current form

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 08:36 AM

Shelve the plan to close Langley , a thriving school , centre of a great community.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 08:38 AM

If you want to expand Woodlawn consider using Monkseaton High school when it is empty

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 08:39 AM

The National Audit Office is currently preparing a paper on planning for school places, scheduled for Spring 2026, examining the Department for Education's approach to overseeing and supporting a resilient school system in England and the ability to respond to changing pupil demand. This government has also advocated for a test and learn approach to improving public services. A new innovative way of working, in partnership with councils, businesses and local organisations as set out in the Plan for Change. I believe there is an opportunity for North Tyneside to be at the forefront of reforming education funding and strategy, leveraging the high quality of schools in the area and the community support to establish itself as a test case for how education could and should be prioritised. There are social entrepreneurs, [redacted] who have done fantastic work redesigning systems and services, whose approaches can provide a framework for how to design around the challenges and build resilience. The challenges we're facing in North Tyneside are not unique to us and I'm incredibly concerned as both a parent and a resident that this consultation does not adequately address these challenges. There is a real opportunity here to shape how the country responds and to deliver better outcomes both locally and nationally. We should not just settle for good schools at 90% capacity having to close, for parents having less choice in their children's education or

for teachers being stretched as thinly as possible when we can design something better which will allow everyone engaging with the education system to flourish.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 08:40 AM

For long term funding to secure the schools. The low birth rate isn't going to last forever.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 08:56 AM

Keep Langley first school open.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:06 AM

1. Do not close Langley. Engage your catchment area and allocation plans to align with Whitley Bay High School and review which school/classes are to be closed once a full cohort of pupils have passed through. This will a) reduce the impact on pupils and b) bring into consideration all schools in the area (regardless of PFI commitments) 2. Any proposal you put forward MUST include a detailed plan of what is going to happen to the children who are impacted. Stating "We will work closely with school leaders to ensure a smooth and structured transition to alternative or merged schools" is not a plan. It's a vague hope that leaves parents with little confidence.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:06 AM

Instead of closing Langley and moving everyone to the Appletree site, I believe the Council should consider a federation or shared leadership model between the two schools. This would mean both schools stay open but work much more closely together — sharing a headteacher, senior staff, and resources. It would reduce costs and help manage pupil numbers while keeping two important community schools available for local families. Many areas in the North East have successfully used this approach when facing similar challenges. It allows schools to save money without losing their individual identities or disrupting pupils and families. The schools could also agree to slightly reduce their intake numbers to help balance places across the area, rather than closing one site completely. In addition, part of the Langley site could be used to support Woodlawn Special School’s expansion or provide nursery and community facilities, so the space continues to benefit local children and families. This alternative would: • Keep both schools open and accessible to families. • Avoid longer travel distances for young children. • Maintain strong community links. • Still achieve savings through shared staffing and services. • Allow flexibility if pupil numbers rise again in future. I understand the Council needs to make the system sustainable, but I believe a federation or shared leadership approach is a fairer, less disruptive solution that protects children’s stability, staff wellbeing, and community choice.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:20 AM

I do not think that Langley should close. You should join the Langley and Appletree schools together equally to create a new school. I disagree with the plan to close Langley fist school.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:27 AM

One of the biggest risks of 'merging' Appletree Gardens First School and Langley First School together is that for two years of education the year 3 and 4 groups at the merged site will be excessive. Teaching standards and staff to pupil ratios could lower, and there'd be a loss of breakout space for library and IT access, having an impact on the quality of education offered. The cost of temporary buildings for two years would be an additional financial burden on the school or council. Rather than move students from Langley into Appletree, if the merge goes ahead the Council should reopen the school admissions process for affected pupils at both Langley AND Appletree, capping year group sizes at a level that meets the middle and high school numbers. This would mean that children most local to the merged school would likely get places. Pupils falling outside of catchment / distance to the school could be offered a place at their nearest primary school. Moving out of catchment pupils from one school to another will not solve the problem their parents will face once they apply for middle schools and there aren't enough places. The council need to assure that there is a First, Middle and High School place for children that live in the three tier catchment area.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:39 AM

The decision to close Langley was made based on evidence in the Cabinet Supplementary Agenda. The document has numerous errors and the information it contains is incorrect. The decision is therefore invalid. The proposal needs stopped, and the process starting again. The decision needs made based on evidence that is not incorrect.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:39 AM

Keep both schools open, knowing that many more houses are being developed in the area and the need for middle schools in the future will grow. Also accept that putting money into keeping class sizes small, and popular local schools open for residents is much more important than spending budgets elsewhere.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:42 AM

The data used in this proposal - like all of the others, is flawed and incorrect. Even 1 example of incorrect data - which I highlighted on email calls the whole thing into question. The report to cabinet explained that the school had no outside space other that to cross a road to the playing field. Clearly wrong - this was clearly an error due to how the schools were labelled on the call for sites map as woodlawn school was marked as langley. This is a clear land grab

opportunity to expand woodlawn provision and reduce out of borough costs without having to relocate the school which would be at a significant cost. The math ain't mathing here with the proposed numbers and the suggestion to move children to Appletree Gardens which doesn't have enough space to accommodate extra children. Also, the parking there is abysmal and already unsafe which has been raised a number of times. All of a sudden you are putting measures in to stop parking around those streets during school times which suggests that this is all predetermined. Why now? FOIR are still outstanding to be able to come up with a viable alternative which you cannot clearly define. Its clear you need extra spaces for Woodlawn, close part of the road between the school and Langley field and build on the land next to Langley field. It has already been scoped out as part of the request for sites (as has Langley playing field which you claim, has not been considered?) so why not utilise this space for an expansion of Woodlawn?

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:44 AM

Defer Major Decisions Until 2032 (Post-PFI Period) No irreversible action should be taken until 2032, when the PFI agreements at Coquet Park and Marine Park come to an end. Financial forecasts indicate that further structural changes or closures are likely once these agreements conclude, which will directly affect pupil numbers (PAN) across the NEPA area. Acting now risks creating instability and potential shortages of places later. Furthermore, the council's justification based on declining birth rates appears unreliable — these figures level out by 2026 and then begin to rise slightly, and they are largely derived from pandemic-era data, which is not representative. Waiting until 2032 would allow for more accurate, up-to-date projections before making long-term educational changes. Pause the Process for at Least Two Years A minimum two-year delay would allow larger cohorts currently in the system to move through both Langley and Appletree naturally. This would significantly reduce pressure on class sizes, protect children's mental health, and maintain the availability of essential SEND spaces (such as sensory and calm rooms). During this period, the council should work collaboratively with school leaders, governors, and parents to explore alternative, sustainable solutions. Pursue a Genuine Amalgamation Rather Than a Closure The current proposal constitutes a closure, not a merger. A true amalgamation — while more complex — would create a new school with a shared ethos, blending the best practices, staff expertise, and educational values from both Langley and Appletree. This approach would build unity, avoid the loss of valued staff, and ensure continuity for pupils rather than simply absorbing one community into another. Explore an Alternative SEND-Integrated Model at the Langley Site Government policy encourages expanding SEND provision within mainstream settings and reducing reliance on EHCPs. Langley's proximity to Woodlawn presents an excellent

opportunity to develop an Additionally Resourced Provision (ARP) or inclusive mainstream model on-site. This would strengthen local SEND capacity, foster integration, and align with national priorities — without dismantling an effective mainstream school. Any such development could be coordinated alongside the closure of a less viable site (such as Appletree) or timed with the end of PFI arrangements for a more informed, strategic outcome. Retain the Langley Site for the Mainstream Provision If the council insists on proceeding with a merger, the Langley site should be retained rather than Appletree's. A delayed implementation date of September 2029 would enable larger year groups to transition smoothly and minimise disruption. Financially, Langley is far more efficient — with utility costs of approximately £4 per square metre compared to £29 at Appletree. Repurposing the Appletree site for the expansion of Woodlawn would make far more sense: it is within 600 metres of the main Woodlawn campus, has its own kitchen facilities, and could provide a natural transition point for older Woodlawn students, supporting independence and life skills. In contrast, moving all pupils onto a single shared site would keep some children in the same small environment from age 4 to 18, limiting social development and preparedness for adulthood. Consider a Federation Model Langley and Appletree could form a federation rather than a forced merger — potentially on the existing Monkseaton Middle School site (if that closure proceeds). This would allow for shared leadership and resources while preserving the individual identity, ethos, and community spirit of each school. Explore Academisation as a Strategic Option Academisation could offer both schools greater autonomy, financial flexibility, and access to shared resources through a Multi-Academy Trust. This may present a more stable, long-term alternative to local authority restructuring. Review the Viability of Coquet Park Instead Coquet Park is already in a weak financial position, and its debt is expected to continue growing even after the PFI period. The council should investigate whether an early settlement or closure could be negotiated to prevent further financial strain. Closing Coquet Park would reduce PAN by 30 per year group, easing local capacity pressures without disrupting thriving schools like Langley. The Coquet Park site could then be repurposed as a secondary base for Woodlawn, potentially with access to the nearby Waves pool for life-skills and physical education — reducing the need for transport to the main Woodlawn site.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:46 AM

First I would like to draw attention to several inaccuracies contained within the guidance, information and data produced by the council, including the statement that Langley does not have access to playing fields for lunch, dinner and for PE/sporting; that the school is currently in deficit; that the majority of pupils would be able to access Appletree without having to cross major roads; and that were briefings and

reports with headteachers (these did not include Governors and so there have been limited opportunities to identify alternative proposals). There are also inaccuracies with the project pupil numbers, deficit forecasting, and of pupil data relating to other schools. There has been no community impact assessment done in relation to closing Langley, not has early years and nursery provision been taken into account - no governing body or senior management at Schools Out Langley has been contacted. Alternative proposal we have identified are as follows, and we would appreciate the council responding to these in more detail than simply stating that they are not viable. PROPOSAL 1 : AMALGAMATION Close both Appletree and Langley and open a new school with a new DfE number on the Appletree site. We propose that North Tyneside Council, with approval from the Secretary of State publish proposals to close both Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School, and open a new first school on the Appletree Gardens site, integrating the strongest aspects of both schools' ethos, staff, and practices to form a new identity with enhanced community appeal. Unlike the Council's plan (closing Langley and enlarging Appletree while retaining its DfE number), this creates a genuinely new entity with a new DfE number, fostering a genuine fresh start. Benefits: ● Community and staff Integration: this proposal will allow us the potential to retain some of Langleys; ethos, governance, and branding, preserving valued elements from both schools while minimising disruption to staff morale, children and communities. The council's current proposal loses all of what makes Langley, Langley. ● Familiarity: A fairer solution for both parents and children, enabling a smoother transition between schools through the involvement of familiar staff which otherwise would be lost under the current proposals. ● Enhanced parental appeal when compared to the current proposal: A new school blending Langley's high parental preference (75%+ uptake) with Appletree's larger facilities could attract more families from both catchments, reducing surplus places (currently 14% at Appletree, projected to worsen) and mitigating deficits faster than a standard merger. ● Educational and financial stability: Potential for higher enrolment (when compared to the councils' proposal) would increase funding, addressing projected deficits and supporting quality education ● The proposal aligns with the council's aim to cap NEPA First School places at 390, ensuring smooth transitions to aligned Middle Schools and Whitley Bay High School (390 places). ● The proposal allows for Woodlawn expansion, again aligning with the council's proposal Challenges: ● While this is a lengthier process requiring secretary of state approval to open a new community school, this option aligns perfectly into the NEPA and the three-tier system that NTC state they are committed to retaining. A true amalgamation would benefit both schools over the current proposal. ● The council has stated this is complex proposal to put into action. While we would acknowledge that this is not as simple as a 'merger'

we would argue that Langley has been at the heart of the community for the last 70+ years and a little extra time to get a fair amalgamation is the least that it deserves. PROPOSAL 2 : MERGER PLUS Instead of closing Langley and expanding Appletree , we recommend merging Appletree with Langley, moving the entire operation of Langley to the Appletree site. Langley would agree to a 'Firm Commitment' to adopt the best of both schools on the Appletree site Proposal: Merge appletree with Langleyl, Langley will agree to a 'Firm Commitment' including: ● A change of school name ● A staff consolidation between Langley and Appletree gardens ● A change of uniform ● A change of governance ● A new ethos incorporates the best of both school Benefits: ● Community and staff integration: allowing us the potential to retain some of Langley's ethos, governance, and branding, preserving valued elements from both schools while minimising disruption to staff morale, children and communities. The council's current proposal loses all of what makes Langley, Langley. ● Familiarity: A fairer solution for both parents and children, enabling a smoother transition between schools through the involvement of familiar staff which otherwise would be lost under the current proposals. ● Enhanced parental appeal when compared to the current proposal: A new school blending Langley's high parental preference (75%+ uptake) with Appletree's larger facilities could attract more families from both catchments, reducing surplus places (currently 14% at Appletree, projected to worsen) and mitigating deficits faster than a standard merger. ● Educational and financial stability: Potential for higher enrolment (when compared to the council's proposal) would increase funding, addressing projected deficits and supporting quality education ● The proposal aligns with the Council's aim to cap NEPA First School places at 390, ensuring smooth transitions to aligned Middle Schools and Whitley Bay High School (390 places). ● The proposal allows for Woodlawn expansion, again aligning with the council's proposal ● The proposal remains in the Local Authority control - this is a benefit as it will be more attractive to the council and mitigates the potential for the proposal to be rejected by secretary of state or the Schools Adjudicator ● It could persuade Appletree leadership to the table to agree to a fair and amicable merger. ● A two year deal can be incorporated into this proposal. ● If a merger has to happen, we believe that it is in everyone's interest to have an amicable and fair arrangement for both schools involved. The leadership of Appletree have now had five weeks to engage with Langley in an effort to reach an amicable arrangement, this has not happened. The worry is that Appletree leadership does not appear to prioritise the wellbeing of ALL children involved, nor has it sought to address Langley concerns. PROPOSAL 3 : FEDERATION Proposal: Forming a Federation between both schools, followed by a prescribed alteration to transfer the entire operation of Langley First School to the Appletree Gardens site under the DfE statutory guidance Benefits: ● Community and staff

integration: this proposal will allow us the potential to retain some of Langley's ethos, governance, and branding, preserving valued elements from both schools while minimising disruption to staff morale, children and communities. The council's current proposal loses all of what makes Langley Langley. ● Familiarity: A fairer solution for both parents and children, enabling a smoother transition between schools through the involvement of familiar staff which otherwise would be lost under the current proposals. ● Educational and financial stability: Potential for higher enrolment (when compared to the council's proposal) would increase funding, addressing projected deficits and supporting quality education ● Minimal Disruption: Federation preserves school identities during transfer. ● The proposal allows for Woodlawn expansion, again aligning with the council's proposal ● The proposal aligns with the council's aim to cap NEPA First School places at 390, ensuring PROPOSAL 4: Phased transition to a single site at Langley Summary: This proposal creates a single legal school entity (by merging Appletree into Langley) effective from September 2026. This new school would operate across both the Appletree and Langley sites for a three-year transitional period before fully consolidating onto the Langley site in September 2029. Proposal Details: ● Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School legally merge to form one school with one headteacher, one governing body, and one DfE number. ● Initially, between Sept 2026-July 2029, the school would operate across two campuses: the Langley site and the Appletree site, to allow the large "bulge" cohorts (currently in Years 2 and 3) to move through and exit the school before the sites are physically consolidated ● The Published Admission Number (PAN) for Reception would be set at 30 for each site, for a total intake of 60 pupils per year across the merged school. ● After the three-year transition, the "bulge" cohorts will have moved to middle school and the total school roll will have reduced to a manageable size (approx. 320-330 pupils). All pupils and staff will then be consolidated onto the Langley First School site and the Appletree Gardens site would then be fully vacated and available for the council to proceed with the planned expansion of Woodlawn School. Benefits: ● Resolves the "Bulge" issue: By delaying the merger by two years, the largest cohorts will have moved on, meaning the consolidated school will open with a manageable pupil roll (estimated ~323-325 based on current data) that fits the capacity of the Langley site without overcrowding or the loss of specialist teaching areas. ● Utilises the stronger Site: This proposal moves the unified school to the Langley site, has shown stronger parental preference and greater resilience to fluctuating birth rates. This ensures better long-term sustainability. ● Less disruptive transition: It avoids the "double move" scenario of merging onto the Appletree site only to face immediate overcrowding and subsequent surplus. Staff and pupils have a clear two-year window to prepare for the final move. ● Cost-effective: This avoids

the significant capital expenditure that would be required to temporarily (and inadequately) expand the Appletree site to accommodate 403 pupils, only for that space to become redundant within a few years. This model also allows the school to access specific split-site funding from the local authority, making this transitional period financially viable. ● Meets council objectives: This plan still achieves the council's key objectives of creating a single 60 PAN first school for the area and freeing up the Appletree site for the expansion of Woodlawn, just on a slightly delayed (but more stable) timeline. Challenges: PROPOSAL 5 - LANGLEY INCLUSION HUB Summary: This proposal is a forward-thinking, federation-based approach that aligns with long-term demographic trends and upcoming changes to other schools in the area. It advocates for a strategic reduction in Pupil Admission Numbers (PAN) across the local school system and repurposes the Langley First School site into a specialist Inclusion Hub. This hub would be created by formally federating Langley First School with the co-located Woodlawn Special School, serving both mainstream pupils and those with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND). Proposal: 1. Reduce PAN at Langley and Appletree: Deliver the NEPA-wide reduction to 390 by right-sizing admissions at both sites from 2027. Cut both PANs to 45/45 (1.5FE each) - this cuts the pair’s capacity from 120 to 90 (-30) now, with the remaining -30 anticipated to be achieved through subsequent NEPA-wide adjustments, subject to consultation - for example, a future PAN review at Marine Park (which has previously operated at 75 PAN) and/or reorganisation aligned to Coquet’s 2032 PFI breakpoint given its structural deficit. This keeps options open while matching actual cohort sizes. 2. Create the Langley/Woodlawn Inclusion Hub: Formally federate Langley and Woodlawn to share governance and leadership. Keep a mainstream base at Langley alongside specialist facilities so pupils can access the right support on one campus, with clear pathways into mainstream lessons where appropriate. 3. Establish an Additionally Resourced Provision (ARP): Open an ARP at Langley (Phase 1 c.12 places, scalable to 16-24) with specialist classrooms, intervention/sensory space and hygiene facilities. Pupils are on Langley’s roll with timetabled inclusion and, where appropriate, dual/part-time arrangements with Woodlawn. Benefits: ● Creates a Centre of Excellence for Inclusion: Leverages the unique co-location of Langley and Woodlawn to offer a full spectrum from mainstream to specialist support, mirroring successful UK co-located models. ● Addresses SEND Need: Grows local capacity and reduces reliance on costly out-of-borough placements by delivering specialist places with mainstream access on one campus. ● Retains Two Successful Schools: Preserves Langley’s popular, high-quality mainstream offer and supports Appletree, maintaining community choice and walkable access. ● Financially Sustainable: Right-sized PANs reflect real demand; ARP places attract appropriate funding; shared estate and leadership reduce

capital and running costs versus a wholesale move/expansion. ● Manages the “Bulge” Cohort: Keeps both sites open and avoids concentrating 403 pupils onto a single site in 2027, smoothing class sizes and transitions. PROPOSAL 6: MERGER WITH CLOSURE OF APPLETREE GARDENS Summary /Proposal: Merge Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School and move pupils from Appletree Gardens to the Langley First School site. Benefits: ● Langley First School is more likely to succeed following the merger; ○ 73% of Langley catchment parents choose Langley in comparison to 44% of Appletree. ○ Projected pupil numbers of the existing schools indicate an average of 26% surplus places at Appletree from 2025-2034 in contrast to 15% for Langley despite Appletree having 44 homes per planned place compared to Langley’s 40 homes ○ Appletree is statistically shown to be the NEPA first school most sensitive to falling birth rates, with the current NEPA birth indicating a requirement of 145 children to attend from outside of NEPA (at the reduced 390 NEPA PAN) they will be most at risk of being undersubscribed and susceptible to falling into deficit. ○ There is a risk to the financial stability of the middle schools and Whitley Bay High School if the first school places aren’t filled and the location of Langley at the edge of the NEPA catchment and it’s ease of accessibility by car along with nearby parking provides a strong advantage over Appletree ○ The parental survey undertaken by Langley highlights the points above with the following responses; - 73% of respondents in catchment moved to the area for Langleyh - 88% of respondents did not choose Appletree as any of their preferences when they applied for a school place - If Langley was not an option only 11% of respondents said Appletree would be their first choice - 33% of respondents would consider home schooling their children if Langley were to close ○ The persistent absence rate at Appletree is 15%, Langley persistent absence rate is 5.9% (the North Tyneside average is 13.7%). Absence data is a critical indicator of pupil engagement and school effectiveness, particularly under Ofsted’s updated inspection framework which has been recently broadened to include grading of ‘attendance and behaviour’ ○ “Schools Out Northern” at Langley First School provides childcare services from 7.30am to 6.00pm from term time from the age of 9 months and allow for flexible booking, Appletree Little Pips provides childcare from age 2 years, 7.45am – 5.30pm (4.30pm for nursery children), this is a significant time difference for working parents and could even cause a requirement to change employment ● Appletree Gardens Building is only more suitable than Langley First School for two years; ○ The larger number of classrooms at Appletree is only an advantage during the merged year groups stage, subsequent to this, the building has higher running costs of circa £44,000 in comparison to Langley circa £7,000 and lower space efficiency for the return to a 300 PAN school. ○ Only two of the proposed 13 Appletree classrooms meet the government guidance of 62m2 for 30 reception

children and 55m2 for 30 KS1+. Whereas 10 of the 11 Langley classrooms exceed the guidance. ○ Government guidance recommends a hall of a minimum 140m2 for PE and assemblies for KS2, Appletree assembly hall is below guidance at 130m2, Langley has an assembly hall of 190m2. Both have separate suitable dining halls. While this does not provide a solution for Woodlawn, although a 300 PAN school building for 32 pupils is unlikely to be a more efficient solution than the current split site arrangement PROPOSAL 7 : PHASED COQUET PARK CLOSURE Summary: Close Coquet Park in 2032, while reducing PAN at Marine Park in 2027 to accommodate a transition. Decrease PAN at Langley and Appletree Gardens to hit 390 PAN for NEPA first schools. Proposal: The main issue in NEPA is Coquet Park and its current -£324,966 revenue reserve. This is only due to increase year on year (-£127,135 this year.) This plan is the riskiest for the council but also the most prevalent in face of the rising costs of Coquet Park for the wider NEPA region. An issue the council faces is how to close the school in a controlled manner around it's PFI contract not ending until 2032. We propose closing Coquet Park in July 2032, and all children move to Marine Park for the next school year. To facilitate, if Marine Park (part of the same PFI contract) reduces its PAN to 60 in 2027, in 2033 upon the new school year it will begin again with a 90 PAN. All of Coquet Park's contingent will move across to Marine Park. This means anyone choosing Coquet Park in the interim knows of the move coming up. Langley and Appletree Gardens will drop to 45 PAN to facilitate a 390 PAN across the region, while giving the possibility to increase in future if (as predicted by ONS data) when birthrates increase again. Benefits: ● Getting out of the PFI contract and the deficit around Coquet Park will be the councils main educational need moving into the 2030's. ● A phased closure is great for parental choice. Anyone choosing Coquet Park knows the date of the move to Marine Park and can choose this with knowledge of the move. ● At only 650m away the two schools easily are walkable (as per councils guidelines on the Langley/Appletree Gardens proposal) ● At no point over the last 5 years has the number of children in the COMBINED catchment (Coquet Park and Marine Park) exceeded a 90 PAN. The highest was 79 in 2022 and 2020. The catchments would only need the slightest change to help Whitley Lodge as this is also in deficit and requires more students. ● At a 45 PAN, Langley and Appletree will seem 'full' as birth rates are dropping. At 60 they both struggle but a lower PAN would alleviate this. While the council believe this is an issue, there are potentials via grants and other financial fundraising this may be manageable. ● The birth rate is due to increase in the mid to late 2030's (Office for National Statistics data), having Langley and Appletree who can take more children when needed is a big bonus for the area.

Screen Name Redacted 11/13/2025 09:47 AM	The proposal to close Langley First School is both extremely short sighted and equally as divisive in the community. North Tyneside currently has an education system to be proud of, and the proposal to close a thriving First School at the heart of a community is incomprehensible. My alternative proposal would be to bring a consultation period and request all schools within the NEPA to form a MAT. Looking at First Schools initially, this would allow each First School to slightly reduce the PAN to accommodate lower birth rates, but also adjust dynamically to growing demands in a particular borough/ward. The cost savings achieved by joining a MAT would far outweigh the slight dip in pupil numbers. Adjustments to each PAN across the NEPA would accommodate the fact that birth rates are currently lower across all wards – the proposal to close Langley First School takes all of the hit in a single ward. This approach while also cost saving, allows full control over the PAN and would allow the target of 390 pupils to be achieved through collaboration and control within NEPA. Even more importantly, it also includes a plan for growth – something which is completely ignored within the current proposal. I also feel that Woodlawn School should be seen as a partner to Langley First School. Collaboration between both schools is key and it should be seen as an opportunity for inclusivity between mainstream and SEND.
Screen Name Redacted 11/13/2025 09:54 AM	I would propose a true democratic merger into a new school, where all carers/children/staff could have an input into a new school's name, ethos, uniform. There are great benefits to such a merger, in terms of keeping the best bits from both schools, and outside scrutiny driving standards up.
Screen Name Redacted 11/13/2025 09:55 AM	Langley is the stronger and more resilient school. Therefore I would propose and 2 year delay to the proposal allowing the largest cohorts to move through. Then in 2029, Appletree pupils would merge into Langley.
Screen Name Redacted 11/13/2025 09:58 AM	Find a different site to relocate Woodlawn School. Merging Langley and Appletree is not the answer.
Screen Name Redacted 11/13/2025 09:58 AM	I know that you have had loads of suggestions from our Friends of Langley, any of them would be better than closing our amazing school.
Screen Name Redacted 11/13/2025 10:04 AM	Since Langley is not massively undersubscribed it should stay open. 10% undersubscribed equates to 3 children!! Countless other schools

work with these numbers. [redacted] Houses are being built in North Tyneside attracting new families and I cannot see how you can predict with a great deal of accuracy what the school population will be in the future - you cannot base accurate formula for the future when the only certainty you have is of the current population and babies due in the next 9 months along with current, KNOWN numbers for pre-school children. There are too many other variables. Fair enough if you are dealing with under subscribed results of greater numbers, but 3 children!! Also I cannot see how a whole school population can be absorbed by another school without huge investment into the physical place and the staff needed to provide a 'good', at very least, educational setting. Far better that money is used to fund the current system. I am fearful that your decision has been made and the consultation process is purely a ticked box exercise for you. To my knowledge no one has visited the school and to make matters worse councillors are badly informed with falsehoods (such as children being unable to access their school field without crossing a road!) Also Langley's finances are not in deficit at the moment. Families move home all the time and Langley's population could change. I am certain that my grandson will thrive no matter what but he loves his Langley family.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:05 AM

MERGER WITH CLOSURE OF APPLETREE GARDENS Summary /Proposal: Merge Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School and move pupils from Appletree Gardens to the Langley First School site. Benefits: Langley First School is more likely to succeed following the merger; 73% of Langley catchment parents choose Langley in comparison to 44% of Appletree. Projected pupil numbers of the existing schools indicate an average of 26% surplus places at Appletree from 2025-2034 in contrast to 15% for Langley despite Appletree having 44 homes per planned place compared to Langley's 40 homes Appletree is statistically shown to be the NEPA first school most sensitive to falling birth rates, with the current NEPA birth indicating a requirement of 145 children to attend from outside of NEPA (at the reduced 390 NEPA PAN) they will be most at risk of being undersubscribed and susceptible to falling into deficit. There is a risk to the financial stability of the middle schools and Whitley Bay High School if the first school places aren't filled and the location of Langley at the edge of the NEPA catchment and it's ease of accessibility by car along with nearby parking provides a strong advantage over Appletree The parental survey undertaken by Langley highlights the points above with the following responses; 73% of respondents in catchment moved to the area for Langleyh 88% of respondents did not choose Appletree as any of their preferences when they applied for a school place If Langley was not an option

only 11% of respondents said Appletree would be their first choice 33% of respondents would consider home schooling their children if Langley were to close The persistent absence rate at Appletree is 15%, Langley persistent absence rate is 5.9% (the North Tyneside average is 13.7%). Absence data is a critical indicator of pupil engagement and school effectiveness, particularly under Ofsted's updated inspection framework which has been recently broadened to include grading of 'attendance and behaviour' "Schools Out Northern" at Langley First School provides childcare services from 7.30am to 6.00pm from term time from the age of 9 months and allow for flexible booking, Appletree Little Pips provides childcare from age 2 years, 7.45am – 5.30pm (4.30pm for nursery children), this is a significant time difference for working parents and could even cause a requirement to change employment Appletree Gardens Building is only more suitable than Langley First School for two years; The larger number of classrooms at Appletree is only an advantage during the merged year groups stage, subsequent to this, the building has higher running costs of circa £44,000 in comparison to Langley circa £7,000 and lower space efficiency for the return to a 300 PAN school. Only two of the proposed 13 Appletree classrooms meet the government guidance of 62m2 for 30 reception children and 55m2 for 30 KS1+. Whereas 10 of the 11 Langley classrooms exceed the guidance. Government guidance recommends a hall of a minimum 140m2 for PE and assemblies for KS2, Appletree assembly hall is below guidance at 130m2, Langley has an assembly hall of 190m2. Both have separate suitable dining halls.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:13 AM

Close Appletree gardens as they have more pupils from outside of the PAN and is the less financially viable school. If you are serious about the future of Woodlorn school and providing outstanding provision for those children the Monkseaton High School Building should be converted and turned into a best in the field site. Funding could come from your own budget (4 million set aside for multi year projects according to your CFO) and sought from central government. Tbh is would be a jewel in the crown of NTC and would also solve both the capacity issues at the current school as well as having an off road car park solving the issue of taxis etc which has been a constant issue between woodlorn and the public.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:13 AM

I am strongly opposed to the proposal to merge Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School. Both schools are successful, stable, and valued by their communities, and they should remain exactly as they are. This merger would reduce parental choice, disrupt two thriving school communities, and risk overcrowding, larger class sizes, and a decline in the high-quality, nurturing environments both schools currently provide. Bigger is not always

better, especially for young children who need stability and a strong sense of belonging. The Council is basing a permanent decision on short-term birth rate fluctuations, which may change again. Closing or merging a school is irreversible, and this proposal does not sufficiently explore alternative solutions that would keep both schools open while managing numbers in a more balanced way. I urge the Council to reject the merger and maintain both Langley First and Appletree Gardens as separate, fully functioning schools.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:15 AM

(1) To leave the schools as they are (2) To carry out an assessment of the local schools using correct information and data.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:23 AM

Close appletree gardens as this looks the less successful school

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:26 AM

I write as a concerned member of the Langley First School community to formally respond to the proposed closure of Langley First School. The school has a long-standing history of educational excellence, community engagement, and pastoral care, and its contribution to the local area cannot be overstated. It is vital that any proposals affecting its future are examined with the depth, rigour, and local understanding that such a significant decision demands. While I acknowledge that North Tyneside Council is undertaking a review of school provision in the area, the current consultation and the information presented to councillors and the wider community give serious cause for concern. There are notable gaps, inaccuracies, and a lack of thorough consideration of both the immediate and long-term impacts, all of which must be addressed before any irreversible decisions are made. The consultation appears to rely heavily on the figure of a 390-pupil admission number (PAN) as justification for closure. Although numerical data is important, overreliance on this single metric risks oversimplifying the complex realities of school provision across North Tyneside. The current reception intake already demonstrates that focusing narrowly on PAN can result in surplus places at secondary level in future years, with a current admission of 310. Without a comprehensive understanding of future housing developments, population trends, and patterns of parental choice, basing a decision of this magnitude solely on the 390 PAN figure is deeply flawed. Future housing developments in the surrounding area must be given proper weight in planning educational provision. Langley First School is uniquely positioned to serve the growing population, and a careful reallocation of catchment areas could balance pupil numbers across local schools without necessitating closure. Failure to incorporate these demographic projections risks undermining the sustainability of education in the area and destabilising long-established communities. Furthermore, new

residential developments will inevitably increase pressure on local infrastructure, particularly the road network. Reducing the number of schools within walking distance will force more families to rely on car transport, worsening congestion and creating safety concerns on already busy routes. The council must acknowledge that such decisions extend beyond education and have material consequences for local traffic, parking, and air quality. The existing three-tier education system in North Tyneside functions effectively and provides a well-established pathway for pupils. Any changes to this structure must be carefully considered to avoid disruption to pupils as they transition between key stages. A more constructive alternative could be the collaboration with a nearby secondary school catering specifically for an additional intake of pupils aged 13 to 16 from the 3-tier system. Done well, with a clear model this will provide additional high school places within the three-tier system, erasing the premature rush to crunch the high school numbers to '390', and positively blend the systems, providing parental choice and fairness. This would preserve the integrity of the three-tier model while delivering tailored provision for older students, thereby reducing disruption for those who thrive within this progression framework. Langley First School also plays a vital role in supporting children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND). Its inclusive ethos and experienced staff create a nurturing environment where all pupils can thrive. Expanding SEND provision within Langley, rather than dispersing pupils across multiple sites, or in an unnecessary (for some) specialist school would enable more focused and consistent support for those who need it most and provide an opportunity for these children to merge into a mainstream setting and ultimately help them to gain a greater sense of belonging in their wider community. Closure would fragment this provision, disrupt continuity of care, and risk the loss of invaluable specialist expertise. Consideration should also be given to utilising existing local facilities—such as parts of Monkseaton Middle School or Appletree—to accommodate older year groups of woodlawn school, ensuring a more age-appropriate environment. By contrast, creating a split 4–18 provision on a single site, as currently suggested, would fail to meet the pastoral and social needs of older pupils and could have adverse effects on their wellbeing and sense of belonging. If, despite community opposition, a merger is deemed unavoidable, it is essential that Langley First School assumes a leading role in any transition. Its strong leadership, proven educational excellence, and positive Ofsted record position it well to guide such a process. Both school's may currently be of the same ofsted rating but it would be wrong to base it on this alone, and Langley has a greater history of success with 19 years of 'outstanding' and 2 years 'good' as opposed to Appletree's 9 years 'satisfactory and 11 years 'good'. Any merger must be carefully staged and adequately resourced, ensuring that additional pupils are only introduced once Langley’s facilities and infrastructure can fully

accommodate them. This would preserve standards, uphold continuity, and demonstrate a commitment to sound strategic planning rather than short-term expediency. Before any closure is even considered, the council must also fully investigate the flexibility of Private Finance Initiative (PFI) schools within the area. There is untapped potential in the more effective use of existing facilities, which could relieve pressure elsewhere without resorting to closure. To date, no convincing evidence has been presented to demonstrate that this avenue has been properly explored. Another major omission from the consultation is the lack of consideration for wraparound care and nursery provision. Langley First provides essential early years education and extended care that working families rely upon. Its closure would remove a cornerstone of community support without any clear plan to replace it. This would not only disadvantage families but also exacerbate traffic and logistical challenges as parents seek childcare in alternative locations. These services are integral to community stability and economic participation and should form a central part of any review. The wraparound is also currently ran by a private company, the option to bring this in-house and ran by Langley First School themselves to bring in additional financial income is currently being explored further. The school is fully committed to working collaboratively to explore all options to solve the widespread projected financial issues that is not isolated to Langley First School, alone. It is important to highlight Langley First School is currently NOT in deficit, nor has it been and the issues with the councils' financial modelling means the projected future deficit is inaccurate and non-transparent. Equally concerning are the inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the data shared with councillors and the community. Transparency and accuracy are essential in decisions of this scale, and the current presentation of information has eroded confidence in the consultation process. Decisions of such gravity must be evidence-based, fully transparent, and developed in partnership with the community they affect. I urge that on this alone, it was unsound to continue with the consultation in its current form until all of these inaccuracies have been put right and corrected to the people/ councillors it was originally presented to. Another viable alternative, which challenges one of these inaccuracies and is supported by North Tyneside Council's own Education Review, would be to adjust PAN across the area rather than closing Langley altogether. The consultation guide incorrectly claims that it would be undoable to reduce a 60 PAN school to 45 and consider Rockcliffe First (which I believe requires building/ maintenance work) or Whitley Lodge First School because this would create three 45 PAN schools in the system. However, if one existing 45 PAN school were closed, this would still only leave two- achieving the same reduction in overall capacity without targeting a thriving, well-integrated school at the heart of its community. This solution aligns with the Council's stated aim of ensuring sustainable pupil numbers while causing far less

disruption. The council and school could then work collaboratively using more accurate financial and pupil projection modelling. Finally, the legacy and community role of Langley First School must not be overlooked. For generations, it has fostered academic success, emotional wellbeing, and a strong sense of belonging. Its contribution cannot be quantified solely in numbers or statistics. It represents a living tradition of community engagement and educational excellence that has positively shaped countless families. My younger child is due to start school in 2027, and I am deeply concerned that they may be denied the opportunity to attend the same nurturing and successful school their sibling currently enjoys. The potential loss of this continuity within families would have far-reaching consequences for community cohesion and parental confidence in local education. In summary, the proposal to close Langley First School is premature, inadequately evidenced, and fails to recognise the interlinked educational, social, and infrastructural implications for the area. A more considered approach would include rebalancing catchment areas to reflect housing growth, safeguarding the three-tier system, expanding SEND provision within Langley, exploring existing facilities before closure, and ensuring wraparound and nursery services are preserved. Above all, it would recognise Langley's leadership and track record as essential to any future restructuring. Langley First School is far more than a building or a number—it is a cornerstone of the community and a trusted foundation for children's futures. I urge the Council to pause, reconsider, and adopt a more measured, evidence-based approach that protects both educational quality and community integrity across North Tyneside.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:39 AM

I am a parent of a child currently attending Langley First School, and I wish to express my profound concern regarding the proposal to close Langley First and merge it with Appletree Gardens First School. My suggestion is that the Council pause this consultation and reconsider it in light of incomplete evidence, evolving local demographics, and opportunities to improve education provision sustainably. The current proposal does not adequately reflect the long-term educational needs of North Tyneside, the forthcoming Murton Gap housing development, or national guidance on inclusive mainstream SEND provision. I firmly believe that, with careful planning and collaboration, Langley First could continue to deliver high-quality education while playing a leading role in the wider local school network. The first step should be to delay the consultation to allow decisions to be based on a comprehensive and accurate understanding of current and future pupil numbers. The consultation appears to rely on short-term forecasts that exclude significant housing growth at Murton Gap. Hundreds of homes have already been built across the local area, and thousands more are planned. Permanently closing a successful school without considering this growth is short-sighted. Once these

homes are occupied, local schools will require every available place. To close Langley now would be akin to selling an umbrella on a sunny day, ignoring the storm approaching. Catchment boundaries are administrative tools, not fixed determinants of parental choice. Families select schools based on accessibility, reputation, and community ties, not merely maps. Many families on the edge of Murton Gap already consider Langley First the nearest and most suitable option. The Council's current modelling excludes these pupils,producing a distorted forecast. North Tyneside Council have recognised the large numbers the estate will bring but has failed to pay accurate consideration to the above points and allocated them all to the South East Planning Area. Government guidance instructs councils to consider new housing developments in school planning; ignoring Murton Gap contradicts this. By the Council's own estimates, approximately 2,700 homes are planned there, potentially generating hundreds of primary-age pupils. Langley First is geographically well placed to meet this demand, and closure would remove crucial flexibility from the local education network. A more constructive approach would build on Langley First's existing strengths. Rather than closing it, the Council could position Langley as the leading school within a federated or partnership model. The school has experienced leadership, strong community engagement, and well-maintained facilities. It operates effectively within the three-tier system, which provides smaller, nurturing environments and smooth transitions between stages. Sustainability and high standards can be achieved without closing a thriving school. A collaborative model would allow Langley to share expertise, support Appletree Gardens, and coordinate planning for future growth, ensuring both efficiency and parental choice are maintained. Langley First also has significant potential to expand specialist provision within a mainstream setting, particularly for children with SEND. The Education Secretary has emphasised inclusive education in mainstream schools, and Langley is well-positioned to deliver this vision. Its physical environment could be adapted for small-group and sensory spaces with modest investment. Enhancing SEND provision locally would meet rising demand and reduce pressure on specialist units elsewhere, aligning with national policy. Closure would eliminate this opportunity entirely and fragment existing inclusive support. Practical steps to achieve this would include: 1. Formally incorporating Murton Gap and other local housing developments into pupil projections, applying Government pupil-yield benchmarks and likely occupancy rates. 2. Conducting a transparent review of local school capacity and travel patterns, recognising that parental choice crosses administrative boundaries. 3. Developing a federated or hub-and-spoke model with Langley as the lead school, coordinating curriculum, SEND provision, and community engagement. The benefits of retaining Langley extend beyond education. The school forms part of the local social fabric, providing children with security, belonging, and inspiration.

Closing it prematurely risks disrupting families, fragmenting communities, and increasing pressure on local roads as parents are forced to drive children to more distant schools. Increased traffic would impact safety, congestion, and air quality in North Tyneside, compounding the practical and logistical challenges already faced by local families. Current pupil patterns in nearby developments, such as Robinsons Fields, reinforce Langley's importance. Families in these areas already demonstrate flexibility in school choice, with proximity and accessibility driving preference. Closure would force longer journeys for young children, increased pressures on roads and traffic, increased pressures on parents working patterns, disruption of peer groups, and increased strain on neighbouring schools. Any responsible planning must consider these real-world factors, not rely solely on projections excluding local housing and parental behaviour. Within the plans for Murton Gap, a need for a new primary school has been identified in the near-future. When the councils ultimate goal is to solve financial issues that falling rolls bring it seems short-sighted to not plan for this to be incorporated into already established schools and facilities. Financially, closure is not necessarily cost-effective. Transitional costs—including redundancy, additional transport, alterations to buildings and grounds, and pressure on receiving schools—often exceed projected savings. Modest investment in Langley, particularly to expand SEND provision and enhance its role in a partnership, would deliver long-term educational and financial benefits, leveraging existing staff, facilities, and community goodwill. Preserving the three-tier system is also crucial. Smaller, stage-appropriate schools support individualised pastoral care, smoother educational transitions, and stronger community bonds. Merging into a larger school risks eroding these advantages. By making Langley the leading school in any collaboration, the Council can retain the benefits of this system while achieving efficiency and planning for future demand. The Council should also consider the potential for Langley to enhance SEND provision, consistent with national policy. Targeted resources such as small-group teaching, sensory spaces, and specialist staff could accommodate a growing cohort locally, reducing the need for out-of-area placements. Closing the school would remove this opportunity, undermining inclusive education objectives. In conclusion, my suggestion is clear: Langley First should remain open, with the Council taking immediate steps to integrate long-term planning and community needs into any proposals. Housing growth, particularly at Murton Gap, must be included in forecasts. Langley should lead any partnership or federated model, develop SEND provision, and accommodate growth from local developments. Closure would remove flexibility, limit parental choice, disrupt communities, and increase pressure on local infrastructure. By contrast, retaining Langley offers a sustainable, inclusive, and forward-looking solution for North Tyneside's children, including my younger child, due to start

school in 2027. It is also worth noting that alternative options for rationalising capacity exist elsewhere within the local school system. For example, Rockcliffe First School, which serves a smaller and more geographically constrained catchment, could be more appropriately reviewed as part of any capacity reduction strategy. Its location offers limited potential for future growth compared with Langley First, which sits closer to the Murton Gap development and several expanding residential areas. Reviewing Rockcliffe's role, alongside wider catchment realignments, could achieve the same numerical balance while retaining school provision where it will be most needed in the coming years. This approach would also be consistent with the Council's Education Review principles of aligning capacity to projected housing growth and maintaining equitable access across all communities. Therefore, I propose you explore the idea of closing Rockliffe First School, and if numbers also require reduce the PAN of appletree gardens first school, as the least desirable school to 45 PAN. This would reduce by the same numbers and still only 2 45 PAN schools would remain in the system with opportunity to expand again in the future.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:44 AM

The decision to close Langley is short sighted. I cannot understand why the decision has been made to close Langley when it is so obviously the school of parental choice for the area. My alternative proposal would be to close Appletree- instead allowing for Langley to remain in place and the appletree children to merge on to the Langley site. Appletree is full of children from outside of catchment. So where are the parents within that catchment choosing to send their children? Langley First school. It makes little sense to close a school that has been successful for 70+ years when appletree is well under capacity year on year. Langley has only been under subscribed for one. This shows more parents choose Langley. The children of woodlawn who will not move across, are 32, rather than 300 and it is known that there is concern from woodlawn parents and staff about the age range that would then be together on one site rather than across two. Furthermore in a recent survey conducted by Langley First School, only 11% of parents said they would send their children to appletree. This is going to result in the school continuing to be underfilled. Leading to appletree eventually failing despite the decision to close Langley, a successful and popular school. Parents would rather homeschool their children than send them to appletree with 16% answering with this preference. I can understand that Appletree First School parents may be happy at this school with the situation as it is now, however when the proposal goes through I feel their concern may rise, as the council overfills small classrooms and destroys the school they once knew.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:47 AM

My strong suggestion is to retain Langley First School in its present location. There were also several inaccuracies published in the consultation documents, including (but not limited to): 1. Projected pupil numbers; 2. Deficit forecasting; 3. Inaccuracies in pupil data at other schools; and 4. There has been no community impact assessment done in relation to the closure of Langley First School. A community impact assessment was done in December 2024 but this was in relation to the Monkseaton High School closure. Also, neither early years provision nor wraparound provision have been considered as part of this consultation; and No governing body or senior manager of 'School's Out' (out of hours provision) at Langley First School has been contacted as part of external communication. The council's consultation document says Appletree "can accommodate 432 pupils, which is more than the amount of both schools combined when future birth rates and admission numbers are adjusted". However, when checked on the gov.uk website for the capacity of Appletree, the capacity is stated as being 293. As yet, the council has offered no assurance about how the Langley children could be safely accommodated on the site. Nor has it given any assurance to parents on class sizes. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, there is a concern that children will be placed in larger class sizes, which could have an adverse affect on their education and wellbeing. Finally, according to the government's school spending comparison tool Appletree is a more expensive building to run. Appletree spends £29 per square metre on utilities, compared to Langley which spends £4 per square metre. I think this is a rushed decision, lacking a robust evidence-base and more time should be taken to defer the proposed closure / merger.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:48 AM

Your proposal clearly has the goal to reduce your SEN costs by expanding a central hub at Woodlawn school, with Langley site being used for this expansion. The birth rate arguments you have made do not correlate with the expansion in housing in the area. Langley School operates at a consistently high standard of education and your report showed bias towards it's intake. Over 70% of students within it's catchment area attend Langley, demonstrating it's popularity in the catchment. The additional physical space at Appletree you have highlighted will not have capacity for Langley pupils to attend. This additional physical space is also used to assist the development of SEN children at Appletree. Creating huge classes full with no physical space for the development of children's mental health will ultimately lead to poor academic standards. The word "merger" has been taken from the Department for Education, when it will not be a merger. Appletree will not have any obligation to recruit staff from Langley or adopt any of it's values. This again has demonstrated

misleading reporting. Suggestions It is clear you as a council need to expand your SEN provision. Rather than centralizing this in Woodlawn, which will make local traffic worse, increase travel times for children, and hugely damage the area in closing Langley, you should consider this as an opportunity for Woodlawn's approach to be expanded into other schools. If Appletree has capacity and is already highly recommended for SEN provision, expand your SEN services there and use the space for that purpose. Do not just make an expanded Woodlawn the only place where SEN can be provided, decentralize this within Monkseaton, Whitley Bay and further to develop this service in other schools where there is capacity available. My other strong suggestion is your budget modelling. You have used very poor financial forecasting as a way to make a case that Langley will be in significant deficit in 3 years, when the reality is that Langley has never operated a deficit and it's forecast for this academic year shows a potential marginal one. It is clear the budget modelling system is inadequate and has been used inappropriately in your report. My last suggestion is to engage better with your schools. Your consultation period has not shown any desire to engage with the school staff or parents. Your team has not demonstrated diligence in this report and it lacks a huge amount of research, which would have been very easy to obtain by working with wider stakeholders. As a publicly funded entity, you will all be aware that you should be accountable for your decisions and work for the best interests of North Tyneside.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:52 AM

Option 1: Retain Langley First School as a Specialist Mainstream Setting for Early Years, Key Stage 1 and Lower KS2 Langley First School should remain open and evolve into a Special Educational Needs (SEN) specialist mainstream school for children from pre-school to Year 4. The school is ideally placed to build on its strong inclusive ethos and make effective use of the School-Based Nursery Capital Grant, for which it had already developed thoughtful and innovative plans. This funding could be used to repurpose the currently underused mobile classroom (adjacent to the Nursery) into a high-quality sensory classroom for children aged 2–3. These children could then transition smoothly into the main Nursery, benefiting from the expertise of Langley’s highly skilled and experienced staff. The proposed sensory provision would offer early, targeted support within a nurturing mainstream environment, fully aligned with the government’s ambition to expand access to high-quality early years education—particularly for two-year-olds and children with additional needs. Children would also benefit from free-flow access to Langley’s exceptional Nursery and Reception gardens, promoting inclusive, play-based learning and development. Langley’s staff already have an excellent track record in supporting children with additional needs and could work closely with Woodlawn School and

Monkseaton Middle School to strengthen local SEN provision. Under this model, Monkseaton Middle could become the SEN specialist mainstream setting for Years 5–11, providing continuity and progression for pupils as they move through their education. Together, these schools would form a collaborative and inclusive network of specialist mainstream provision across all key stages, ensuring that every child can access the right support in their local community. Option 2: If Closure Is Deemed Unavoidable, Langley First School Must Not Merge with Appletree — Instead, Establish a New School with a Fresh Identity If the closure of Langley First School were to proceed, it is absolutely vital that it does not merge with Appletree Gardens First School. This proposal is strongly opposed by parents, carers, and the wider community. A forced merger would result in the loss of Langley's unique identity, ethos, and sense of belonging — all of which are central to the wellbeing and progress of its pupils. Many families have chosen Langley specifically for its nurturing, inclusive approach and its smaller, community-based feel. To simply absorb Langley's children into Appletree would risk damaging that trust, upsetting settled children, and fragmenting a community that has supported generations of families. Instead, a more constructive and fair alternative would be to create a new school with a new Department for Education (DfE) number, drawing on the strengths of both Langley and Appletree. This new start would allow a fresh, forward-looking identity to be developed collaboratively by both school communities, while avoiding the negative connotations of one school being subsumed into another. Staffing should also be managed transparently and equitably, with all posts openly advertised and allocated fairly between the two existing staff teams. This approach would ensure the best possible mix of experience, expertise, and continuity for the children, while treating all employees with respect and fairness. Forming a new school — rather than forcing an unpopular merger — would honour both schools' histories, preserve community trust, and give every child the stability and identity they deserve.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:55 AM

The most effective and sustainable approach would be to merge Langley First School and Appletree First School, moving pupils from Appletree to the Langley site. This move should be delayed for at least two years, allowing the larger cohorts of children currently in the system to transition to middle school before any changes take place. Langley First School is the more successful and popular of the two schools. Current data indicates that 73% of parents within Langley's catchment choose Langley, compared to 44% for Appletree. This demonstrates the strong parental preference for Langley and highlights the risk that, even after a merger, families may still avoid Appletree — leaving it vulnerable to ongoing financial pressures and surplus capacity. While Appletree's building may offer short-term

capacity advantages during the current 'bulge' years, this issue will resolve naturally if the merger is delayed. Once the larger year groups move on, Langley will have sufficient space to accommodate projected pupil numbers. Langley represents the stronger long-term option for a number of clear reasons: • Larger classrooms and hall providing better learning and communal spaces. • Lower running costs, ensuring financial sustainability. • Extended wraparound care that operates longer hours, includes a wider holiday club, and supports children from nine months old — helping families with a single drop-off and pick-up point. • Safe street scheme at drop-off time, allowing children to walk, scoot, or cycle safely to school. • Higher parental preference and confidence within the community. • Proven resilience to fluctuating birth rates in the area. • Sustained demand — future parents are more likely to choose Langley over Appletree, securing the long-term success of the merged school. A merger based at Langley, implemented after a short delay, would protect educational standards, ensure smooth transitions for pupils, and reflect genuine parental and community preference.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:56 AM

Consider reducing PAN at both Langley and Appletree First schools and forming a federation school co-locating SEND provision. Closing Coquet First School (a one form entry school with structural deficit) in 2032 - PFI aligned and reduce Marine back to a PAN of 75 - something that was mentioned in guidelines to Langley closure/Appletree merger supporting documents. This reduces PAN as council has proposed but more in line with current and future demands and also allows schools to increase PAN again in future if required This piece sets out a comprehensive account of the factual inaccuracies, procedural shortcomings, and wider educational, social, and community impacts associated with the proposed closure of Langley First School. It draws upon publicly available data, consultation materials, and parent-led evidence to provide a balanced but critical analysis of the proposal. The findings demonstrate that the proposal to close Langley First School is based on incomplete and, in some cases, inaccurate information. It fails to adequately consider the impact on early years provision, wraparound care, community cohesion, children with special educational needs (SEN), and local transport infrastructure. It also overlooks key demographic and migration data indicating that the underlying rationale — falling birth rates — may be temporary and offset by population movement and planned housing growth and is not just a local but a nationwide issue. Given these deficiencies, the report concludes that a closure would be premature and potentially harmful. Should amalgamation proceed, the Council is urged to pursue a true merger between Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School under Department for Education guidance, to ensure equity, scrutiny, and continuity for children and families. 1. Introduction This report has been prepared to

provide a comprehensive analysis of the likely impact arising from the proposed closure of Langley First School, Whitley Bay. It responds to the North Tyneside Council consultation, identifying material inaccuracies and omissions in the documentation provided to Cabinet and the public, and outlining the potential educational, financial, and social implications. The analysis draws upon parent and community research, publicly available government data, and direct feedback from stakeholders associated with Langley First School. 2. Accuracy and Transparency of Consultation Documentation The initial documentation presented to Cabinet, which informed the decision to proceed to consultation, contained multiple factual inaccuracies: • School facilities: The Cabinet report stated that Langley pupils must cross a public highway to access playing fields. In reality, the school has a well-used playing field directly adjacent to the main building. A separate field across a minor road is used only once annually for Sports Day. Langley also maintains a reception garden based on a forest school ethos, a potting garden, and an outdoor classroom, all of which support inclusive education and children with SEND. • Financial position: The report incorrectly stated that Langley is in deficit. The school has only forecast a potential deficit for 2025–26 — for the first time — and is actively working with an independent financial advisor to improve its budget position. • Catchment accessibility: It was claimed that most dwellings in Langley's catchment can access Appletree Gardens without crossing major roads. This is inaccurate. Many children would be required to cross Seatonville Road and/or Cauldwell Lane, as well as Bromley Avenue, all of which are busy routes. • Engagement with schools: While meetings with headteachers were referenced, these were brief and excluded governing bodies, limiting schools' ability to contribute solutions. Additionally, the consultation documents themselves contained inaccuracies relating to projected pupil numbers, deficit forecasting, and pupil data at other schools. No specific Community Impact Assessment has been conducted in relation to Langley's closure; the only such assessment on record (December 2024) related to Monkseaton High School. 3. Procedural Concerns: Closure vs. True Merger Under Department for Education (DfE) guidance, there are two statutory routes to amalgamation: 1. Closing one school and transferring pupils to another. 2. Closing both schools and establishing a new entity — requiring approval from the Secretary of State and the Office of the Schools Adjudicator (OSA). The Council has opted for the first, simpler route, citing speed and local control. However, the Langley community strongly advocates for the second option — a true merger — for the following reasons: • A merger would avoid community division, ensuring both schools and children contribute to the ethos, name, and culture of a new institution. • It would ensure greater external scrutiny, enhancing public confidence in the decision. • It would allow a more deliberate and fair process, particularly given that Langley is not currently in deficit and there is no

immediate financial urgency. This approach would uphold fairness and ensure that the process reflects the shared interests of both school communities. 4. Building Capacity and Educational Environment The consultation asserts that Appletree Gardens can accommodate 432 pupils — exceeding the combined current capacity of both schools. However, government data lists Appletree's capacity as 293. Clarification has been requested but not provided. No assurances have been given regarding: • How Langley pupils would be safely accommodated on the Appletree site. • Future class sizes, particularly for pupils aged seven and older, where no legal cap exists. There are concerns that overcrowded classes could negatively impact educational outcomes and wellbeing. Furthermore, according to the government's school spending comparison tool, Appletree Gardens is significantly more expensive to run (£29/m² utilities) than Langley (£4/m²), raising concerns about long-term financial sustainability. 5. Traffic and Accessibility The proposal includes no traffic impact assessment. Key differences between the sites include: • Langley operates a daily street closure outside the school to ensure pupil safety; Appletree cannot do so as it sits on a bus route. • Langley benefits from a nearby free public car park; Appletree does not. • The assumption that pupils will walk to school is inconsistent with parental feedback. A parent survey found that while 78% currently walk to Langley, only 37.6% would walk to Appletree. The proportion driving would more than triple (from 18% to 55%), suggesting a significant increase in local traffic, congestion, and pollution. 6. Financial Context The Council's documentation projects future deficits for both schools but omits context: • Langley is not currently in deficit, while Appletree is on the list to receive Falling Rolls funding to compensate for surplus places. Langley is not on this list and does not receive this support. • The Council has not engaged directly with Langley's leadership to address its forecasted deficit, despite this being the responsible course of action. Financial sustainability concerns therefore appear overstated and unevenly applied. 7. Impact on Children with Special Educational Needs (SEN) Langley First School provides a robust and inclusive environment for children with additional needs: • 13.5% of pupils are on the SEN register, with a further 8% receiving targeted support. • The building is fully accessible, featuring ramp access, adapted toilets, and a specialist changing area. • The school offers a sensory room, outdoor classroom, forest school area, and multiple quiet intervention spaces. • Staff are highly trained in neurodiversity-affirming practice, with Thrive specialists, mental health ambassadors, and SENCO-led support across all key stages. No assurances have been provided regarding how — or whether — equivalent provision will be made at Appletree. The suspension of Appletree's planned Additionally Resourced Provision (ARP) further increases uncertainty. Langley's proximity to Woodlawn Special School represents a strategic inclusion opportunity that aligns with government priorities for keeping

children with additional needs in mainstream settings. 8. Demographics, Birth Rates, and Pupil Projections The Council's case for closure relies heavily on declining birth rates. However: • Office for National Statistics data shows that while birth rates declined until 2023, they are expected to stabilise by 2026 and then rise. • Internal migration trends show more families moving into North Tyneside, particularly coastal areas, to access the three-tier system. • 58% of surveyed Langley parents moved to the area specifically for the school. Furthermore, pupil projection data beyond 2030 appears to exceed the DfE's published National Pupil Projection Model timeframe and contains inconsistencies, such as unexplained changes in cohort sizes. When corrected, Langley's projected surplus in 2030 is 14% — within 4% of the Council's acceptable range — while Appletree's is 34%, well above it. 9. Parental Choice and Community Impact Langley has a consistently higher proportion of catchment children (73%) than Appletree (44%) and a wider geographic draw. Parental surveys show that 88% of Langley families did not list Appletree as a preference school. Only 11% would choose it as an alternative if Langley closed. Closing Langley therefore directly contradicts patterns of parental preference and risks long-term instability by eliminating the more popular and demographically resilient school. 10. Early Years and Wraparound Provision The consultation does not consider early years or wraparound care, despite their crucial role in supporting working families. Langley's "Schools Out Northern" service provides flexible care from 7.30am–6pm, including holiday provision. Appletree's "Little Pips" service operates shorter hours (7.45am–5.30pm, ending earlier for nursery) and reduced holiday provision. Survey data shows: • 60.5% of parents regularly use Langley's wraparound care. • 35.6% would need to reduce working hours if it ceased. • 62 families are already considering home-schooling if Langley closes. A failure to replace this provision would significantly affect family employment and local childcare capacity. 11. Wider Systemic Impact The proposal also affects other schools within the North East Planning Area (NEPA): • Woodlawn School: Plans to relocate post-16 provision onto the Langley site risk displacing 300 mainstream pupils to accommodate 32 students — conflating two unrelated issues (mainstream and SEND capacity). • Coquet Park First School: Although not selected for closure due to its PFI status, it faces long-term structural deficit, raising questions about equity and financial rationale in the Council's selection process.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:04 AM

Give the whole process more time. I find it hard to trust the council's reasoning because so much of it feels disconnected from reality. The birth rate figures you've used don't take into account the impact of COVID-19, which caused a temporary dip that shouldn't be treated as a long-term trend. On top of that, the housing development you've

	referenced is only half finished, and families are still moving in—so we can't possibly know the true demand for school places yet. When decisions are based on incomplete or inaccurate information, it leaves our community questioning how we can have confidence in the outcome
Screen Name Redacted 11/13/2025 11:05 AM	Place Woodlawn students in the newly vacated Monkseaton high school and create a 'Northern Hub of excellence for children with additional needs'. This will reduce traffic around already crowded streets and will help with you provision for SEN children in line with government guidelines. There is then space to either expand Langley in to the Woodhorn side of the building as and when it is required with the new housing development bringing in many new families. Or the council then has the scope and space to create a Langley Primary school to cater for children from Nursery to year 6. Money will also be saved as there is a pool on site, so ferrying children to swimming lessons could be avoided and children could also be brought to the new facility from other areas of the borough.
Screen Name Redacted 11/13/2025 11:06 AM	Maintain both schools. 2025/26 birth rate appears to be higher and there are a large number of houses being built which will increase number of families in the area
Screen Name Redacted 11/13/2025 11:15 AM	Keep Langley open. It's an excellent school with good results and reports. Children thrive there. There are new houses being built locally and school spaces will be needed. Apple tree doesn't have the same reputation, not is there space to accommodate the children from Langley.
Screen Name Redacted 11/13/2025 11:17 AM	Keep Langley open
Screen Name Redacted 11/13/2025 11:19 AM	My suggestion is that the council adopts a phased, child-centred approach which protects all children already in the system from structural upheaval, while managing surplus places and future deficits in a controlled way. Any reorganisation should start from current Reception-age children downwards, not from the council's wish to eliminate projected deficits at the earliest possible date. I see two levels to this, in order of priority: 1. The ethically correct and educationally best route – full protection for current cohorts, with structural change applying only to future intakes. 2. A minimum acceptable compromise – federation + five year PAN taper + formal transitional guarantees – if the council refuses to hold the system steady for current cohorts. Both are more child-centred and still more

than capable of addressing the council's concerns than the immediate closure and merger proposed. Protect the children who are already in the system The starting point should be very clear: - Any child who has already commenced their education within the Whitley Bay three-tier system should be allowed to finish that journey within that system. - Structural changes should apply to children who have not yet started school – for example, new Reception intakes from an agreed future year – rather than to those already in Reception, Year 1, Year 2, Year 3 or Year 4. - Out-of-catchment children who are already settled and thriving at Langley or Appletree Gardens should not be placed under pressure to move home, or move school, or change system, simply because the council wishes to bring forward deficit reduction. In practical terms, this means explicitly protecting what many families reasonably saw as a "bubble" of children: the current cohorts who entered school on the understanding they were joining a three-tier pathway and building relationships and routines accordingly. --- Option 1 – Keep schools structurally as they are for current cohorts and phase in change for future intakes This option is the most protective of children and the most straightforward to understand. Under this option: - Langley First, Appletree Gardens First, and the relevant Middle schools remain open in their current form for all pupils who are already on roll. - All current pupils are guaranteed progression into the three-tier path as originally envisaged – First to Middle to High. - Structural changes (closures, mergers, changes in age range or a possible move towards two-tier) apply only to new intakes from a defined year onwards (for example, children starting Reception in 2027 or later). How this can be achieved: - The council adopts a formal transitional scheme which guarantees that all children on roll at Langley or Appletree as of an agreed cut-off date will: Complete their First school education on their current site, and retain guaranteed access to an appropriate Middle and High in the Whitley Bay three-tier pathway. This can be implemented by adding a clear transitional priority group into the oversubscription criteria at Middle and High level covering these named cohorts. - Clear structural timetable for future intakes The council then sets a future start date for any structural change. For example: From September 2027, the new admissions structure will be X (whether two-tier, merged Firsts, etc), but all children who started before that date will complete their journey under the present three-tier arrangements." This ensures families with younger children know exactly which system they are entering, instead of having the rules changed on them mid-way. - Financial management of interim deficits In the interim period while current cohorts are protected, the council uses its existing tools – licensed deficits, DSG management, gradual staff non-replacement and natural wastage – to manage the financial impact. The serious projected deficits do not arise instantly; they build over future years. The council has time to manage them without front-loading disruption onto existing children. Educationally, this option is

clearly best: It provides stability, predictable transitions, and continuity of relationships. It does not turn current children into “transitional collateral” for system redesign. It allows families who chose the three-tier path – including those outside strict catchment who are already in the school community – to honour that choice. Financially, it asks the council to accept that there will be a managed period where there is some financial pressure and some surplus capacity locally, in order to protect young children’s wellbeing. That is a policy choice, not an impossibility. --- Option 2 – Federation + five year PAN taper + transitional guarantees (minimum acceptable compromise) If the council refuses to hold the system entirely steady for current cohorts, the minimum acceptable compromise should be: A federation between Langley First and Appletree Gardens First, a five year tapered reduction in Published Admission Numbers (PANs) across the relevant First schools instead of an immediate 60-place cut, and formal transitional guarantees for current pupils’ three-tier progression. This compromise still protects children far better than the current merger proposal, while giving the council a plausible route to address future deficits and surplus capacity. 1. Federation between Langley and Appletree: Rather than closing Langley, the council should support a federation in which: there is one executive headteacher overseeing both schools; the two schools share a single governing body; leadership, administration, and SEN coordination are shared across the two sites; curriculum planning and policies are aligned, and staff can be deployed flexibly. This achieves several things: It reduces duplication in senior leadership and back-office roles, creating genuine cost savings. It allows both sites to remain open, preventing an immediate influx of all Langley pupils onto the Appletree site and avoiding class size inflation. It gives a structured framework within which future changes can be planned jointly, rather than one community being told it is being shut and absorbed by another. Federation is a well-established tool, used widely across England, for exactly this kind of situation – it allows savings without sacrificing local presence and continuity for children. 2. Five year PAN taper: Instead of removing 60 places in one step by closing Langley, the council should: agree a five year PAN taper across Langley and Appletree (and, where fair and proportionate, small reductions across other local First schools) to bring the cohort totals down towards 390; reduce intake gradually (for example by 5–10 places per year, per school) in response to actual birth and admission data; monitor these figures year by year and adjust the taper if reality diverges from projections. A tapered approach: still achieves the council’s aim of eliminating surplus capacity; avoids sudden saturation of Appletree; gives staff and families time to adjust to changing cohort sizes, and reduces the risk of later discovering that projections were inaccurate. 3. Transitional guarantees: Even under a federation + taper approach, current pupils’ rights and expectations need explicit protection. This can be done by: building a transitional

priority group into the oversubscription arrangements for relevant Middle and High schools for all current cohorts at Langley and Appletree; explicitly including children who live outside the strict catchment but are already established at these schools; ensuring that PANs and, if required, one-off bulge places are sufficient to accommodate these cohorts at Middle and High level until they complete their time in the system. This is particularly important in cases like my daughter's, where being technically outside the catchment does not change the fact that she started Reception in the three-tier Whitley Bay pathway and is settled in the school community. She, and others in similar positions, should not be forced into moving school or system mid-way because of later structural changes. Relationship to Monkseaton Middle and Monkseaton High... The issues around Langley and Appletree cannot be fully separated from the wider context – the planned closure of Monkseaton High and the consultation on Monkseaton Middle. There are questions here which require an area-wide conversation: Whether Monkseaton Middle might, in future, act as a Key Stage 2 hub in a carefully phased move towards a two-tier structure; whether the empty Monkseaton High buildings could, in future, be used as a multi-use education campus (for Middle, upper primary, or additional SEND provision). However, those are medium- to long-term strategic questions. They should be considered in a separate, dedicated review, with their own options appraisal and consultation, rather than being used to justify immediate closures and mergers that fall disproportionately on current First school cohorts. Under either Option 1 or Option 2 above: current Reception–Year 4 children at Langley and Appletree would complete their three-tier journey without further disruption; any re-use of Monkseaton Middle or Monkseaton High, or any shift towards two-tier, would be timed to start with new intakes after those children have progressed. In regards to the SEND expansion at Woodlawn and use of the Langley site... I recognise that the council wants to use the Langley site to expand Woodlawn Special School and improve SEND provision. This is an important and worthwhile aim, and I support the principle of enhancing SEND capacity. However, even this does not require the abrupt closure of Langley's mainstream provision for children who are already there. The council could: phase Woodlawn's expansion over time, initially use part of the Langley site while allowing existing mainstream cohorts to finish their First phase on the remainder, align the end of Langley's mainstream intake with the start of full Woodlawn expansion, so that change is driven by natural leavers rather than forced moves. --- My suggestion is that the council adopts a reorganisation plan which: keeps both Langley and Appletree open in the short and medium term; fully protects current cohorts' three-tier progression wherever possible; only applies structural changes to future intakes; uses federation and tapered PAN reductions to reduce surplus places and deficits; embeds formal transitional guarantees for existing pupils, including those outside

catchment; phases Woodlawn's expansion in a way that does not displace current Langley children prematurely; and considers the potential use of Monkseaton Middle and Monkseaton High as part of a separate, area-wide strategy, not as a reason to rush changes onto current young children. This approach strikes a more honest balance between financial responsibility and the council's fundamental duty to protect standards, continuity, and the wellbeing of children who are already in its care.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:24 AM

Merge Langley First School and Appletree First School and move the pupils from Appletree to the Langley First School site, and delay this move for an additional two years until the larger cohorts of children have moved onto middle school. Langley First School is the more successful school of the two schools. 73% of Langley catchment parents chose Langley in comparison to 44% of Appletree. There is a risk that in the future potential parents will not choose to send their children to Appletree, and therefore Appletree will still fall into deficit, and continue to have surplus spaces. The Appletree building is only more suitable than Langley during the 'bulge' year group stage, this will be resolved if the merger is delayed. After this point all predicted children will fit into Langley. Langley is a more suitable school in the future for numerous reasons: • The classrooms are bigger • The running costs are lower • The hall is bigger • Langley's wraparound care operates for longer hours, has a wider holiday club offering, and is able to take children from nine months old, meaning parents are able to have one drop off and pick up location, and have longer to get from work to collect their children. • Langley operates a morning 'safe street' whereby the street outside school is closed to cars and children can safely walk, scoot, and bike into school. • Langley has a higher parental preference. • Langley as a school has shown greater resilience to fluctuating birth rates in our region. • There is a strong likelihood that prospective parents will not choose Appletree in the future.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:27 AM

The proposal to close Langley and displace 300 local school children into a system that doesn't have space for them at Appletree is being made to benefit 32 pupils who are currently based at Woodlawn's Post 16 provision at Marden High School. The majority of these children will travel to the current Woodlawn site in cars, buses and taxis, putting more pressure on an already very busy local neighbourhood with narrow residential streets, whilst currently many local children walk to school and benefit from the Safe Streets scheme operating around Langley. The government's ambition is to keep as many children with SEND in mainstream education and Langley already offers first class and long-established SEND provision, and indeed 13.5% of its current role are currently classed

as SEND, rising to 24% when you take into account those receiving additional support due to early identification. This provides a strategic opportunity of dual registration for Langley and Woodlawn or similar options, that would not only protect the future of both, equally important schools, it would protect and enable this 24% of pupils to remain in mainstream education and not displace 300 local children at the expense of 32 post 16 pupils from the current Woodlawn roll. The council needs to think further out of the box and look into this as a viable proposal that looks at the needs of young children instead of considering schools as merely buildings. It is interesting to read no impact assessment has taken place for this proposal. Something I thought was fundamental and indeed statutory when putting forward proposals such as this. This suggestion would also protect Langley as successful, viable and popular school, which many parents in the Appletree catchment choose to send their children to. Langley also isn't currently in financial deficit although the local authority has inaccurately stated this. Langley is predicted to go in to deficit in 25 / 26 for the first time ever, but is working to prevent this. In comparison, another local school - Coquet Park, who from 22 / 23 has been in deficit and predicts a continued deficit of £0.325m in 25 / 26, with no plan to show how it plans to balance this deficit. It also is a one-form entry school, something the council says isn't financially viable and is in general poor value for money for local tax payers. I understand that this school is a PFI funded school which in a way protects, it, but why at the expense of Langley and it's 300 pupils who will be displaced if the school closes. Also, in comparison to Appletree, which costs £29 per square metre for utilities, Langley runs at a fraction of that cost - £4 per square metre for utilities. Appletree is also in receipt of 'Falling Rolls funding' which Langley isn't as it's surplus is within the council's acceptable range. All of this information makes it clear that this proposal is purely a money saving exercise for North Tyneside Council at the expense of a successful and financially viable school, which operates within the council's standards. This makes it even more apparent that the council MUST look at other options where SEND provision is protected in mainstream education but also at options of Langley and Woodlawn working more closely together. I would suggest you visit both schools and speak to pupils, parents, teachers and the governing bodies to fully understand what is possible and how important it is to consider these options and look at new proposals with children at the heart of these. I think is it appalling there has been no contact with Langley or any visits to the school from anyone from the council during this period. You should be ashamed, which it seems you are with your lack of visibility.

Screen Name Redacted

11/13/2025 11:27 AM

Firstly you need to put right all the wrong information and data already provided which works against any fair consultation. Secondly you need to present a projection of likely pupil numbers [nursery up to 18]

emanating out of the Murton Gap development for the next 10-20 years as it works in the opposite direction to the likely changes in population numbers of all age groups up to 2042; this affects several schools, of which the nearest to Murton Gap in Langley FS. Also to consider more localised projections of numbers in the Whitley Bay and Monkseaton areas, which may not following the same pattern as general projections for the borough as a whole. Thirdly you need to consider a fulll true merger for Langley FS and Appletree as part of a wider consultation in relation to all the schools in the area, and whether indeed the future should be 2-tier as it is in other parts of the borough. These have been considered seperately in the past, and proposals of the magnitude of major school closures [which started with Monkseaton High] need to be part of a wider review, which can then incorporate SEND pupils properly as well. I propose that nothing can be done until the corrections are fully made to the documents, the issues then recirculated and a proposal of the impact of a change to 2-tier is fully considered alongside the changes in numbers of school-aged children specifically in different areas across the borough, rather than considering just 2-tier a couple of years ago and a multitude of unpopular changes now- they are connected, not disconnected. The proposals currently being considered are a BIG issue for people and are connected to the local plan for building, with future projections of school-aged pupils locally in WB and Monkseaton, with future traffic issues, with everything so you must consider 2-tier in that context as well. Dont just blunder on this particular group of proposals and then later wish you had done it better. At the very least, I propose that, specficially in relation to Langley and Appletree, that a proposal to close both is the only fair way to deal with this. But also proposals to close others might be done at the same time. This takes time. Consultation should actually mean consultation, not "done deeds" which I worry this all is. However these essentially must take into account the best interests of children, not just be some convenient way of sorting out the SEND problem. The best interests do not include having more children run over by traffic using very busy roads, but they do include retaining the best schools we have in NT, such as Langley FS. I am aware that FoL are submitting carefully thoughout alternatives and you must consider these as they are done in the best interests of all pupils and are based on a lot more information which is considerably more accurate than that provided during this 'consultation'- I hope it really has been a real consultation- I understand from my son and his wife at a meeting with parents, NT people presented wrong facts, made wrong assumptions and altogether made it look like a fait accompli. I hope this isnt the case.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:36 AM

First and foremost, I would like propose that the final decision is taken by the Council Cabinet utilising the correct information. There have

been a large number of discrepancies in the information used to arrive at this proposal, the key ones of these (as there were many!) are: - Langley has a field separated by a public highway, meaning groups of children are escorted ‘off site’ for each PE/sporting activity and have no access to playing fields for lunch and dinner breaks - UNTRUE. The school does in fact have a well-used playing field immediately adjacent to the building, with a separate field across a minor road which is used once a year for sports day. Langley also has an outdoor space in the reception garden, which follows a forest school ethos and is also used for children with SEND as well as a potting garden and an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming) - The school is in financial deficit - UNTRUE .The school has only predicted a deficit for the year 25/26, for the first time ever and is working with an independent financial advisor to see where the budget can be improved. - The majority of dwellings [currently in Langley catchment] can access [Appletree] without crossing major roads - UNTRUE. Many of our children (including my own) would need to cross Seatonville Road and/or Cauldwell Lane). [redacted] There were briefings and reports with headteachers - UNTRUE. Whilst there have been meetings, this has been very brief and Headteachers could not include Governors which meant there was little options for them to act or come up with solutions. [redacted] Within its consultation documentation, the council states: While currently both schools are in surplus (they receive more funding than they spend), Langley First is predicting a deficit (spending more than they receive) in 2026 which is projected to grow to £0.751m by 2028. At the same time Appletree Gardens is predicting it will enter deficit by 2028. School leaders have made changes and worked hard with the Council to make the financial situation better, but because low pupil numbers mean less funding, the situation is not improving. If left unchanged, the risk is that the two schools would continue to grow in deficit, and this in turn would limit their ability to sustain high quality education. Whilst these figures are not inaccurate, they are somewhat misleading. Appletree Gardens is in receipt of additional Falling Rolls funding, to make up for its surplus places. Langley is not in receipt of this funding, as its surplus figure is within the council’s acceptable range. This means that actually Appletree Gardens has more of a deficit than Langley First School. I can also personally attest that the council has not met - nor offered to meet - with the leadership or governing team at Langley to provide them with the opportunity to address its forecasted deficit. Alternative Solution If the council really do want to look at finances, I suggest they look at Coquet Park and 'value' that is providing. Within the consultation documents, the council makes reference to considering

the closure of Coquet Park but that this was not deemed financially viable. This is due to a private finance initiative (PFI) school, which the council is contractually obligated to until 2032. According to the council's cabinet paper, 2022/23 was the first financial year that the school ended with a deficit balance (Langley has not projected that until this FY), and it ended 2024/25 with a cumulative deficit of £0.325m. The school has been unable to submit a budget plan which shows it coming back into financial balance within three years (something Langley has not been given the opportunity to do). In line with Scheme for Financing Schools, the school is classified as being in a structural deficit, which means there is a long-term financial problem that requires significant, strategic changes to resolve. The school currently also has a one-form entry, something the council says is not financially viable (Langley is two-form). As well as being poor value for money for the taxpayer, due to the high interest charges the PFI contract is costing the council, this school is not financially viable by the council's own recognition. In the absence of any proposed solutions being made available, it is difficult to understand how the council proposes to stop this school from being forced to close once the PFI contract ends in 2032. Surely this is delaying the inevitable? So, rather than throwing in good money after bad, the closure of this school would then resolve this issue.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:38 AM

If there is to be a 'merger' between Appletree, the only fair solution for children, staff and the community is to make this a true merger by closing both Langley and Appletree and forming a new school with a new leadership, identity and ethos on the current Appletree site. The merge date should be delayed by a year to September 2028 to allow time for this to take place, while ensuring that the current Year 2 group (which is at full current capacity across all NEPA schools) can progress to middle school, reducing the need for additional short-term capacity on the Appletree site. The formation of a new school would combine the best of both Appletree and Langley while ensuring a new, vibrant identity, and resolving any negative feeling around the closure of Langley, a much loved school at the heart of the community. this approach will also maximise the chance of the new school being a preferred choice within the North East Planning Area both in the short term and longer term, ensuring the ongoing viability of the new school. This proposal would be fairer for pupils. The current proposal to close Langley would be very disruptive for pupils as they will be required to integrate to an existing school with new teaching methods and few (if any) of their current teachers accompanying them on the move. This proposal would also be fairer for staff, providing staff of both Appletree and Langley with an opportunity to apply for roles at the new school, enduring the best of Appletree and Langley's leadership, teaching staff and practice are combined. Supporting Information - Langley is the preferred school of

the local community, with 75% of children living in catchment area attending Langley, vs 44% of children in Appletree catchment going to Appletree. At the time of the planned merger there would also be more children from Langley than Appletree at the combined school. Ensuring that the new school is the chosen option for parents will be vital, and this proposal makes this more likely than the current plan. The formation of a new school would combine the best of both Appletree and LangleyThis would ensure that Langley is the preferred school among the local community with more in children catch

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:46 AM

We as a community need the correct facts and figures to make suggestions. The projections and forecasts can not be correct if the initial data is floored.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:47 AM

My alternate proposal is to close coquet park, a school already in a financial deficit but protected by PFI status. The council is making a short sighted decision when there is a school that is already massively in a deficit. I propose that at the very least this process is suspended for the foreseeable as the timescale given has not been sufficient for parents to come up with alternatives/examine the data provided.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:48 AM

There are many people better placed and significantly more informed on this matter than I am. I still felt it important to have my say. It is discussing that you are looking to close Langley. There feels no real substance to any of the reasons given. The meeting held at Whitley High school was an embarrassment.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:51 AM

Move Woodlawn to the Appletree Gardens site, where they could accommodate their 30 extra Sixth Form pupils and the new REAL merger of two excellent First Schools could have the site of Woodlawn and Langley. It's a greener space where the children go out more regularly and there would be the least disruption caused as I don't think that 'catchment' necessarily applies to Woodlawn pupils.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:54 AM

Delay merger. Move Appletree gardens onto Langley site. Larger site at Langley (see individual school footprints) with better persistent absence rates (5.9% at Langley and 15% at Appletree). Higher parental choice for their catchment school (73% of Langley catchment choose Langley school and only 44% of Appletree catchment choose Appletree school) Federate Langley and Appletree schools and along with Woodlawn align for SEND provision.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:54 AM

We have suggestions that are too in depth to address on this forum. My son in law and other parents have put forward their views of how this difficult situation can be addressed. Of course, a unemotional factual based outcome on paper would appear to work well, but put in the mix hundreds of families and children of primary age thrown into the reality of this, it is not a feasable proposition in its current form. More time is required to work through, with parents a outcome that can work.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:56 AM

Having read through the consultation I do not believe that the council have fully explored alternative options. The options appraisal is not particularly comprehensive or creative. I believe a range of alternative options should have been fully explored before presenting a rather binary choice. Alternatives that could have been given more consideration include: maximising opportunities for inclusive provision within mainstream provision, while retaining the specialisms of Woodlawn and Monkseaton Middle School; the impact of the future debt burden of the PFI schools in the NEPA area, options to achieve a true 'merger' of Appletree and Langley (the current proposal is not a merger - it is the closure of a thriving school and the movement of pupils into an existing school).

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:59 AM

Close Appletree, allow pupils to attend Langley and other first schools in the area, turn Appletree into a combined SEN school with monkseaton middle school.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:59 AM

General issues with the process ● The initial documentation given to the council’s cabinet, which the decision to move to consultation was based upon, contained several inaccuracies, including: ● Langley has a field separated by a public highway, meaning groups of children are escorted ‘off site’ for each PE/sporting activity and have no access to playing fields for lunch and dinner breaks (This isn’t true. The school does in fact have a well-used playing field immediately adjacent to the building, with a separate field across a minor road which is used once a year for sports day. Langley also has an outdoor space in the reception garden, which follows a forest school ethos and is also used for children with SEND as well as a potting garden and an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming) ● The school is in financial deficit (This is incorrect. The school has only predicted a deficit for the year 25/26, for the first time ever and is working with an independent financial advisor to see where the budget can be improved) ● The majority of dwellings [currently in Langley catchment] can access [Appletree] without crossing major roads (This is incorrect. Many of our children would need to cross Seatonville Road and/or Cauldwell Lane) ● There were briefings and

reports with headteachers (Whilst there have been meetings, this has been very brief and Headteachers could not include Governors which meant there was little options for them to act or come up with solutions) ● There were also several inaccuracies published in the consultation documents, including (but not limited to): ● Projected pupil numbers ● Deficit forecasting ● Inaccuracies in pupil data at other schools ● There has been no community impact assessment done in relation to the closure of Langley First School. A community impact assessment was done in December 2024 but this was in relation to the Monkseaton High School closure. ● Neither early years provision nor wraparound provision have been considered as part of this consultation ● No governing body or senior manager of 'School's Out' (out of hours provision) at Langley has been contacted as part of external communication. Merger vs closure The campaign's position is that we don't believe Langley is the right school to choose for closure. However, if we cannot persuade the council on this, we would like it to be a true merger. It isn't currently. Under department of education guidance, there are two ways to amalgamate two or more schools: 1. Close one school and move the children to another school 2. Close both (or more) schools and publish a proposal of its intention to do this. This option requires consent from the Secretary of State and then final approval from the Office of Schools Adjudicator (OSA), not the council. The council argues that this takes decision making away from the local area and is a longer, more complex, statutory process which would lengthen the process and increase uncertainty. The campaign's position is that a true merger is the fairer way to approach this for the following reasons: ● The current consultation has already created divides within our community which are unhelpful. Both schools are good schools, it's not fair to penalise one over the other. A true merger would mean both schools - and most importantly the children - could have an input into a new school's name, ethos, uniform etc and would mean we could keep the best bits from both schools, including staff. It would also make the transition smoother for the children. ● The requirement to ask permission from additional routes (the Secretary of State and then final approval from the Office of Schools Adjudicator) increases the scrutiny over the decision making process, which we see can only be a good thing ● This should be about doing the right thing, not the easier thing. Surely if we want to get this right for our children, we shouldn't be rushing the process. Given Langley isn't yet in deficit, why does it matter that it will take longer? Building space ● The council's consultation document says Appletree "can accommodate 432 pupils, which is more than the amount of both schools combined when future birth rates and admission numbers are adjusted". However, when we checked on the gov.uk website for the capacity of Appletree, the capacity is stated as being 293. The campaign has asked for clarification on this ● As yet, the council has offered no assurance about how the Langley children could be safely

accommodated on the site ● Nor has it given us any assurance on class sizes. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, there is a concern amongst us that our children will be placed in larger class sizes, which could have an adverse affect on their education and wellbeing. ● According to the government's school spending comparison tool Appletree is a more expensive building to run. Appletree spends £29 per square metre on utilities, compared to Langley which spends £4 per square metre. Traffic ● No evidence has been provided in the supporting documents in relation to traffic impact as a result of these proposals ● Langley currently closes the street outside school every morning to make it safer for the children. Appletree cannot close the street to cars in the mornings or at collection times due to it being on a bus route. ● Langley also has a free public car park very close by, which Appletree Gardens does not have. ● The assumption appears to be that children will walk to school. ● The parent survey carried out by Friends of Langley asked parents how they currently travel to school: ● 78% (150) said they walk ● 18.3% (35) said they drive ● When asked how they they would travel is their children attended Appletree: ● 55% (104) said they would drive ● 37.6% (71) said they would walk Finance Within its consultation documentation, the council states: While currently both schools are in surplus (they receive more funding than they spend), Langley First is predicting a deficit (spending more than they receive) in 2026 which is projected to grow to £0.751m by 2028. At the same time Appletree Gardens is predicting it will enter deficit by 2028. School leaders have made changes and worked hard with the Council to make the financial situation better, but because low pupil numbers mean less funding, the situation is not improving. If left unchanged, the risk is that the two schools would continue to grow in deficit, and this in turn would limit their ability to sustain high quality education. Whilst these figures are not inaccurate, they are somewhat misleading. Appletree Gardens is in receipt of additional funding, known as Falling Rolls funding, to help it make up for its surplus places Langley is not in receipt of this funding, as its surplus figure is within the council's acceptable range. The council has not met - nor offered to meet - with the leadership or governing team at Langley to address its forecasted deficit. Children with special educational needs (SEN) ● There are 40 children out of 297 on the SEN register, equating to 13.5%. However, there are an additional 24 children who are receiving additional support following early identification, which takes this figure up to 24%. ● [redacted] ● Langley offers the following support for children with additional needs: ● The building is all on ground level with ramp

access, accessible toilets and a specially adapted changing space with bed for a child with a catheter ● The sensory room has no windows allowing a fully darkened experience if needed, and has a padded wall and floor ● The outdoor space in the reception garden follows a forest school ethos, used for children with SEND through their time at Langley, and there is a potting garden to offer gardening opportunities for small groups of children. ● The teachers offer a lunchtime club away from the dinner hall ● There are three specially adapted spaces - The Nest in Nursery, The Sensory Room (Hive), which offers an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming, and a specifically adapted KS2 space. These spaces allow for breathing space as well as targeted intervention for children who struggle with the demands of the classroom and are well used. ● Every classroom has a 'haven' area which children can use to regulate and re-set. ● The following classroom adaptations are regularly used throughout the school; flexible seating arrangements, visual timetables (both universal and bespoke), use of 'Now and Next', incorporating special interests, movement breaks, 'soft landings' and additional support/intervention for reading. ● The school presents as 'Neurodiversity Affirming' with subtle adaptations to the environment; soft lighting, clear visuals, adapted seating arrangements, resources for movement and heavy work in place, strategies for regulating emotions throughout ● No guarantees have been given about what, if any, adapted provision, SEN specific places or breakout spaces would be available at Appletree following the closure of Langley ● It is also unclear how all children will be accommodated into classrooms before even considering the need for SEN specific spaces. Appletree was in the process of applying for the development of an Additionally Resourced Provision (ARP) to accommodate SEN but we understand this plan has been put on hold due to this consultation. ● The Inclusive culture and staff expertise have been developed over time at Langley. This culture is authentic and reliant on the staff team – their strong relationships, communication skills, connection and dedication to the children. ● Rather than being viewed as a candidate for closure simply because it is located next to a special school, Langley's position represents a strategic opportunity. Its proximity to Woodlawn Special School allows for dual registration, enabling pupils to access targeted interventions and therapies as needed while continuing to participate in mainstream classes and interact with a diverse peer group. This approach supports the government's key priority of inclusive education, keeping children with additional needs in mainstream settings wherever possible Birth rates This consultation relies heavily on the argument that birth rates are falling. ● Whilst there is no denying the downward trend in birthrates throughout North Tyneside up to 2023, the Office for National Statistics predicts that birth rates will level off from 2026 and then begin to increase again. ● Birth rates within the NEPA have been declining since 2008. However, despite

this, the numbers within NEPA schools have been resilient to this downward trend, with the majority of schools* being within the council's 10% acceptable surplus range on average since 2020. ● Internal migration has also not been taken into account for this consultation. Aside from a decline in 2022, the Office for National Statistics shows more young children move into North Tyneside than out of it. Although these statistics don't go down to NEPA level, we do know many families move specifically to the coast to take advantage of the three-tier system. ● The parenting survey conducted by the Friends of Langley showed 58% of respondents (out of 185 responses) moved to this area specifically to send their children to Langley First School, with a further 3% who had been planning to move to the area to send their children to Langley. ● The North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 also contradicts the rationale for closing Langley due to falling birth rates as it states: "Net inward migration from neighbouring areas, primarily Newcastle, helps to sustain the overall working age population and limits the fall in the number of children in the borough" *Appletree Gardens has had a 23% surplus level on average over the last five years. Pupil projections The 'pupil projection methodology' was cited in the supporting documents provided in the Council proposals but there is no link to this methodology provided. Looking online we assume they must have used the National Pupil Projection Model since this is the only published methodology. However, the National Pupil Projection methodology only publishes projections up to 2030. Somehow, the council has forecast pupil numbers well beyond 2030. The council's projection figures also appear to be inaccurate: ● It projects 59 pupils starting in 2025 in Reception in Langley, which drops by six students to 53 in Year 1. There is no explanation of this and no indication from parents in this year group of their intention to leave ● In comparison, Appletree appears to gain 18 students between Reception to Year 1, again with no explanation as to where these additional students have come from and not in line with the school's admission records ● When these figures are corrected, we see that in 2030 (the acceptable time frame for pupil projections) Langley surplus is projected to be 14% surplus - only 4% away from the council's acceptable level - whereas Appletree's surplus is projected to be almost double at 34%. One of the main factors in the council's decision-making is the concern that the capacity at Whitley Bay High School (WBHS) is 390 pupils, and the proposed first school and middle school changes are aimed at preventing the high school from going over capacity. However, our research group has found: ● Based on the council's methodology, from the current reception onwards, it is unlikely the numbers of pupils at WBHS will reach 390. Therefore the council's focus on ensuring numbers don't exceed this figure are misguided ● This issue the council is trying to fix relates to children already in the system, rather than future pupil projections, particularly the current year 2 and year 5 year groups. Closing

Langley will not tackle this issue Parental choice This consultation assumes parents will choose to send their children to Appletree Gardens if Langley First School is closed. This would certainly be true for the current year 2 group, where there are no spaces across the whole of Whitley Bay to house these children other than at Appletree (where we understand there are currently two spaces). However, with a surplus at many of the other schools in the area, it cannot be assumed that Appletree would be the school of choice. ● The council's consultation document shows 44% of catchment children attend Appletree compared to 73% at Langley; 12% of Langley pupils attend from the Appletree Gardens catchment area ● In the most recent 2 previous years of higher birth rates, 2020 reception and 2023 reception intakes, Appletree was the only NEPA first school with surplus spaces in admissions, 14 and 6 respectively. For the 2 lowest birth rate years, 2024 and 2025 intake, Appletree had the largest portion of surplus places in admissions against PAN, 32% and 45% respectively ● When looking at the 2025 admissions data, the distance of the last place offered at Langley was nearly 6 miles, compared to 3.6 miles for Appletree, demonstrating a far wider geographic draw and a greater ability to attract families from further afield. ● Of the 187 parents who responded to the survey carried out by Friends of Langley, 88.2% said Appletree Gardens was not one of their school preferences when they applied for their school places. ● That same survey also asked which school would be their first choice of school for their children if Langley were to close. Of the 187 responses to this question: ● 38.5% chose South Wellfield (72 parents) ● 20.3% chose Southridge (38 parents) ● 11.2% chose Marine Park (21 parents) ● 11.2% chose Appletree (21 parents) ● 3.2% chose Whitley Lodge (6 parents) ● 3.2% chose Coquet Park (6 parents) ● When asked if they would take a place at Appletree Gardens if offered, 43 parents said no. ● A further 62 parents said they would potentially consider home-schooling their children if Langley closed. ● An analysis of birth rates mapped against six years' of reception offers data for each school showed Appletree Gardens is ranked as the most sensitive school in the entire planning area to falling birth rates. Langley, by contrast, has a medium sensitivity, cushioned by its proven popularity and wider draw. ● The council's proposal is therefore not just to close the more popular school, thereby ignoring parental choice, but also to close the more demographically stable and resilient one, leading to a longer-term risk. New homes The Murton Gap development will see up to 3,000 new homes being built between now and 2032. The council has consistently told us that new homes don't automatically mean more children. However, the development proposal estimates a need for an additional 748 primary school places, and proposes to build a new two-form entry primary school to provide an additional 420 primary school places for the development. According to the council's school catchment checker, the development is covered by New York Primary

School. However, there is a considerable proportion of the development which would be considerably closer to both Langley and Appletree. The below image shows the Murton Gap development and its proximity to Langley (circled) Current year 2 children This section is specifically for parents with a parent in year 2, who would be in year 4 at the point that these proposals go ahead as they currently stand. ● All schools within the North East Planning Area (NEPA) are currently full for this year group, apart from Appletree Gardens, which we understand currently has two spaces ● A merger with Appletree would mean 118 children in year 4 ● As yet, the council has not provided any information as to what the class sizes would be in the 'merged' school. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, there is a concern amongst us that our children will be placed in larger class sizes, which could have an adverse affect on their education and wellbeing. Implementing this merger in 2027 would mean disrupting the largest cohorts of pupils currently moving through the system. If this merger is to go ahead, a far more logical approach is to wait until the smaller birth-rate cohorts are in the schools. Early years and wraparound provision The council has accepted that it has not taken either early years nor wraparound provision into consideration as part of the consultation. When asked at Whitley Bay High School about wraparound, one of the officers said the council 'would look to work with providers' but could offer no further assurance.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:59 AM

I am aware that the SEND schools in the North East are over-subscribed, which has been an issue for many years. There is not enough provision available for high need children who cannot be support in regular education. This proposed merger is entirely strategic on expanding Woodlawn SEND school than merging two schools due to arbitrary predictions on birth rates. Langley School is well within tolerance set by the council, and moving the pupils to Appletree shows that the primary focus is on Woodlawn SEND school expanding and using the space. The proposal aims to disrupt and displace children from a performing school, and move them to a less desirable school. The running cost of Langley School is significantly less than Appletree Gardens, so the most logical solution - if costs/funding - are the issue, is to migrate Appletree students to Langley. However, as I believe that the real goal is to expand Woodlawn, I expect this is a fait accompli, and alternatives will not actually be considered.

Optional question (295 response(s), 204 skipped)
Question type: Essay Question

Q2 We are keen to understand how a proposal to merge the schools could affect you, your child or your family. Please use the space below.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 12:22 PM

in the letter you have indicate low pupil numbers however aside from Reception/year 1 in apple tree all classes are the correct size. I'm concerned your going to bloat the class numbers at apple tree to an above average class size. I refute the comment that apple tree is such a size it can absorb half another primary school with no investment in expanding practical things like the hall. Also you have given no timeline on the proposal. for example is it a swift merging meaning new pupils being added to existing classes at all year groups? or is it a 3 year phased approach and wont effect existing class and pupils at apple tree?

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 12:23 PM

[redacted] I am writing in response to the consultation regarding the proposed merger of Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School. After careful consideration, I wish to formally register my opposition to this proposal. My reasons are as follows: 1. Impact on children's wellbeing and learning • Langley First School provides a familiar, safe environment where children are settled and thriving. Forcing pupils to move to a new school could cause anxiety and disrupt learning. • Moving children to a larger school may reduce individual attention, especially in early years. 2. Travel and accessibility • While the two schools are only 600 meters apart, the current walking route may not be suitable for younger children, especially in adverse weather. Additional transport or safety concerns may arise for families. 3. Community and social connections • Langley First School is an important part of the local community. Its closure could disrupt local networks and reduce parental involvement and support. 4. Impact on SEND provision • Langley shares a site with Woodlawn Special School. I am concerned that reallocating the site exclusively to Woodlawn may not provide continuity of support for mainstream pupils who currently benefit from inclusive practices. 5. Financial and logistical concerns • While the council cites financial pressures and surplus places, these should be balanced against the negative impact on children's education and community cohesion. Alternative solutions could be explored, such as resource sharing or targeted investment to improve efficiency. 6. Lack of engagement with parents and pupils • Decisions of this scale require meaningful consultation with families and staff. It is important that parental concerns are fully considered before any final decision is made. In summary, I believe the closure of Langley First School would have a negative impact on pupils, families, and the local community. I urge the council to reconsider this proposal and explore alternatives that maintain the school while addressing financial and demographic challenges. Thank you for considering my views. [redacted]

[redacted]

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 12:43 PM

[redacted] if the school closes my children will either be separated for one year while my youngest is in reception or my youngest will have his education disturbed by moving schools after reception. As a single mum i can not split my self in two to do the drop offs and pick ups, [redacted] i understand the impact changing schools can have. The fact the monkseaton middle school is also likely to be shut leaves parents anxious. Considering a high school has been shut, a middle school and possibly a first school are likely to be shut it will stop parents moving in to the area, it is hard enough to find a good middle school with open places.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 12:47 PM

Although the schools may be merging on paper, it will not be the same, and the disruption will be significant. This is especially concerning for children born during lockdown, who are already statistically more prone to anxiety and difficulties with change due to their early years of isolation. To uproot them midway through their school journey, only to then face another move to middle school two years later, feels incredibly insensitive and unfair.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 01:08 PM

Concerns are over crowding of schools, therefore at a disadvantage for better education and safeguarding of the children. Will there be enough one to one with pupils. The upheaval of having to change a school when they’re settled is seriously damaging for a child. What happens in the case of a rise, in the north Tyneside area with births.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 01:16 PM

In terms of an actual merger, I have no issue with this at all. Based on the data it does make sense although I do sympathise with Langley parents who may disagree, perhaps I would if it was the other way around. My main concern is the impact this will have on suitable parking facilities at Appletree Gardens School. It is already incredibly difficult to get parked at the school and the council are on the verge of making it more difficult with more parking restrictions being introduced. Now I appreciate the fact that the council are pushing for more sustainable methods of getting to school to be used but this is not always possible, and the merger of these schools with make the traffic situation considerably worse. Are the council intending to improve parking facilities on the Appletree Gardens site? Particularly with the exceptionally large school field that may well be even larger if Monkseaton Middle does in fact close?

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 01:28 PM

My son has attended Appletree Gardens First School for his third educational year now ([redacted] The school is not that big, and I am gravely concerned as to how introducing a full other school would impact class sizes - class sizes have been proven to have an effect on the quality of learning for pupils. I am also concerned as to how the merge would effect Appletree's ethos - would the other school adapt this or would there be a new one? My son, as well as all the other children in each school respectively, have spent their educational years abiding by a school ethos; it is evident that one cohort of children either way will have to learn a new one. At the end of the day, yet again, this boils down to money and how money can be saved by cutting corners. Yes, the birth rate is lower, but birth rates fluctuate - what is the plan when there is a spike but suddenly less schools to accommodate all of the children? Cram them in and hope for the best with their learning journeys? I feel this would also be the case now. Appletree Gardens works as it is and it does not compromise on the quality of teaching and education given, and they are incredibly well led. How will all this change when you have another Headteacher coming in? What about the teachers at Appletree now? I think you will find that this is why more and more people are choosing not to have children and we have found that the birth rate is so slow - it is because our children are always the ones being negatively impacted by Local Authority and Governmental decisions. Not only is the UK in a sorry state with backwards priorities, it would seem that North Tyneside are too.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 02:19 PM

My child is in a school with friends he has had since preschool. If the plan is to merge with Apple tree it would be a huge inconvenience due to location for us, meaning we would likely look to move to wellfield instead. Our son has just gone into year 1 which means he will have 2 years, move schools for 2 years, then move again. I think this will have a detrimental affect on his learning, as well as causing unnecessary upset. If we were to move him to Wellfield now, he would be in a new school, completely on his own, again causing unnecessary upset.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 02:23 PM

it will mean longer commute to schools and then work. no nursery place for our other child at the same school. going to a school that was very noticeably lower quality

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 02:52 PM

My child did not get offered his first choice of school being South Welfield First School because administrations were too high for his birth so he got put in his second choice of School which is Langley First School and now if the school was to be moved to Appletree Gardens, this will be his fourth School in his life and he is only five

	years old. This is gonna upset him again to settle in a new environment.
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 03:25 PM	My daughter already feels overwhelmed enough in the class of her size. Merging the schools will create much larger class sizes. Keeping them smaller is absolutely necessary at this point in their education. Children should be invested in rather than have costs cut at every opportunity. Allow children to grow in a safe environment without the constant worry about changing schools. My daughter is only 5 and I've already lost my ideal high school (Monkseaton) potentially losing the middle school (also Monkseaton) and the last thing we need is a huge change to her first school education too!
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 03:28 PM	I chose appletree for a reason, my 2 older children were pupils there, I currently have a child in year 1 there and a 5 month old we hope will attend. We chose appletree for it's nurturing, caring and personalized approach to the pupils and parents. I am concerned that merging with Langley will effect this, the teachers, change of head and the ethos of the school. I believe doing this merger will be a negative for the children there and their learning. Why not allow Woodlawn to merge into Langley so you have a combined first and special needs school would this not be something that could be looked at that would not negatively effect the children at Langley who would have to be moved to appletree. I do not support this merge between appletree and Langley for the negative effects it will have on the school, staff, pupils and my children
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 03:48 PM	Too many changes impacting on children. Some willneed to change schools three times at age 9
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 04:45 PM	My four children all attended Langley and I believe it would be a mistake to close a high performing and excellent school. Whilst it doesn't directly affect my family now because they have moved on to middle and high schools in the area, I believe the removal of this school would not be good for the residents in the area.
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 05:12 PM	Apple tree gardens has a less affluent catchment area.
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 05:18 PM	These proposals smack of the typical NTC ineptness to manage budgets, to plan ahead and also care for the children of the borough. In all of these proposals and supporting documentation there is a distinct lack of any mention of those key people who are effected by

this proposal - the children. there was no benefits listed to how the children will be better off, will they have better facilities? will there be more options for wraparound care? As we have seen with Monkseaton high school NTC will not listen to any points put across, the vacant school sites of both Monkseaton Middle and Monkseaton High will be earmarked for housing no doubt!

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 05:45 PM

I work in another school in the same area and can see how and why the merge would work well. It could also mean more places filled in the other schools that are struggling to fill them. The plan to use Langley to expand Woodlawn is also a good idea. There needs to be a lot more support and provision for SEN children in the local area.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 05:51 PM

It would mean children have to commute further to school site at Appletree Gardens so more parents would use cars causing even more congestion on roads which are over busy anyway. This would also be extremely harmful environmentally having cars loitering around where children go to school and be damaging to the children’s health as well as their safety.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 05:55 PM

[redacted] Our daughter has had some struggles settling in, and some difficulties with behaviour. The staff at Langley have worked with us wonderfully and she has really turned a corner and finally settled after a very straining time for our family. If she has to move schools before middle school, and have new teachers who don’t know her etc. this would be an unnecessary upheaval for her and her social and academic progression would ultimately suffer.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 06:03 PM

It could affect many families and children, what about those children who not like change and cannot cope with change? The staff who have worked there for years? Wheee do you plan on putting that many staff and the head teacher and deputy from Langley first school? Langley is an absolutely amazing school who for many years parents fought to get them children into the school down to their amazing reputation and stands miles apart from Apple Tree Gardens. Use the land for the specialist school sounds lovely but how many staff are going to lose their job or better yet leave the council with the move? Valuable members of staff who have worked there for years and established amazing relationships with the pupils.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 06:09 PM

I can't help but think the 3000 houses being built nearby might influence school numbers in the near future.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 06:11 PM

I am concerned about the impact on house values in the nearby area of Langley, and concerned about the potential redundancies for good teachers. It is becoming increasingly difficult to be a teacher in the current climate and closing schools is not going to help retention or recruitment. However, I do understand that it is not possible to operate without a sufficient number of pupils due to budget. I would hope that rhe children at the new school will receive a satisfactory educational offer, an improved and modernised school premises and retention of excellent teachers from Langley as it is a very strong school.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 06:14 PM

My little boy has just started in Langley first school in reception. He attended the pre school nursery at Langley too. A few issues have been raised in regards to his emotional regulation and he currently receives additional support from the school. I'm am devastated to think that we may have to go through another upheaval as he will really struggle. He has only just settled with the children he went to preschool (and now school) with. His teachers know him So well and know how to handle him and make him feel safe. I can't bear the idea of him being moved from his current safe place. He is also thriving having less pupils in his class as he finds large numbers overwhelming and over stimulating. Please think of the children when making this decision.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 06:20 PM

I live in a local street andwe are plagued with traffic from both schools. I hope the pupils will be accommodated well at the proposed new school and would ask that a car park is considered for the many necessary buses needed for pupils at the special school and the significant number of teachers. All needed I know and I have never complained ..but if my street could be less cluttered with traffic this would be a positive to come out of this. The special school needs the whole site for sure. I wish every member of staff and pupil well who attend Langley .. traffic is just a by product of a school. Please think about traffic at all the new sites..it's not fair on properties who are the schools neighbours..

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 06:31 PM

This school is part of the community. It is well loved and special place for many families. It impact on children's, staff and families health and wellbeing is huge. It has been a long standing pillar of the community for many many years. My own children attend and attended Langley and the thought it will no longer be there is upsetting for all. It has a respectable reputation and the staff work incredibly hard to maintain high quality education to all pupils. The school is thriving and to shut it down and move it is utterly devastating. Pupil numbers are within

	the acceptable zone and it consistently attracts families due to its special qualities.
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 06:36 PM	I feel that this merger would be disruptive to a whole community of families, children, staff and other stakeholders at Langley. The school retains a good reputation and is a place of social, educational and emotional support for all families whose children attend. The possible disruption to all children and the impact it may have on them academically and emotionally has been underestimated and could cause many problems, for families as well as staff, who will now be very worried about the security of their jobs, which is a concern given r he cost of living crisis. This feels like another step towards removing the 3 tier system, which is supportive and gradual for children. It feels as those the priority is finances and not in the best interests of the children in North Tyneside.
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 06:38 PM	This will affect the community by over loading the current system. Merging schools will have a detrimental effect on the level and standard of learning for all pupils., and thus effect the community going forward.
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 06:50 PM	Concerns about access to wrap around care
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 06:55 PM	Both of my sons attended the school now proposed for closure. It played a meaningful role in their early development. Though they're grown now, our family still feels a strong connection to the school and its place in the community. Closing it would be a loss to the area's educational heritage and to future families seeking trusted local options.
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 07:00 PM	[redacted] This is pacing great mental, physical and fincancial strain on myself and loved ones as well as colleges and friends.
Screen Name Redacted 10/02/2025 07:03 PM	My child has struggled with starting school and nursery and the teachers have been absolutely amazing at making sure she has settled in as well as possible. They have got her used to the environment and now she is thriving. This has taken over a year and now she is really settled and enjoying school. I worry that this is really going to set her back and knock her confidence. She is a quiet child

who is being supported by SALT who have also been seeing her in the school setting. Going forward I also worry that I will struggle to get my younger son into the same school which is going to make drop off and pick up near on impossible.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 07:12 PM

It would have a large effect on my child. He has additional needs at present we have been denied an EHCP and therefore the school does not get any provisions for him but they put everything he needs in place. I don't believe he will receive the level of care he does now if class sizes are increased and the teachers are having to spread their focus over more children which will cause him to act out and not achieve academically

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 07:36 PM

I went to Langley first school when I was younger. I don't think it's right mixing two schools together. You will be destroying fields. And the traffic around monkseaton is terrible. So don't do it.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 07:40 PM

The most ridiculous idea ever! Langley first school has been at the heart of monkseaton for decades! House prices will be massively affected as people move to the area to send their kids to Langley, exactly what we did years ago.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 07:40 PM

My child has 2 years left at Langley. I believe this change will cause parents to start removing children/siblings from school now which will have a profound affect on the morale & create a negative vibe in school.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 07:44 PM

Langley First School is far more than just a place of education – it is at the heart of the community. Generations of families have sent their children there, and many parents who attended the school themselves now proudly watch their own children flourish in the same nurturing environment. Closing Langley would take away a vital part of the community's identity and break the strong bonds that have been built between children, families, and staff over the years. The teachers and staff at Langley First are exceptional. Their dedication, care, and commitment to every child make the school a safe, welcoming, and supportive place. Parents consistently value the close relationships staff form with their children, which helps them feel secure, confident, and happy in their learning. Moving pupils away from this trusted environment risks unsettling them and undoing the progress they have made, particularly for the youngest children who thrive on consistency and familiarity. The closure would also reduce the choice available to families. Having more than one school in the

area allows parents to select the environment that best suits their child's individual needs. By forcing all children into one larger school, diversity is lost and families have fewer options. This may also put greater pressure on Appletree Gardens, where resources, outdoor space, and individual support could be stretched, meaning children do not get the same level of personal attention they currently receive at Langley. Practical challenges would also arise. For many families, Langley's location is convenient and accessible, allowing siblings to attend schools close together and children to walk safely to class. Relocating pupils to Appletree Gardens would increase travel distances, traffic, and stress for parents, especially those without access to a car. For young children, this additional disruption in their daily routine can have a real impact on their wellbeing. Langley First School has always been known for its inclusive and supportive ethos, ensuring that children who need additional help are given the attention they deserve. In a larger merged school, those pupils may risk being overlooked. Parents value Langley's smaller, close-knit environment where no child is lost in the crowd and every child's achievements are celebrated. There is also the emotional impact to consider. Children need stability to feel secure and to do well in school. Forcing them to leave a place where they feel safe, happy, and part of a community could cause unnecessary stress and anxiety. At a time when young people's wellbeing is already under so much pressure, it seems wrong to remove a source of comfort and stability that Langley provides. Finally, while the Council highlights falling birth rates, population numbers can change. If birth rates rise again in future years, the area could face a shortage of school places. Keeping Langley open offers flexibility for the future, ensuring that the local community remains well-served and resilient to change. In every sense – educationally, emotionally, and practically – closing Langley First School would harm children and families in the area. It is a beautiful community school with fantastic teachers and a proven record of helping children to thrive. To take that away would be a loss not only to current pupils but to future generations of families in Monkseaton.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 07:57 PM

I worry that merging the schools would have a negative affect on my daughter. How large are these classes going to be. She's already in a class of 26 so how is that undersubscribed. Will she still get the attention she deserves as a young pupil or will it be too many students to teacher ratio. This is a crucial age for development.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 08:18 PM

It would cause significant psychological distress towards my send child who remains and may cause disruptive behaviour

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 08:22 PM

There are many unanswered questions in the FAQs regarding the proposed merger. Langley First School was chosen by us because of its excellent reputation, passion for outdoor learning and their particular education style. Will the same ethos of Langley be transferred to Appletree? If so how will this be transferred, if not why? and have NTC considered the impact on the children's educational needs? Langley also has an excellent SEN provision which has been invaluable for my child, I have major concerns that this provision may not be available in another setting and they will be failed by the system. The FAQs suggest the local birth rate is declining, yet there is a housing policy for nearly 1000 new homes per year in north Tyneside. It states that the majority of those moving to north Tyneside are older people / families - what evidence is therefore this and who has undertaken the data analysis? This should be shared with the public as a part of the consultation process. What measures are being taken by NTC to ensure the needs of the children and their education will be met to the same standard they are currently receiving? There is no substantial information available and this should form a part of the consultation! Is the meeting of schools partially being undertaken to cut the council deficit as a whole or have the school budgets / forecast been treated independently of the wider financial issues of NTC council?

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 08:27 PM

I am concerned about the quality of the education and care that staff are able to continue to offer - as parents we chose Appletree from others for its capacity to support neurodiverse children more appropriately than other schools which are more focused on academic achievement. I am concerned that a merger would limit parents options to choose appropriate schooling for children with different needs

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 08:52 PM

My child is in year 1 at Langley. This is his 3rd year there including pre-school and he is finally settled and very happy in the setting. We feel that merging with another school could cause overcrowded classrooms and disruption for our children as they enter their final year of first school. Friends will be split up, a new setting will need to be adjusted to for a very short time. Instability can rock the foundations of children's education.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 09:20 PM

Im absolutely devastated langley is not just any school the whole ethos of the school cannot be found in any other local schools. We moved into the area Purley so our children could go to langley. I have a child in reception and nursery this hugely affects me my nursery child will not be allowed to continue at langley yet my reception child will until 2027 meaning 2 different schools. Where do I apply for my

child to go? Appletree gardens is a completely different school to langley and not a right fit or change! Covid happened school rates will be low for this they will soon rise langley used to be over subscribed and no doubt will can with its reputation! Wellfield over subscribed and waiting lists ?? Move some over. Look at other uses for classrooms etc!

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 09:33 PM

Our son has 2 years remaining at Langley and it sounds likely that he will either move to Appletree next year or see out his final years at Langley, but with reduced number of children and likely demotivated staff (Monkseaton High is a prime example). [redacted]

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 10:03 PM

We have moved our son from appletree nursery to Langley nursery with a view to him staying there until middle school. The merge would be incredibly unsettling for him to return to appletree (if there is a space)or move YET AGAIN to another school setting

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 10:43 PM

Let's stare of with Apple tree having a larger surplus, why does Langley need to close to try and force kids into larger classes which in turn will effect learning quality, council don't give a shit about that, they care about lining there pockets. How about the SEND children currently in Langley that don't take well to change, any thoughts on them? No of course not only how to claim back more expenses.

Screen Name Redacted
10/02/2025 11:26 PM

As Grandparents the closure of Langley First School is very upsetting. Our 1st grandchild is currently Yr2 and our 2nd grandchild was due to start pre-school Sept 2026. It has a massive impact on the family that this may not happen. Our 1st grandchild will experience more school changes than expected if merger happens. As a family we, potentially, will have to logistically manage 2 children in different educational settings.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 12:34 AM

I would now be unable to walk with my child to school and we would have to drive to a new school which is pretty upsetting. Langley first school has been our first choice since our daughter was born and I don’t understand why it can’t be kept open with smaller numbers? I would like to hear alternative solutions rather than this one?

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 06:26 AM

My daughter started Langley first school this year and has absolutely blossomed in confidence and absolutely adores the school and staff. I

am very distressed about the uprooting of her and so many other children if this school was to close. With the mass amount of houses being built in the area I do not understand the thinking of closing down so many schools. Surely the thought is that there will be more families inhabiting these homes and eventually an increase in children in the area? Especially once hopefully we as a society are fully recovered from the effects of the pandemic. It seems so short sighted and cruel to close these schools rather than addressing the funding issues and trying to save these schools which are so loved and important to the community. Surely we need to find ways to encourage families in the area rather than reducing services for them and packing as many children into fewer schools to save some money.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 06:56 AM

My family are ok as they are in catchment for Valley and Whitley High. However what about those that aren't? Omg the travel to other schools the upset traumas this will cause will be massive.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 07:17 AM

I have two children in Langley; the youngest who has just started reception and also attended the nursery. [redacted] My children love to attend Langley, it has a lovely community feel. My youngest would take a long time to settle anywhere new, he was born during Covid and has already suffered disruption in his early years and now you want him to 'merge' into a new school at age 6. It is further for us to walk, we currently walk to Langley every day and have no main roads to cross whereas now we're expected to cross Seatonville Road and the road near Bromley field, both which are very busy an me will get even busier with more parents at Appletree. I don't believe this is fair on the children of Appletree either who are going to be overran with hundreds of new children sharing their space. Are we expected to buy all new uniform and school bags when the children move? Is there enough wrap around space to accommodate Langley children as many of us are working parents. I cannot believe that the children of our school have to suffer for the councils terrible budgeting of money. It will be a huge mistake to lose Langley First School.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 07:19 AM

I am the vicar of the parish in which both schools sit. My child is at Little Pips (the 2 year old provision at Appletree Gardens), I am a governor at Appletree Gardens and am also Chair of Governors at Monkseaton Middle School. I agree with the proposals to merge the two first schools, and can see the logic of freeing up the Langley site for Woodlawn. However, I am concerned about the community impact of closing Langley, which is a well-loved and popular first school. I

want to see proper and meaningful support from the Local Authority for the change process, and especially for those most directly impacted by the proposals.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 09:41 AM

Ultimately your aim is to sell land and make new homes which equals more kids. Your motive is back handed cash to fill your pockets before you're removed from office. Your data about catchment areas and birthrate is a lie. You're ruining the future of our community based on misinformation. The community will not forgive you. Labour out!

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 09:48 AM

We moved to Monkseaton, pay premium prices on our house and one of the biggest factors for wanting to live in the area is because we want our children to go to Langley first school. We have one child there now and two younger children which we hope to go to Langley in future. Many of our friends and neighbours are in the same position moving to the area with younger children in hopes of putting them into Langley first school. From data available we can see that the percentage of people now living in the catchment area and sending their children to Langley is much higher than those who live in the Appletree area and send their children to Appletree school. There is valid reason for this. Appletree gardens was not a school we are interested in sending our children to. Langley is an important part of our community. Appletree does not have the space to accommodate all the children from Langley, my sons school year (2) is at capacity so it makes no sense moving him for one final year to then move again for middle school the following year, this disruption to the children would have a negative impact on the children's emotional and social needs therefor affecting their education. Year 1 and reception children were covid years and low birth rate but this global pandemic and time should not be classed as accurate data. Using the word 'merge' makes it sound like all the children would be accommodated and the staff and teachers will have equal opportunities to be part of the proposed plan, however this is not the case if the school remains as Appletree, under their governors and team, leaving only Langley staff at risk. We urge you to reconsider this.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 10:36 AM

Our daughter was born out of catchment and we have moved into catchment to hopefully attend Langley. My first question to you is have these stats been considered in your data presentation? Are you aware that families have moved into the area to attend the school? If our daughter does go to Langley and it merges with apple tree I feel that the impact of this could be classed as chaos. Different school cultures coming together, ways of working being blended. I would be interested to understand how this is going to be managed with a

detailed plan. Any business going through a merger is difficult to navigate with staff alone, you really need to get this right in order for children not to feel the negative impact of your decision making. Culture navigation and change takes time, there will be families like ours who are not willing to put their child in such situations.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 10:44 AM

Closure of any schools in our region affect the community as a whole, but I think the decision to close Langley and thus enable expansion of the SEND provision on one site seems a sensible and good outcome.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 10:50 AM

[redacted] we see a huge volume of traffic, aggression, near misses and compromised health and safety for both residents who live here and families attending Appletree Gardens school. I dread to think what will happen if this plan goes ahead. I really think this needs looking into as a priority before any plans are agreed as the safety of everyone, both residents here and school users must be a priority. You could also look to extend our driveway, along with neighbours driveways to get residents cars off the road and install fences and parking restrictions. Or, if the schools must close, think about using Monkseaton High school.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 12:01 PM

[redacted] I am concerned at the impact on residents of increased student numbers, [redacted] There is already significant pressure on resident parking due the lack of off-road parking, and the pavements and pathways are constantly damaged and in poor state of repair because of residents and school-run parking on pavements. Increasing the number of children being dropped off and collected on a daily basis will have a detrimental impact on resident parking and access, and on the condition of the roads and pathways around the area.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 12:37 PM

Merging Langley First School into Appletree Gardens would have a significant impact on our family. The most immediate concern is the increase in travel: walking to Langley is currently safe and manageable for our children, but Appletree is further away, which would likely mean more car journeys, adding stress to our daily routine, contributing to congestion, and raising safety concerns. We also value the close-knit community of Langley; our children thrive in an environment where staff and pupils know each other well, and we worry that a larger merged school would lose this personal connection. In addition, we are concerned about whether Appletree has the capacity and facilities to accommodate additional pupils

without creating overcrowding. Most importantly, it feels that the proposals focus heavily on numbers and finance without considering how educational outcomes might be affected. Attainment and progress often depend on a sense of belonging and stability, both of which could be undermined by merging the schools.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 02:06 PM

Upheaval for our children. Lesser quality of education due to increased number of children per class in Appletree. Langley is a brilliant school, my daughter has made wonderful friendships with her school mates and the she feels secure in the care of her teachers there. She's a very anxious and timid child and this upheaval will be a lot for her to process, as I'm sure it will for lots of other children. I specifically bought my house 2 years ago in order to be as close as possible to Langley as this was the school I chose for my child to start at nursery. I visited Appletree and didn't think it suited my daughter, it's a lot bigger and intimidating for her.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 02:33 PM

We are not from the Whitley Bay area, but we decided to move into the area in 2022 after having our little boy - who is due to start reception in 2026. This decision was not taken lightly as house prices are high reflecting the local School being good. We have started him in school nursery this year, the transition has been hard and this additional move will be a huge disruption to his wellbeing and education. In addition we rely on the wrap around care at Langley [redacted] What provisions are in place to accommodate the additional wrap around need at the merged school ?

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 02:37 PM

It is essential that the council take a long term look at funding. Whilst not great for children to have disruptions to their school environment they will be fine. The council are correct to look to merging schools so that public funds can be better spent. Two tier system should be looked into also.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 02:59 PM

It would not affect me or my family directly. However, it would affect my neighbours and people living locally

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 04:33 PM

Anything like this is a danger to the three-tier system. People move here for this reason for their children. Our eldest has blossomed now she’s at middle school and we want the same for our youngest too.

Screen Name Redacted

Increase in class sizes leading to a reduction in the quality of learning

10/03/2025 05:06 PM	and teaching. A longer commute to and from school
Screen Name Redacted 10/03/2025 05:37 PM	It would disrupt my child's development. A child whose childhood has already been affected by covid. The schools are barely undersubscribed, I'd this seems like an underhand way to limit my child's future.
Screen Name Redacted 10/03/2025 05:51 PM	Merging the schools could potentially lead to overcrowded class rooms and consequent drop in educational outcomes. Disruption of education at such an early age age will have a major impact on children’s well being and mental health. It will also mean disrupt to pick up and drop off arrangements
Screen Name Redacted 10/03/2025 06:14 PM	I have grandchildren who will be going to school in 2 and 3 yrs time and I am concerned about them as there won’t be places for them It will be classed as being over subscribed as we are not in the catchment area you will use this as an excuse for children’s places
Screen Name Redacted 10/03/2025 07:41 PM	I am writing to provide my formal response to the consultation on the proposed merger of Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School. While I appreciate the council’s efforts to address financial sustainability and alignment within the North East Planning Area, I have serious concerns regarding the proposal as currently presented. While falling pupil numbers have been presented as the main driver, the closure of Langley would have serious negative consequences for children, families, and the wider community. 1. Financial arguments are insufficient to justify closure The consultation states that Langley First School is projected to be in cumulative deficit by 2026–2028. However, it also acknowledges that Appletree Gardens is projected to enter deficit by 2028. This suggests that the merger does not resolve the underlying issue of financial sustainability, and therefore closing a valued school prematurely may not be necessary. Alternative measures could include: Shared leadership or federated arrangements with Appletree Gardens. Incremental expansion of wraparound childcare and other income-generating services. Temporary or phased adjustments to Published Admission Numbers (PANs) rather than a full closure. Closing Langley on the basis of projected deficits alone is premature, especially given the sensitivity of financial projections to small changes in pupil numbers or local demographic shifts. 2. Travel distances and accessibility The consultation repeatedly cites an 800m walking radius as a “reasonable expectation” for children to walk, with the furthest point from Langley to Appletree Gardens at 1,200m. For children aged 4–9, these distances are significant, particularly in winter or for families

with multiple school drop-offs. The consultation does not assess safe walking routes, crossings, or accessibility for vulnerable children. Increased reliance on car travel raises safety, traffic, and environmental concerns. 3. Equality and SEND considerations The proposal frames the merger as a benefit for Woodlawn Special School by allowing expansion of SEND provision. While the development of SEND provision is welcome, it should not be at the expense of mainstream school choice. The consultation does not adequately consider: Low-income families who may struggle with transport. Children with SEND currently attending Langley who may face disruption to familiar support structures. Families reliant on Langley's before- and after-school wraparound childcare to maintain employment. These omissions raise concerns regarding compliance with the Equality Act 2010 and the council's statutory duties to consider the impact on protected groups. 4. Community impact Langley First School is described in the consultation as a "good, valued school." Closing it will: Reduce parental choice. Disrupt local community networks and social cohesion. Remove a local hub for events, extracurricular activities, and community engagement. The consultation does not adequately assess these social and community impacts. 5. Educational standards and wellbeing Langley provides small class sizes, strong staff-pupil relationships, and a nurturing school culture. Disruption from closure risks affecting learning, behaviour, and emotional wellbeing. Children with SEND or additional needs are particularly vulnerable. Absorbing Langley pupils into Appletree Gardens could destabilise both schools and undermine educational quality. 6. Options appraisal and alternative measures The options appraisal dismisses alternatives without fully assessing their feasibility: "Do nothing" was discounted purely on financial grounds, without considering other mitigations. Federated leadership or shared governance could reduce costs while preserving school identity. Incremental adjustments to PANs could reduce surplus places without closure. The council does not explore hybrid solutions such as partial repurposing or phased reorganisation. Previous consideration of two-tier systems or Multi-Academy Trust models is presented, but the consultation does not analyse potential benefits in the current demographic context. 7. Demographic assumptions may be inaccurate The consultation relies on declining birth rates and GP registration data. Housing developments and population shifts may increase pupil numbers in the near future. No sensitivity analysis or scenario planning is provided to account for this uncertainty. 8. Transparency and documentation Some supporting data, such as pupil distribution maps, detailed financial tables, travel assessments, and the Equality Impact Assessment, are complex and difficult for parents to interpret. Greater clarity and accessibility are required for meaningful engagement. 9. Long-term planning concerns Closing a school like Langley is a short-term financial solution with irreversible consequences. Once capacity is removed, it cannot easily be

reinstated if demand increases. The consultation does not adequately consider long-term implications for school choice, local population growth, or community cohesion. 10. Joint impact on families and inequality The cumulative effect of educational disruption, longer travel, loss of childcare, and reduced parental choice disproportionately affects: Working families. Low-income households. Children with additional needs. This risks deepening inequalities rather than addressing them. Conclusion Based on the points above, I do not support the closure of Langley First School or its merger with Appletree Gardens First School at this time. The proposal, as presented, appears premature, disproportionately disruptive to families, and insufficiently justified by financial, demographic, or educational evidence. I urge the council to reconsider alternatives that: Preserve parental choice and school identity. Protect the quality of education for all pupils. Maintain wraparound childcare provision. Address travel, accessibility, and safety concerns. Fully evaluate alternative governance, PAN adjustments, or partial repurposing solutions. Consider long-term demographic and community impacts.

Screen Name Redacted
10/03/2025 08:36 PM

Merging two schools into one seems a very rushed idea. The increased headcount will result in larger classes of kids even if extra classes are created. Regardless of the fact that squeezing all the extra kids into the school you are making a number of teachers, TAs and support staff redundant.

Screen Name Redacted
10/04/2025 07:24 AM

This proposal fails to demonstrate clear educational, community, or logistical benefits and appears to prioritise administrative convenience over the needs of local families. Langley First School has long been an essential part of the local community, offering a nurturing and high-quality learning environment that supports children’s early development and wellbeing. Its closure would not only remove parental choice but also disrupt the education and emotional stability of pupils who thrive in its smaller, community-focused setting. Consolidating two vibrant school communities onto a single site risks overcrowding, reduced individual attention for pupils, increased pressure on staff, and diminished outdoor learning and play opportunities. Furthermore, the suggested repurposing of the Langley site for Special Educational Needs and Disabilities provision should not come at the expense of primary education places within the area. While expanding SEND capacity is important, it should be done through dedicated investment rather than through the closure of a successful, high-performing mainstream school. This proposal undermines community cohesion and risks long-term negative impacts on educational quality, parental confidence, and pupil wellbeing. I urge the Local Authority to reconsider this merger and instead invest in sustaining both schools as vital educational assets

within their respective communities. • Ignoring Parental Choice: Families deserve meaningful options in their local education system. Closing Langley First School removes that choice and disregards the preferences of the local community. • Unjustified Educational Benefit: The proposal lacks evidence that consolidating both schools will lead to better learning outcomes. Instead, it appears motivated by logistical and financial concerns rather than student needs. • Premature Repurposing of Langley Site: Reallocating the Langley site for specialist SEND provision before fully considering other alternatives risks losing a vital mainstream educational asset forever.

Screen Name Redacted
10/04/2025 10:31 AM

We chose Langley because they have a nursery provision that is 2.5 days a week and I was able to adjust my work days to accommodate this. I cannot adjust my working days to suit the half days at appletree gardens nursery and we have a child who will be joining school nursery in 2026. As Langley has a bigger nursery intake than appletree gardens; would the nursery times be adjusted to match the 2.5 days a week of Langley as this better suits working families. This would need to be in place for the 2026 intake otherwise we will be in a very difficult position. My eldest child is currently in reception so in September 2926 she will enter year 1. I understand she would remain at Langley for this year but it would make the school drop offs very difficult in the mornings. Ideally, we would like her to move with her whole class but if her younger sibling will be attending the nursery is it possible for her to start year 1 at appletree gardens? If not, will there be an allowance in terms of arrival times for drop off and pick up as one parent cannot be at both schools at the same time. Thanks you for your consideration.

Screen Name Redacted
10/04/2025 04:30 PM

I chose Langley for a reason, it is an incredibly special school and I absolutely support the ethos and learning methods at Langley x

Screen Name Redacted
10/04/2025 05:43 PM

Two generations of my family went to Langley and ultimately onto University. Langley is the school that my grandchildren would be likely to attend in future if it stays as it us. If the schools merge then this would impact the wider family and where we all choose to live in future. My friends are teachers and parents of children at Langley so this would also impact negatively on their jobs, support structures and the whole community.

Screen Name Redacted
10/04/2025 06:43 PM

It's just unnecessary...send provision is already in Monkseaton middle. Your not considering future children to attend Langley etc. .birth rate of babies now...have you collected data in the local area of children requiring this in the near future?. Roads will be even more

contested...as parents having to travel further....you doing millions on bike routes to promote cleaner sir for the environment..this move will create more pollution,

Screen Name Redacted
10/04/2025 09:09 PM

Extra travel time. Parents/carers/children's mental health Social and emotional wellbeing for the children affected. New friendships with peers from different area therefore unable to socialise out of school. Disruption of education Breaking up of children's established friendships. Loss to local community of Langley school children. Hundreds of new build housing developments in local area bringing in new families. Where will these children attend school ?

Screen Name Redacted
10/04/2025 09:28 PM

It can knock back several months of progress as well affect confidence in the child

Screen Name Redacted
10/04/2025 10:42 PM

Merging Langley pupils into Appletree will allow our school to continue to grow. It will provide financial stability. Appletree is big enough to accommodate all of the pupils from Langley. For example, we have space for extra classrooms and two large halls. Appletree is closer for the majority of pupils. Our school is a THRIVE school and staff are well trained to support pupils and their families through this transition.

Screen Name Redacted
10/05/2025 01:01 PM

2 of my children went to Langley and it was a great little school. [redacted] I understand the great need for a larger SEN school in North Tyneside.

Screen Name Redacted
10/05/2025 02:55 PM

[redacted] I was astounded by the ethos of the school. It was abundantly clear to me how nurturing and professional all the staff were. I cannot put into words how wonderful it is to see children overcome challenges and difficulties, smile, thrive and reach their full potential. [redacted]

[redacted] There are many children attending Langley who have similar problems to my daughter and many who face daily challenges for different reasons. All of these children have one thing in common… their need for stability! They know they are valued members of our school and have built trusting relationships with staff as well as important friendships. I am living and dealing with what happens when a child isn't properly supported and their individual needs met. Parents CHOOSE Langley first school, often bypassing Appletree. Generation after generation attend our school because they know that we offer education and wellbeing care in a way that no other school can. We're not just a building. We are a family and centre to our community. The damage of losing Langley First School is immeasurable.

Screen Name Redacted
10/05/2025 05:09 PM

My child has just started school nursery, they aim to keep students and staff together as they move into reception to ease transition. My child loves school, his teacher and class. You are completely destroying his start in mainstream school potentially damaging his connection to it and obliterating the relationships that have been built. This is a high performing school with an outstanding reputation. There has to be another option that is for the benefit of the community rather than it simply being a question of money.

Screen Name Redacted
10/05/2025 07:55 PM

My daughter is a nursery pupil of Appletree Gardens. She is a young 3, and was very shy and timid when starting. The small nursery classes have allowed for her to have one on one with the teachers, getting her comfortable and engaged. This will not be possible when the school is overpopulated after the merge. No child with benefit from the merge.

Screen Name Redacted
10/05/2025 08:30 PM

This is a small community school where children walk to school as part of a community. We don't need transport access school. Support is goid for children who need extra intervention. It is a community resource and teachers are fabulous. Each and every child is known as an individual and counts. An amalgamation means a bigger less personal and individual school.

Screen Name Redacted
10/06/2025 10:40 AM

Langley is a big part of our community. My children went to this lovely school and I hoped my grandchildren would too. There are plans to build thousands of houses nearby. Families could walk to school from those houses rather than drive to Appletree or have the need for a new school to be built

Screen Name Redacted
10/06/2025 01:15 PM

I am glad the NTC are finally taking the situation in hand. Further closures of First and Middle Schools are inevitable after the closure of Monkseaton High School. I am very sorry for the families affected but acknowledge there is at least a plan this time around compared to the (ongoing) chaos the closure of MHS has created for older children. I would like to know what middle school catchment the children living in the newly formed Appletree/Langley catchment will be in. 1. Will this new catchment displace children in the Marden Bridge Middle School, Wellfield Middle School and Valley Gardens Middle School. Will these children find themselves rejected from their own catchment Middle School because children from Langley and Appletree now need places when traditionally they would have got into MMS on catchment and VGMS on distance. 2. Are younger children in South Whitley Bay (Rockcliffe)about to be displaced at Middle School transition as their older siblings are being rejected from WBHS because of distance. Have you done the sums? Properly? Have you thought beyond the next year or two? 3. I am worried about the lack of stability in the three tier system. Closures and mergers could continue for years. What does that mean for the quality of standards and teaching? I wouldn't want a teaching job in the three tier system, it's so unpredictable. 4. Why are we keeping the 3 tier system? Rip off the plaster and go 2 tier now. It's clearly unsustainable. The 'consultation' on 3 tier is now so historic its irrelevant and the work you did in 2022 is so narrow. Clearly three tier school staff are going to say they would prefer a three tier system, turkeys don't vote for Christmas! Who exactly are you doing this for, fighting to preserve a waning and expensive system? Particularly successful Headteachers at particular schools? Particularly vocal and well resourced neighbourhoods? Not the children, give us local and high quality 2 tier education with genuine choice and stability instead of faffing about with historic consultation and entitlement. Use the money you save on providing adequate sixth form options for all of the kids unfortunate enough to find themselves outside of the monolithic Whitley Bay High School admissions process.

Screen Name Redacted
10/06/2025 05:59 PM

The proposal has a direct impact with further education in the NEPA area, I agree that since Monkseaton High school was closed to pupils other factors need to be absorbed at lower levels and whilst they impact is relatively minimal for the children in school at the moment, it

has to be done. The admissions procedure needs to be more robust as people outside if the NEPA area are trying to get in any way, lying about address or reasons as to why they should get a place. It needs to be strict, appeals shouldnonly be up heald if the council have made a mistake and usually this is not the case. After having gone through the issues with Monkseaton, I feel very strongly about this. If you nothing catchment then you dont get in, too many rule breakers. Applications should be triple checked against evidence of address and bank, child benefit letters council tax.

Screen Name Redacted
10/07/2025 12:30 PM

I am very concerned about the road safety aspect of increased pupil numbers at Appletree Gardens First School. At present parking before and after school is chaotic with double parking,vehicles parking on the pavement and parents often arriving more than 30 minutes before end of school in order to park close to the school. In the winter the problem is even worse. I fear that an inevitable increase in vehicle numbers will further endanger the safety of young children. If the merger were to proceed there would need to be measures put in place to prevent this.

Screen Name Redacted
10/07/2025 07:27 PM

I have concerns about this planned merger, we have recently moved into the new Robinson field development and in our row of 5 houses alone, 4 of us have recently had first children in the last 2 years and the 5th house already have a child at Langley first school. Given the size of estate (over 300 story homes) will have attracted a lot of other young families, I would like to see evidence of this being taken into account in the birth rate planning. I liked the idea of close walking options to schools when purchasing the property and Langley school will be our first choice for our child in a few years, due to location, reputation and wrap around care options. I have serious concerns that this cost saving exercise will ultimately create oversubscribed classrooms which will detriment my son’s education and that of other children on the estate. Further more looking at the longer term murton gap plans, containing 3000 homes in total and a proposed new primary school how does this fit into the current knee jerk planning of merging the first schools and disrupting a lot of children in the process.

Screen Name Redacted
10/08/2025 09:55 AM

Dear Sir/Madam, I write to express my views on the proposed merger of Appletree Gardens and Langley First School. Whitley Bay is already reeling after the news – less than ten months ago – of the closure of Monkseaton High. One has to wonder where the latest round of changes will end. The proposals are confused and, indeed, confusing. The plan to base the amalgamated school in Appletree’s premises and retain that school’s DfE number would suggest that the

new entity will essentially become an enlarged version of the existing Appletree school. Yet we are also told (albeit very tentatively), “It is hoped the merged school would have a new identity and new ethos, set by staff, pupils and the school community”. Is this realistic, given that the ties with Appletree will be strong? Even no more than the most cursory glance at educational history reveals that the law of unintended consequences has led to countless instances in which amalgamated schools have become beset by problems that were never envisaged. I am sure that I do not have to remind the Council that in the months immediately following the merger of King’s School and Priory Primary, there was so much internal upheaval that the Principal left after just a term. “Vision differences” with others were widely cited as the reason for his resignation. It is easy to see how comparable differences may emerge among the senior leaders, teachers and governors of the Appletree/Langley hybrid. Every school has its own perspective on what its educational mission should involve and this is at least partly shaped by the unique community it serves. There are significant differences in the emphases of Langley and Appletree. How can the two be reconciled in the new school? The nature of the modern education system sets schools against one another amidst a climate of some rivalry. Neighbouring schools (like Appletree and Langley) compete for student numbers, the best SATs results and the most favourable Ofsted ratings. Uniting teachers from the previous organisations within a combined school will be “a challenge”, at best. If competitive interviewing is employed to determine which staff will serve in the new school, there is an obvious risk of more personal divisions arising, too. Both Appletree and Langley were rated “good” in their last inspections. There is no educational case for merging them. I understand that there are great pressures on the funding of education in North Tyneside but surely alternative solutions are preferable. Good schools are difficult to find and must be protected. They inspire tremendous loyalty among their students and their parents. Closing or merging them should be a last resort. I myself am not a parent. I did not attend Langley as a pupil, nor have I served as a member of staff there. Consequently, I consider my interest to be more detached than that of many who will offer their response to the proposed merger. My connection with the schools is atypical. Some years back, I undertook PhD research at Langley, alongside other Whitley Bay schools. The contributions of the pupils at Langley were excellent – among the best, in fact, that I elicited in the whole study – and were pivotal to the success of my project. Good schools, in addition to benefiting local children and the community, can be integral to the development of new ideas in education. When promoted in major journals, these bring the work of North Tyneside’s schools to national – and even international – attention. My own research contributed to significant innovations in the US. These developments would never have happened without the involvement of Langley First School. [redacted]

[redacted]

Screen Name Redacted
10/08/2025 02:03 PM

Concerned as to how this will affect other primary schools . numbers in the monkseaton area, and high school places for other north tyneside schools.

Screen Name Redacted
10/08/2025 10:49 PM

Naming Appletree Gardens as the merger school is leading to upset within 2 communities. Langley parents are upset, shocked, worried and frustrated which is understandable. Using the term merger (as per DFE guidance) is confusing and misleading to parents but is also leading to friction between the two communities. They are taking their anger out on Appletree. Appletree serves a different decile population with EAL , disadvantaged and SEND there is historical bias against Appletree as it is perceived as the first school in the " council estate " these words were used by Langley parents in the meeting. Appletree and Langley are both good schools with relatively small budget problems compared to the rest of the authority. Don't make this a short term money saving plan due to PFI schools and force Langley pupils across a busy main road. Work towards cohesion. Langley and Appletree have always been part of the same partnership and both have lots to offer. They may both have the capacity to take in years 5 and 6 to help with the middle school surplus students if Monkseaton closes.

Screen Name Redacted
10/09/2025 12:15 AM

Will disrupt my child's education will result in excessive moves in school 2 in 1 year to be exact as they will be in year 4 when the move is proposed Worried merged school will mean overcrowded classrooms & my children will be lost in their classroom & their education learning will be negatively impacted. Maybe a chaotic & disruptive environment. No separate sen provisions proposed for those who need it Loss of friendships & complete loss of teachers who know my children's needs & have a strong relationship with them from the start of their school journey. Also current teachers will leave before merge so my children will be at the mercy of supply staff gaps in their learning. No library or computer room facilities at appletree as these rooms will be used as classrooms nothing proposed for this Not a merge my children will be forced into a completely new school my opinion an inferior school I live right next to it to where they are currently not chosen for them by us their parents. This will cause irreparable anxiety & stress & will disrupt their learning at key stage of their journey. Do not agree do not support!!

Screen Name Redacted
10/09/2025 10:32 AM

I am currently in the position of deciding where to send my 3 year old to school nursery, ideally she would go to Langley, and if it closes in

	the academic year of 2027, she, and my 5 year old daughter would join Langley Gardens (Appletree Gardens), at the same time meaning that I don't need to do two drop offs at different locations. [redacted]
Screen Name Redacted 10/09/2025 01:25 PM	I don't necessarily disagree with the proposal to merge schools if it makes better financial sense and will give better facilities and opportunities for pupils however I do not agree with the idea of merging on Appletree site. [redacted] The increase in pupil numbers will only make this worse.
Screen Name Redacted 10/09/2025 04:28 PM	My son is settled and about to start year one in September 2026. He'll be getting moved mid school after a turbulent time at Nursery post covid where he ended up in 4 different nurseries due to closures
Screen Name Redacted 10/09/2025 05:28 PM	It won't affect me at all but the messing with tier systems, closures, mergers etc has gone on for nearly 30 years. If the council had a long term plan a lot of this could have been avoided.
Screen Name Redacted 10/09/2025 05:35 PM	I think the need for both schools is needed in the catchment area
Screen Name Redacted 10/09/2025 06:06 PM	My child is looked after by grandparents who do not drive., while we are at work. They would have to walk my child from their home close to Langley first school, to appletree gardens which is a long walk for small children and elderly people. Appletree gardens was NEVER an option for my child to attend and you are now taking away our parental choice for our children.
Screen Name Redacted 10/09/2025 07:32 PM	Our children have both now left Langley, so it would not affect us directly but we feel passionately that other children should benefit in the same way ours have.
Screen Name Redacted 10/11/2025 12:34 PM	As a worried grandparent I'm aware of the impact on my grandchild's future education if this school was to be closed
Screen Name Redacted	It will impact negatively on family friends who attend, much loved staff

10/11/2025 02:27 PM

and staff that are friends. The meeting did not yield any answers to questions. It's shameful. It will quite possibly negatively affect house prices and the community as it will deter people moving into our family friendly community. The onus should not be on us to find the solutions! To me it seems clear that you want to reduce and ultimately in time eliminate the three tier system. It started with Monkseaton High School. The new housing estate on its doorstep would have brought new families to the area. When you consider the figures used to project future numbers were incorrect coupled with the low surplus spaces at Langley the only reason I can see for choosing Langley is that you wish to expand Woodlawn to create more spaces in specialist provision. The was this has been handled is shambolic and shameful. Very disappointing!

Screen Name Redacted
10/12/2025 07:14 PM

The movement of pupils will be disruptive for pupils, parents and schools. What plans has the Council got for the capacity of other schools to accommodate the most vulnerable pupils, including those with EHCPs. Will there be an admission process for these pupils?

Screen Name Redacted
10/12/2025 08:34 PM

My daughter attended Langley and I have many friends whose children attend. Langley gave my daughter the foundation of her educational journey. Langley is an amazing school and should not be merged with Appletree Gardens. Sadly I've heard that this decision has already been made and the consultations are just a for formality. I hope that North Tyneside Council listen to the parents, pupils, staff and the local community as they know what is best for the children who attend Langley First School.

Screen Name Redacted
10/13/2025 02:10 PM

You are creating a huge disadvantage to these children they will be overcrowded in school, create nuisance for the neighbours to the school as you are create a lot more noise, footfall and traffic. You will spoil a nurturing environment in to a prison

Screen Name Redacted
10/13/2025 08:35 PM

It's clear that only financial considerations have been made when putting this proposal together. The lack of consideration around practical arrangements - how exactly all these children will fit in the building, the impact on all groups of children, the staff etc is abysmal and has removed any faith in council leadership. More creative options need to be put forward - this is an embarrassment.

Screen Name Redacted
10/13/2025 09:46 PM

Avoid paying extra in council tax

Screen Name Redacted
10/14/2025 02:46 PM

Hi, Consultation Response I note from the Cabinet report of 22 September 2025 (“Strategic Education Review – Update”) that no Transport or Traffic Impact Assessment has been undertaken for the proposed merger of Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School. The report contains only brief comments on approximate walking distances (400–1500m) and confirms that “there are no environment and sustainability implications arising directly from this report.” In addition, I have reviewed the Council’s “Options and Background Data” page for the proposal. This includes some information on distances and catchment mapping, stating that: • the two school buildings are approximately 600m apart; • an 800m radius from Appletree Gardens First School covers most dwellings within both catchments; • the furthest point from Appletree Gardens to the edge of Langley’s catchment is 1,200m; and • “most dwellings can access Appletree Gardens First School without crossing major roads.” While these distance figures are helpful, they do not amount to a full Transport or Traffic Impact Assessment. The background data omits any analysis of: • predicted changes in pupil travel modes (e.g. walking versus car use); • vehicle trip generation and potential impacts on local roads; • parking demand and drop-off / pick-up implications; • road safety and walking/cycling route assessments; and • potential mitigation measures to address these impacts. Given that the proposal will clearly alter pupil travel patterns and could materially affect parking, traffic, and walking routes around Appletree Gardens, this constitutes a relevant consideration under section 508A of the Education Act 1996 and the Department for Education’s Opening and Closing Maintained Schools statutory guidance (October 2024). That guidance requires decision-makers to consider travel times, safety, and likely increases in vehicle use when determining school closure or merger proposals. Accordingly, before any final decision is made, the Council should publish a Transport Statement or Transport / Traffic Impact Assessment setting out: • current and forecast pupil travel modes and distances; • expected changes to vehicle movements and parking demand; • a road-safety assessment of walking and cycling routes; and • proposed mitigation measures. Without this information, consultees cannot properly evaluate the implications of the proposal or have confidence that the Council has fulfilled its statutory duty to promote sustainable travel and consider the full community impact. Freedom of Information/ Environmental Information Request Dear Information Governance Team, Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, I request copies of all documents, correspondence, or analyses held by North Tyneside Council relating to transport or traffic impacts of the proposed merger of Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School. Specifically, please provide: 1. Any Transport Assessment, Traffic Impact Assessment, Transport Statement, or Travel Plan prepared in connection with the proposal. 2. Any correspondence, consultation, or

advice received from the Council's Highways / Network Management teams or external consultants about travel, traffic, road-safety, or parking implications. 3. Any calculations or mapping showing pupil travel distances, routes, or anticipated changes in modal split. 4. Any internal discussion notes or reports explaining the rationale for concluding that a transport assessment was unnecessary (if that was the decision). If no such assessment or analysis exists, please confirm this explicitly in writing. I would prefer the information in electronic form.

Screen Name Redacted
10/14/2025 06:15 PM

They will be squeezed into alternative schools which will be overloaded and not get adequate education

Screen Name Redacted
10/14/2025 06:24 PM

My child doesn't attend either school, I have friends who's children does and seeing the emotional impact and stress it's putting on them is awful. Will we see other local primary schools bursting at the seems now taking in extra children? The extra traffic in the local area etc I bet people making these ridiculous decisions haven't got children attending theses schools.

Screen Name Redacted
10/14/2025 07:52 PM

Although my child will have already transitioned to middle school by the time the Local Authority's proposal to close Langley First School takes effect, I feel compelled to speak out. I may not be directly affected, but I cannot in good conscience remain silent while an excellent school is being sacrificed to solve logistical challenges elsewhere. Langley First School is not failing. It is not underperforming. It is being targeted simply because it shares a site with another school that requires more space. I fully acknowledge that action is needed to address capacity and resource pressures, and I accept that pupil numbers must be managed. However, I do not accept the method being proposed — a unilateral closure — when a legally sound and educationally fair alternative exists. Amalgamation is a viable and recognised option under Department for Education guidance. It offers a way forward that respects both school communities, preserves educational quality, and treats staff and families with dignity. I see no justification for closing Langley First School when amalgamation would achieve the same practical outcomes without the harm and disruption this proposal would cause.

Screen Name Redacted
10/14/2025 08:46 PM

While my child does not attend either school, he does attend schools out Langley during the holidays. Both my husband and I work full time, and without this provision we would struggle, and our son, who is settled in this setting having attended for the last two years would also suffer in the upheaval.

Screen Name Redacted
10/14/2025 09:59 PM

[redacted] When we purchased our property we did so knowing that we were in the catchment for Langley, an excellent school which my husband also attended. When deciding on a private childcare provider following my maternity leave, we opted for Schools Out at Langley in order to ensure consistency as this would one day be the wraparound provider for them when they started at the school. We have been so happy with the provider and are now concerned about it's future if the school closes. Given the huge shortage of nursery places, this is a serious concern. Aside from this, I have a number of concerns as a parent of future students in North Tyneside. The first is that the proposed closure is based on projected numbers but given the planned building of the Murton Gap development, if these projections are underestimated, this could potentially lead to shortage of school places. There is no way to accurately predict who will purchase these homes. I also have concerns about class sizes. Whilst I appreciate that larger class sizes are more economical for the local authority, they are not more effective for teaching. The teaching profession is already haemorrhaging staff and running with no flex in the system with every class at maximum size is likely to push even more good teachers out of the profession increasing workload and pressure. Finally, I have concerns about both traffic and the environmental impact of the school closure. Langley is within comfortable walking distance of my home but I would inevitably drive to Appletree as walking with two young children would not be practical. Assuming others would be doing the same, I would question how an already overstretched road network can cope with the additional traffic. I also question how this fits with the councils green agenda!

Screen Name Redacted
10/15/2025 12:31 PM

[redacted] School's Out at Langley is a self contained building in the grounds of Langley First School. It has its own entrance and garden area. In the school holidays, Langley Out of School Club opens and operates without the need for Langley First School to be open or be affected by this. [redacted]

[redacted] "Our children are at Marine Park First School but we have used the holiday club at School's Out at Langley for a few years now. Its an absolute treasure and an asset to Whitley Bay and if we lose it, the impact will definitely be felt widen than the Langley population. It is by far and wide the best quality early years provision." "We are so lucky to have School's Out at Langley. The service and flexibility they offer is superb." "One of the many reasons we chose Langley First School was School's Out at Langley and their staff. Its a lovely place that the kids adore. We honestly dont know what we would do without School's Out at Langley." "My daughter attends School's Out at Langley and one of the main reasons I chose for her to attend was to give her consistency from the age of 1 - 9. Nowhere else offers this in the same way." School's Out at Langley have 182 children registered who attend during school term times. 87% of these children attend Langley First School and access the wraparound, breakfast club and after school club. [redacted] This is a large childcare provision and the loss of this to the local community would be catastrophic in light of the fact that many other childcare provisions in the community are already full with long waiting lists. [redacted]

Screen Name Redacted

10/16/2025 08:25 PM

We currently live in Shiremoor but do not think Shiremoor first school is a good enough school to send our daughters too. We have our eldest currently in south wellfield nursery and are expecting to be unable to send her to the reception after an influx of langley children desperately trying to find space in another school. We are in the process of trying to move to the area and if your closure goes ahead and we miss the deadline we will be unable to send our daughters to our desired school regardless. The amount of children you will be

	displacing by closing langley is going to have a major knock on effect for families all across the area. The whitley Bay area has a really good reputation when it comes to education and you are jeopardising that by forcing other schools around langley to take on more pupils than they can handle and diluting the quality of their education.
Screen Name Redacted 10/17/2025 02:16 PM	I think the expansion of Woodland is too fantastic an opportunity to miss. The lack of spaces for children with additional needs is surely a priority when classrooms sit empty in primary schools.
Screen Name Redacted 10/17/2025 08:24 PM	Langley First has a unique culture and ethos which cannot simply be transferred to another setting. Each school develops its own curriculum focus, values, and ways of working with children. Merging into Appletree Gardens does not guarantee that the strengths and traditions of Langley will continue. Disproportionate impact on SEND children - Children with additional needs thrive on stability, routine, and familiar staff who know them well. Moving them into a larger, unfamiliar environment risks setting back their progress and widening the gap between SEND pupils and their peers. Displacement of pupils and loss of community - Langley First is more than a school building – it is the heart of our community. Closing it will displace pupils, split up established friendship groups, and weaken vital links between families, staff, and local services. This harms children's sense of belonging and the cohesion of our community. Capacity concerns- The council's figures show Langley has only around 10% surplus places (an acceptable level), while Appletree Gardens has 25% – but this equates to only about 15 spare spaces per year group. This is not enough to accommodate all Langley pupils, meaning children risk being sent further afield. Our daughter left in the summer this year. She attended the school from age 5. During her time there she was exposed to innovative learning experiences that caught her imagination and understanding. High quality teaching was provided through out. The approach to phonics was fantastic-my daughter's reading has significantly increased because of it. Although there was changes in the senior leadership during her time - excellent transitions were managed to support pupils with these. For other children not to have this experience would be a tragedy. The Forrest school, outdoor stage, Mrs Coombs Garden, sports shed, Trim Trail, the book shed in the yard and school field - highlight the diversity of facilities that the school offers. I am not convinced that this would be replicated in a merger with Appletree.
Screen Name Redacted 10/18/2025 11:44 AM	This would disrupt my child's start to education, when they've started in reception then moved into a new school later on. It needs to be thought out and planned before it's agreed to close.

Screen Name Redacted 10/18/2025 02:04 PM	Traffic from the building site. More daily traffic on my estate
Screen Name Redacted 10/19/2025 10:28 AM	My daughter is in Year 4 so would not be directly affected by the first school proposals (though will be by the middle school proposals). However, I understand the arguments presented and, while unfortuante, this seems to be the most logical proposal to ensure efficient use of scarce funds.
Screen Name Redacted 10/19/2025 10:01 PM	The merger will impact hugely on the staff and children causing endless unnecessary disruption to the local community and infrastructure. Come in North Tyneside Council. You are better than this.
Screen Name Redacted 10/20/2025 09:49 AM	Appletree Gardens first school does have extra rooms that are not conventional classrooms, but their are being used on a regular basis, like the library and this ICT room. Merging Langley and Appletree would deprive all pupils from this development and learning opportunities. Furthermore, according to https://get-information-schools.service.gov.uk/, it is not true that Langley First School and Appeltree Gardens First School have a surplus of places, Langley has an overshoot of 10 students, and Appletree Gardens 52 students. There is simply no room on the Appletree site to welcome a whole other school, unless the Council is actually planning, not considering, to close Monkseaton Middle School, which would go against the transparency of the consultation.
Screen Name Redacted 10/20/2025 04:13 PM	I worry what will be schooling will be available in NT when my children have children
Screen Name Redacted 10/21/2025 11:46 AM	it will not. Both my children have been through Langley and are now at upper schools.
Screen Name Redacted 10/21/2025 01:13 PM	It would not affect us directly as our child left Langley last year, but we have plenty of friends with children at the school and the disruption that it would cause them is unsettling, and I'm glad that my child won't have to suffer it when it goes ahead. I say when as most people know it's a done deal.
Screen Name Redacted	[redacted]

10/22/2025 12:05 PM

[redacted] Moving their daughter to the Appletree site, apart from the emotional issues she would face, would involve a longer journey to school twice a day. I'm aware that the Council is required to make some significant changes, but it seems to me that Langley is the victim of its own success as far as these proposals are concerned. Appletree has higher percentage of unfilled places; it has a much lower percentage of children in the catchment area attending the school; its percentage surplus will go from 25% to 29% based on your projections and it will never be lower than 22%. In the next 9 years, the unacceptable level will be met or exceeded in 7 of those years. Langley's projected surplus will go from 10% to 17% and will only once exceed that figure (18%). In the next nine years it will never meet or exceed the unacceptable level. Langley's projected surplus gets nowhere near the figures for Appletree. I note that the information so far provided makes no reference to the number of pupils at Woodlawn; is this deliberate? I am keen to understand whether, with suitable adjustments, the Appletree site could accommodate both Appletree and Woodlawn pupils. Over half of the parents living in Appletree's catchment area have chosen to send their children elsewhere, whereas 3 out of 4 parents living in Langley's catchment area have chosen to use Langley. Doesn't this indicate that Langley is much-valued school? Why must it be sacrificed in the manner being proposed?

Screen Name Redacted
10/22/2025 08:06 PM

It protects the three tier system and reduces surplus places.

Screen Name Redacted
10/23/2025 08:45 AM

none

Screen Name Redacted
10/23/2025 11:10 AM

Langley First school is a nurturing, supportive and forward-thinking school. [redacted] Any disruption to a child's education is harmful (for instance, we are seeing long-lasting detrimental impacts of school closures during the COVID pandemic)

Screen Name Redacted
10/24/2025 12:47 PM

Keeping the 3 tier system in place is important to many families this merger does that.

Screen Name Redacted
10/24/2025 01:09 PM

I have worked in a number of schools as a teacher and teaching assistant and I find Appletree to be the best by far. The ethos of Appletree has children at the heart and I am looking forward to being

able to work with more families and welcome them into the Appletree Community.

Screen Name Redacted
10/24/2025 05:33 PM

Appletree Gardens First School is not just a school—it is a truly special place, where every child is nurtured, inspired, and given the tools to thrive. As we look toward the merger with Langley, we are confident that Appletree Gardens is uniquely positioned to continue supporting our children, both during the transition and long into the future. This is due to a combination of factors, including our well-established staff, strong leadership, commitment to continuous improvement, and our long-standing focus on inclusion and excellence. Our school is built upon a foundation of care, compassion, and ambition. Guided by our Thrive ethos and underpinned by our 'Blossom Code', we are committed to fostering resilience, a deep sense of belonging, and the individual growth of each child. This approach, coupled with our excellent reputation for working with children with SEND, ensures that every pupil—regardless of their background or challenges—has the opportunity to flourish in a supportive, inclusive environment. Appletree Gardens' team is highly skilled, experienced, and dedicated. Many of our staff members have worked together for years, building a cohesive and dynamic team that is deeply invested in the success and well-being of our children. [redacted] This is reflected in our most recent Ofsted report, which recognised our consistent efforts to raise standards and maintain high levels of care and support for all pupils. The opportunities at Appletree Gardens extend beyond the classroom, where we strive to nurture the whole child. Our curriculum is enriched with a variety of activities—from dance festivals to bike riding and Forest School sessions—that ignite curiosity, build confidence, and instill a lifelong love of learning. Our spacious, well-resourced classrooms and beautiful site provide an inspiring and safe environment where creativity and collaboration flourish daily. What truly sets Appletree Gardens apart is our strong sense of community. We have fostered a family-like atmosphere where staff, pupils, and families share a deep pride in our school. We have weathered challenges together, and this unity and sense of belonging will be invaluable as we move forward in the merger process. The proposed merger offers us an opportunity to build on our strengths, ensuring that our high standards of care, inclusion, and academic achievement continue to benefit all children. We are fully committed to ensuring that every pupil will receive the support, guidance, and opportunities they need to succeed, both during the transition and beyond. We want to reassure all our parents and families that as we move forward with the merger, we are fully committed to offering the same high-quality education and nurturing environment that has made our school

a special place for so many. Our experienced, dedicated team, along with our proven track record of success, ensures that we are more than equipped to welcome new families and pupils into our community. We are confident that, together, we can continue to provide a safe, inclusive, and enriching experience for every child. Our focus remains on fostering growth, resilience, and a sense of belonging, ensuring that all children—whether returning or new—will continue to thrive. The Appletree Gardens ethos of care, collaboration, and excellence will remain at the heart of everything we do, and we are excited to continue this journey of growth.

Screen Name Redacted
10/24/2025 05:44 PM

The proposal to merge Appletree Gardens First School with Langley first school offers an exciting opportunity to strengthen our community and enhance learning opportunities for all pupils. Appletree Gardens First School has strong leadership and a well-established, dedicated staff team committed to driving the school forward and supporting positive growth. By maintaining our existing staff structure within our merged setting, we can preserve the strong relationships, expertise, and stability that define our school ethos. This proposal ensures continuity for our children and families, while creating a stronger, more sustainable future for education in our community.

Screen Name Redacted
10/24/2025 05:44 PM

I think it's a good idea as we they would be moor resources for the children

Screen Name Redacted
10/24/2025 05:52 PM

I feel y

Screen Name Redacted
10/24/2025 06:22 PM

The merge wouldn't affect my child, or is as a family. We are in Apple tree gardens catchment area, which my child attends. I have no doubt that Apple tree gardens would be able to facilitate the merge, and welcome all future pupils with open arms, following the schools ethos. Both of my children have attended, or still do attend, and they thrive and become the best versions of themselves, with both teachers and us as parents, having a positive input into the early years of there life. It would just become another opportunity for the school, local community, and our children to form new friendships.

Screen Name Redacted
10/24/2025 06:56 PM

I think the merger would be beneficial if it allows us to keep the 3 tier system. This is so much better for children’s relationships and negative relationships. Appletree has been a fantastic school with great space inside and out. Appletree provides so many opportunities for the children and really have taken time and care to design the curriculum to best fit the children while also supporting the children to

grow with the best values and manners.

Screen Name Redacted
10/24/2025 07:04 PM

I think it will be a great idea the children will thrive in Apple Tree just like my daughters have.

Screen Name Redacted
10/24/2025 08:03 PM

This proposal protects the 3tier system and gives stability to ensure children continue to thrive wherever they are learning in a safe, secure environment.. * Appletree Gardens have an amazing passed record (and are continuing to so to this day) of being a nurturing, well equipped,ambitious school that don't just value the lives of their children but care for the whole family including their staff. They are interested in the complete child wether it be in their ambition to grow academically or caring for their social/ emotional/ physical needs.. *Children are given the opportunity to build on their existing strengths and this will continue through our aims to ensure all learners will achieve to their potential. *Appletree is well equipped to continue to meet and exceed high standards of education. * Lots of opportunities are offered in addition to the normal school day. Forest school/ Thrive/Cookery Club/ Sports Club to name just a few. Good Ofsted grading. A strong , caring and hard working staff whose vision is to give the best environment in order to deliver high standards of education to every child who passes through the doors of this school. [redacted] I have seen my own children develop into strong, caring ambitious adults. They had a solid foundation and now are both professionals in their own field. The devotion, care and string ambition of our teachers then and today has never changed plus the effective leadership provides a solid platform of good practice. Finally we are a family……THE APPLETREE FAMILY who may I say I am extremely proud to be part of. I challenge anyone who is thinking of sending their children to this school to speak to our parents or come and visit. We'd love to welcome you and to have a look round.

Screen Name Redacted
10/24/2025 10:02 PM

The merger of Langley First School with Appletree Gardens First School wll affect my school as it will make Appletree Gardens First School bigger in numbers. This can only make us a stronger school and protect our future and the three tier system in Whitley Bay. At Appletree we would welcome any new pupils and families with open arms to join us in our amazing school. We are a strong, Thrive-trained nurturing staff, (who having applied to have an on-site ARP and are currently developing a sensory garden), are ambitious, forward thinking and certainly not scared of change or challenge. The opportunities we offer our pupils from all over the world, (including on site forest school) will continue to provide a broad and balanced curriculum full of meaningful learning opportunities.

Screen Name Redacted
10/24/2025 10:04 PM

I agree with this proposal , as Appletree Gardens' dedicated staff and leadership team have the skills and vision to ensure that the benefits for pupils, staff and the community are front-and-centre. This proposal provides a sustainable school system and a valuable opportunity to build on existing strengths. The school building is physically capable of taking on larger numbers of pupils without the suggested risk of over-sized classes. Any short term repurposing of spaces would not compromise the quality of education and, if the school's application for an ARP is successful, it will increase targeted support for pupils with specific educational needs, enhancing the school's offer. Ofsted (June 2024) said that pupils at Appletree were extremely proud to attend this happy and welcoming school, that they were keen to learn and that behaviour and learning expectations were high. Leaders and governors were described as ambitious for all pupils and as having a clear vision for continual improvement. This proposal, in my opinion, leaves Appletree Gardens First School best placed to share their expertise, enhance the educational quality for all stakeholders and build a thriving school community of the future.

Screen Name Redacted
10/24/2025 10:14 PM

I agree with the merger because it will help protect the 3 tier system in Whitley Bay. Appletree Gardens is a fantastic school and is more than capable of welcoming the Langley pupils. They have a really strong ethos and have the children at the heart of everything they do.

Screen Name Redacted
10/24/2025 10:14 PM

The proposed merger brings exciting opportunities for Appletree Gardens. It will strengthen our pupil numbers and help secure the future of the three-tier system. Appletree is a fantastic school with an exceptional offer — a nurturing, supportive environment where children are truly at the heart of everything we do. We warmly welcome children from Langley, as we do all children who join us, whatever their background or walk of life.

Screen Name Redacted
10/24/2025 11:38 PM

I am a proud member of staff at Appletree Gardens First School, and I would like to express my full support for the proposed merger. Everyone who works at Appletree is incredibly proud of our school, our children, and the strong sense of community that makes it such a special place to learn and work. Appletree is a happy, nurturing, and ambitious school where every child is encouraged to reach their full potential. Our most recent Ofsted inspection (June 2024) described pupils as “extremely proud to attend this happy and welcoming school” and praised the high standards of behaviour, the ambitious curriculum, and the caring relationships between staff and pupils. These values run through everything we do and will continue to define our school as we move forward. The Appletree site offers

fantastic facilities, extensive outdoor space, and modern learning environments that are ready to welcome more pupils. The merger would allow us to make full use of these facilities, securing sustainable pupil numbers for the future while protecting the high standards of teaching and learning that families value so highly. This proposal also supports the future of the three-tier system in the Whitley Bay and Monkseaton area — a system that works extremely well for our children and provides continuity and stability as they move through each stage of their education. As a staff team, we are also passionate about inclusion and supporting children with additional needs. We remain very keen for an ARP (Additionally Resourced Provision) to be developed at Appletree in the future, as we believe our school has the ethos, expertise, and environment to make this highly successful. We hope this will be considered as part of the longer-term planning for education in our area. We understand that change can be challenging, but we see this proposal as an exciting opportunity for growth, stability, and continued excellence. Appletree has so much to offer — a dedicated team, wonderful children, supportive families, and a proven record of success. This merger would allow us to build on those strengths and continue to thrive for many years to come.

Screen Name Redacted
10/26/2025 03:53 PM

[redacted] The school has always been at the centre of the Monkseaton community and I believe that, with its strong values based ethos , and experienced, dedicated staff, will be well placed to support children, families and staff through the transition process. [redacted] I see in Appletree Gardens latest OFSTED report the qualities that will be necessary to ensure a successful merger: High staff morale, effective SEN provision and experienced leaders and staff team who will be well placed to build upon their strengths and to make a success of the integration process, whilst ensuring that all children continue to be enabled to reach their full potential. The children's love of learning , good behaviour and the consistently applied behaviour policy which makes high quality learning possible and which will help to support the inclusion of new pupils. The excellent learning environment which has been created , with a strong, inclusive curriculum which will enable the school to continue to grow and improve following the merger. I am sure that Appletree Gardens, drawing on all of its strengths, will continue to provide a safe, inclusive and nurturing environment for all the pupils, for many, many years to come.

Screen Name Redacted

Appletree delivers a fantastic education for students who attend. It

10/26/2025 10:35 PM

has capacity to accommodate additional students without any detrimental effects to existing ones. If one of the schools has to close then this is the best solution, the head teacher and staff at Appletree are devoted to providing the best education and support for their children as is possible. I'm sure that existing students and those welcomed from Langley would continue to receive an education of the highest standard with this merger while also protecting this area's 3 tier system for future cohorts.

Screen Name Redacted

10/27/2025 05:34 AM

Pragmatically something needs to be changed to ensure that education is financially viable. I understand that many schools are currently running below capacity and at a loss therefore I agree with the proposal to merge Langley and Appletree. Most children are resilient and with the appropriate support, this should have no negative impact on their education. With this in mind, I believe there are a higher number of SEN children attending Appletree therefore I agree with the merger which would prevent a higher level of support being required to assist with this move. I disagree with the proposal to create a new school as I believe this would create a higher level of challenge with all children requiring 'moving', upheaval for a larger number of staff and ultimately cost significantly more to ultimately create a school which is no better than the existing schools - even getting to that level of stability will take significant time and money. Ultimately this is an incredibly difficult situation for those at Langley however Appletree is an excellent school and I agree with the proposal to merge.

Screen Name Redacted

10/27/2025 05:56 PM

I am aware of the controversy surrounding the merger of the two schools [redacted] I feel that it is important to resolve this quickly so that all the children can feel secure and settled in their school. Across North Tyneside there needs to be provision for all children - including SEND children- and the plan for the merger seems to be a way of providing this . Apple tree is a great school and will be able to meet the needs of all the children.

Screen Name Redacted

10/28/2025 07:23 AM

[redacted] As a result, we were initially hesitant to enroll him in nursery or allow anyone other than family to care for him. However, from the moment he started at Langley, we felt a deep sense of reassurance knowing that his needs were being met. He thrived during his time in nursery and reception, making incredible progress and learning a great deal in a short period of time. As he grew older, he began to experience anxiety, reluctant to leave us as parents, unwilling to sleep alone, and showing resistance to going to

school. The support we received from Langley, alongside the school's dedicated mental health team, was nothing short of outstanding. They provided invaluable assistance, not only to our son but also to my husband and me. After several months of collaborative efforts and with the school's guidance, our son now eagerly runs into school every day and is flourishing in Year 2. My daughter, who also attends Langley, has had a wonderful experience from nursery through to her current time in reception. The teachers at Langley genuinely care for the children, making a concerted effort to nurture and support them as if they were their own. I am deeply grateful for the positive environment Langley provides for both of my children. The thought of having to move my son to a new school, [redacted] is deeply concerning. Langley has been a place where both of my children have thrived, and the idea of starting over at another school fills me with great unease. I urge you to oppose the proposed merger of Langley First School with Appletree Gardens First School. This plan is not in the best interests of our children or community, and I have serious concerns about its impact: Loss of culture, ethos, and curriculum Langley First has a unique culture and ethos which cannot simply be transferred to another setting. Each school develops its own curriculum focus, values, and ways of working with children. Merging into Appletree Gardens does not guarantee that the strengths and traditions of Langley will continue. Disproportionate impact on SEND children Children with additional needs thrive on stability, routine, and familiar staff who know them well. Moving them into a larger, unfamiliar environment risks setting back their progress and widening the gap between SEND pupils and their peers. Displacement of pupils and loss of community Langley First is more than a school building – it is the heart of our community. Closing it will displace pupils, split up established friendship groups, and weaken vital links between families, staff, and local services. This harms children's sense of belonging and the cohesion of our community. Capacity concerns The council's figures show Langley has only around 10% surplus places (an acceptable level), while Appletree Gardens has 25% – but this equates to only about 15 spare spaces per year group. This is not enough to accommodate all Langley pupils, meaning children risk being sent further afield. For these reasons, I strongly urge you to reconsider these proposals and protect Langley First School's future. Our children deserve stability, belonging, and the high-quality education they are already receiving in their own community school. Thank you for your time.

Screen Name Redacted
10/28/2025 09:08 AM

My granddaughter is in year 1 at Langley first school. The teachers at this school are fantastic and the school ethos has enabled my granddaughter to develop into a confident happy well educated child. The school is part of a wonderful community and to close this school

and move children at this young age would have a devastating effect on the area and particularly the children.

Screen Name Redacted
10/28/2025 09:49 AM

[redacted] I was born and raised in Whitley Bay / Monkseaton and it was important to me, as an adult, to move back to the area so that my children can also attend school here. The schools are exceptional and the the three tier system is revered across the country. In my view, this proposed closure is just the beginning. Where does it end? WHY will the council not listen to its residents? This closure is not wanted, and it is also not needed. I am extremely concerned that other school closures will follow.

Screen Name Redacted
10/29/2025 11:06 AM

My children are all grown up I am thinking about future generations and where children will have to travel and to keep them safe when travelling to and from school

Screen Name Redacted
10/29/2025 08:30 PM

This is affecting our decision on first school choices. We were interested in both Appletree and Langley but the uncertainty due to the merger means we will not apply for either school now. Our nearest school was oversubscribed last year (Backworth) and although we are not in catchment at the moment, we love South wellfield School and are hoping to move into Whitley Bay in the next few months, but South Wellfield was also oversubscribed last year. We have even less chance now of gaining a place at one of these schools because it is likely that most of the people who were going to apply for the 60 places at Langley will now apply to the other schools.

Screen Name Redacted
10/30/2025 11:35 AM

After much consideration and observation of events following the merger proposal announcement, I am in agreement with the proposal as a means to strengthen the school system for the community in the long run. The stakeholders at Appletree are well established, experienced and innovative. They are prepared for this proposal. This proposal would effectively sustain the first\ primary education in this area serving a diverse community. It will support Appletree's existing community- 35% pupil premium, 12% EAL, 14% SEND in continuing to provide a quality education that our families trust. Economically, it is within walking distance of family homes and the school is poverty proof trained and very conscious of family finances in all we do. With the proposed closure of the middle school, it is not overlooked that the education and wraparound care for the youngest families in the most deprived area of the NEPA catchment is proposed to remain- this is important. Appletree also has a strong equalities, diversity and inclusion plan and ethos which supports our current community and

also serves new pupils well (we have many throughout the year!). The transition to support a proposed 'bulk' of children, in the interim, will be well supported. We have a solid reputation for managing and support pupils with SEND and would be keen to develop an ARP at Appletree. We believe this would again support the needs of our community and under this proposal reassure some of the parent worries around transition and care of their children. Under this proposal, the 'bulk' year groups would be an unusual dynamic, particularly in 2027. It would be useful to know, as early as possible, how many children might join the merged school. This would affect how the school runs currently and would require careful planning to manage effectively. The families affected the most under the proposal are the families currently attending Langley who will then transition to Appletree or another school. This could pose many difficult scenarios for these families and again we would need to plan sensitively, creatively and collaboratively to succeed. Staff and families are being affected at Appletree by the unwarranted negative social media this proposal has attracted. We would hope the school would be supported to continue to stay strong and positive in the face of this in order to maintain strong leadership and values.

Screen Name Redacted
10/31/2025 03:00 PM

My son is in year 2 at Langley which has 60 children , there are 58 year 2 children at Appletree. I am very concerned about his education in a school with a year group of 118 with unfamiliar teachers who will likely be temporary to cover the merged years. When I applied for both my children to go to Langley it was because of the feeling I gained from the school and a comfort that my children would be in a warm and nurturing environment with teachers who prioritised the pupils. I also visited Appletree and I had no doubt that I wanted my children to attend Langley, we lived in Langley catchment but, even if we hadn't, I would have chosen Langley and we put Southridge second and Marine 3rd despite Appletree being the second closest to our home.

Screen Name Redacted
11/01/2025 09:26 AM

Appletree gardens served both of my children it is an inclusive and friendly school that helps children feel safe and make progress. Despite being through COVID staff provided excellent sow in the absence of classroom teaching and my children actively made progress with their guidance and feedback. It isn't just a school it is a community with an ethos to be proud of. While no school closures are welcomed clearly change needs to happen and the appletree site is large enough to accommodate all the students without compromising a 3 tier system. This proposal makes sense and places students in a school which upholds important values of community and safety of students. My children had this to say; 10 years old- I don't think you should Close apple tree because apple tree is the best school I've

ever been to. In some schools I think that staff keep telling you off when you make a mistake but at appletree they'll tell you how to do it right and motivate you to do it better the next time you try it and that's why I think apple trees the best school ever 13 year old: I have autism and it's been a long way to get diagnosed. In appletree I never felt any different to my friends. I did in middle school but never at appletree. It holds each student at the centre. We are what is important so that it doesn't matter if you have barriers or hurdles staff help you over them so you can achieve. I've seen what it is like when relationships and positivity are not the most important thing and it makes school a lot harder. Those 5 years at appletree made me kind, smarter, and I accepted myself without question. The staff and school are incredible and anyone would be luck to be in that environment. From looking at the data change needs to occur to future proof the system and ensure a 3 tier can remain. Appletree is an ideal school to cater for the needs of all, locally and with plenty of space. Therefore I support the merger - my whole family do.

Screen Name Redacted
11/01/2025 06:12 PM

Merging the schools ensures a steadier future for Appletree Gardens and ensures the children can be reassured their excellent education can continue. Parent/carers can relax knowing little changes after the merger will have an impact on their child’s education. Appletre gardens ensure all children feel welcome from every where in the world and north Tyneside. Individual characters are embraced and allowed to grow whilst following the school ethos. Children are celebrated for who they are and what they can achieve whilst being w courage to better themselves at their own level.

Screen Name Redacted
11/03/2025 05:49 PM

Although this decision will not affect me or my family directly I feel the merger of the two schools due to falling numbers of children in the area is essential to result in the continuation of the high quality of education in the local area. I also feel strongly that Woodlawn school needs to expand to ensure they have capacity to cope with the level of demand for places from across North Tyneside.

Screen Name Redacted
11/04/2025 08:20 AM

The merger would allow the amazing work and inclusive community at Appletree by the staff to continue. My children got an education here that set them up for life. As long as the council can support the school effectively with bulge year, as promised in the parent meeting this is a good plan that will benefit everyone because the head and staff at appletree will prioritise the well-being of everyone involved.

Screen Name Redacted
11/04/2025 12:15 PM

No objection to the principle of the merger for the long term viability of quality local education. As a parent of a Langley first school pupil we

have structured our working pattern to align to the hours of operation. Primarily the structure of Nursery provision of 2.5 days per week; we have a sibling due nursery place in coming 12 months. This remains important. Prior to 2027 there needs to be some consideration for parents dropping off children at two locations.

Screen Name Redacted
11/05/2025 05:45 PM

My grandson is in year 2 so if this goes ahead will be in a year group of over 100 children. The disruption and impact of education will have a detrimental effect of his education. The lack of stability and predictability is already causing upset and anxiety. This will be compounded by the fact he will then have another move to middle school so will have 2 moves in less than 18months. One of My twin granddaughters struggle with her social and emotional development, the inclusive nature of Langley has meant she has settled so well in reception as a result of the specialist teachers. Something that is massively at risk due to these proposals. Finally we have seen the traffic and how dangerous it is around appletree estate already on a school run we don't feel confident we could get our grandchildren there safely without driving as we would have to cross seatonville road. Just today there was an accident on Bromley during school drop off. LangleyAvenue safe school means our grandchildren can safely get to school.

Screen Name Redacted
11/05/2025 06:50 PM

Although we don't live locally, we hear so much about Langley First School from our grandchildren — and it's always with excitement and pride. They tell us about the teachers who make learning fun, the friends they've made, and the projects they're part of. It's clear the school gives them confidence, curiosity, and a real sense of belonging. As grandparents, that means a lot. Knowing that our grandchildren are part of such a nurturing, well-balanced school community gives us real peace of mind. Langley clearly does more than teach lessons — it anchors families, builds friendships, and gives children a strong start in life. To hear it could close is deeply worrying. A good local school like Langley is the foundation of a community. It draws families in, keeps the area connected, and helps children feel safe and supported. Take that away, and you lose something much bigger than a building — you lose part of what holds the community together. We'd urge the council to think carefully about the long-term consequences. Once a school like Langley goes, you can't easily rebuild what it represents

Screen Name Redacted
11/05/2025 06:55 PM

Access to appletree my child would potentially need to cross 2 very busy roads by themselves in yr 4 when walking alone with no longer having lollipop persons available. No safe school street like Langley again affects children's safety. I am very worried about reduced

wraparound provision . Much shorter hrs and would they have space to accommodate all that was needed. I would have to reduce my hrs at work which financially I can't afford to do. Also parking is a concern. I worry about large class sizes, and the quality of education my child might receive. I am very concerned about the fact it is not a true merger, Appletree was not on my list a a school I would choose to send my child and it is only right and fair that it needs to be a true merger with best staff and ethos taken from both schools as it is creating further divided.

Screen Name Redacted
11/05/2025 07:38 PM

Although I don’t live locally, I hear so much about Langley First School from our grandchildren — and it’s always with excitement and pride. They tell us about the teachers who make learning fun, the friends they’ve made, and the projects they’re part of. It’s clear the school gives them confidence, curiosity, and a real sense of belonging. As grandparents, that means a lot. Knowing that our grandchildren are part of such a nurturing, Ill-balanced school community gives us real peace of mind. Langley clearly does more than teach lessons — it anchors families, builds friendships, and gives children a strong start in life. To hear it could close is deeply worrying. A good local school like Langley is the foundation of a community. It draws families in, keeps the area connected, and helps children feel safe and supported. Take that away, and you lose something much bigger than a building — you lose part of what holds the community together. I’d urge the council to think carefully about the long-term consequences. Once a school like Langley goes, you can’t easily rebuild what it represents

Screen Name Redacted
11/06/2025 08:59 AM

[redacted] Stability, consistency, and routine are so key for him, and he has flourished in the local community through volunteering and running weekly at our coastal parkruns. He loves Whitley Bay, and the life he has made here. Langley is a brilliant school, and the very best school for our son. We initially went into the Reception schooling system quite anxious that the further transition and relationship bonds required would pose a challenge for him, just four months into his placement with us. We approached both Langley and Appletree as our top choices. Langley's provision of a dedicated staff member for looked after children was the first signal to us that this was the school for us. When we visited, we were blown away by Langley's THRIVE and therapeutic approach, provision of sensory room and haven areas, and just how open and receptive the staff were to learning and mirroring our strategies to support him and his behavioural needs at this difficult time. Appletree provisions made no

comparison. The proposed multiple transitions to Appletree, then middle school (with our son's need for structure and routine), will have a detrimental effect on our son's confidence and trust in the school system. It is a big concern to us that no clear guidance has been given on whether such therapeutic approaches, named staff, his own teacher, would continue to be present at Appletree, or whether he would lose this support should this proposal go ahead.
Additionally, we are well aware that the first school / middle school system, in North Tyneside, with it's aims of long-term benefit and stability, do pose another transition for him in 4-5 years, which we are taking the impact of quite seriously already. A transition to Appletree in 2 years (the proposed non-democratic merge, transfer into new school building, new teachers, new environment, new uniform), followed by another middle school two years later, would lead to massive regression in trust in the public school system for our little boy, potentially with no recourse for the support we have sought out for him. We are working very hard to help him build relationships, structure, and trust in things being reliable. It is so disheartening that Langley, which offers such brilliant support for so many children with additional needs, will be closed and cause such similar disruption for so many other children. The proposal, as is, would lead to poor outcomes for our son, and needs to change to suit the needs of the people it affects. Due diligence and true democratic engagement during the potential merger is of utmost importance to our family. As noted above, the current proposal has had very poor reception in the local community, and has created divisions in coming across as a hostile takeover (Langley closing, children then just attending Appletree). I would propose a true democratic merger into a new school, where all carers/children/staff could have an input into a new school's name, ethos, uniform. There are great benefits to such a merger, in terms of keeping the best bits from both schools, and outside scrutiny driving standards up.

Screen Name Redacted
11/06/2025 10:00 AM

Having lived in the area for many years, and moved to Preston Grange specifically for it's proximity to good schools, we did a lot of research before we chose Langley for our children. We viewed Appletree Gardens as we went through our decision making process and were disappointed with the provision on offer, as well as the results, the grounds, the surrounding area (nightmare for parking) and the building itself - there were buckets lining the corridors catching water dripping through the roof. We made a very informed decision to choose Langley for our children and both are thriving there. If the council takes the decision to close Langley and 'merge' it with Appletree, we would take the decision to remove our children from the school as we did not want our children to go to Appletree Gardens in the first place. This leaves us with 3 choices - homeschooling our children (when we work full time), moving away from the area entirely

to find a new school, or trying to get our children into other local schools, barely any of which have surplus spaces. Moving the children to another local school is disruptive and we run the risk of having to separate siblings across schools because of the scarcity of places across the area. When considering what we might do if this went ahead, some of the concerns we have around this are as follows: - The parking outside Appletree Gardens is scarce - Langley has a free car park in very close proximity that we use regularly. Should the children have to go to Appletree, we'd have to find parking on already-congested local streets. Furthermore, the road leading to Langley is closed every morning to ensure the safety of our children in getting to school - this can't be done at Appletree so there's a much higher risk of an incident with hundreds more pupils trying to access a school across busy roads with minimal parking - how can this be deemed safe for our children? - We're concerned over how Appletree can accommodate all of the Langley children - we've been given no reassurance whatsoever through the documentation provided by the council as to how they can all be safely accommodated on site. Furthermore, the risk of enormous class numbers because a real concern - over the age of 7 there's no limit on how many children can be in one class, and the council have provided no reassurance on this either. We have real concerns over the quality of learning for our children in class sizes of more than 30. - According to the council tool, Appletree is a significantly more expensive building to run than Langley - so why choose to close Langley? - Whilst neither of my children are currently on a SENCO pathway, Langley has an excellent provision should we need this. We have had no reassurance whatsoever that this provision would be matched at Appletree. Rather than being viewed as a candidate for closure simply because it is located next to a special school, Langley’s position represents a strategic opportunity. Its proximity to Woodlawn Special School allows for dual registration, enabling pupils to access targeted interventions and therapies as needed while continuing to participate in mainstream classes and interact with a diverse peer group. This approach supports the government’s key priority of inclusive education, keeping children with additional needs in mainstream settings wherever possible. - My daughter is currently in year 2, and would be going into year 4 at the point that this 'merger' would come about. All schools within the NEPA are currently full for this year group apart from Appletree, which I understand has 2 spaces. A merger with Appletree would mean 118 pupils in Year 4. As yet, the council has not provided any information as to what the class sizes would be in the ‘merged’ school. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, I am concerned that our children will be placed in larger class sizes, which could have an adverse affect on their education and wellbeing. - Wraparound provision - we have had no assurances

whatsoever that Little Pips at Appletree could accommodate the wraparound requirements of the current Langley children. The opening times for Little Pips are significantly shorter than those at Schools Out at Langley which is going to have a huge impact for working parents, like myself. Implementing this merger in 2027 would mean disrupting the largest cohorts of pupils currently moving through the system. If this merger is to go ahead, a far more logical approach is to wait until the smaller birth-rate cohorts are in the schools.

Screen Name Redacted
11/06/2025 12:23 PM

Langley School has had an incredible and lasting impact on my children and our family. I have two children (one in Year 1 and one in Nursery) who are both flourishing at Langley. The care, dedication, and professionalism of the staff have created an environment where every child feels valued, supported, and inspired to achieve their best. The teachers don't just educate; they nurture confidence, curiosity, and kindness. They take the time to understand each child as an individual, celebrating their strengths and guiding them through challenges with patience and genuine care. Having worked in education myself, I know the profound difference a school and its teachers can make in a child's life. The impact that the staff at Langley have had on my children has been huge. They have helped them grow in confidence, develop a love of learning, and build strong friendships. Langley is more than a school; it's a thriving community that gives our children the very best start in life. The proposed closure would cause considerable damage to my children's education and to the many families who rely on this school. Closing a successful, nurturing school like Langley is deeply concerning and short-sighted. The chronic underfunding of education over the past two decades is not an excuse to dismantle what is working so well. Below are areas of the consultation that cause great concern. 1. There are several inaccuracies within the documentation published as part of the consultation including: ● Langley has a field separated by a public highway, meaning groups of children are escorted 'off site' for each PE/sporting activity and have no access to playing fields for lunch and dinner breaks (This isn't true. The school does in fact have a well-used playing field immediately adjacent to the building, with a separate field across a minor road which is used once a year for sports day. Langley also has an outdoor space in the reception garden, which follows a forest school ethos and is also used for children with SEND as well as a potting garden and an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming) ● The school is in financial deficit (This is incorrect. The school has only predicted a deficit for the year 25/26, for the first time ever and is working with an independent financial advisor to see where the budget can be improved) ● The majority of dwellings [currently in Langley catchment] can access [Appletree] without crossing major roads (This is incorrect. Many of our children would need to cross

Seatonville Road and/or Cauldwell Lane) ● There were briefings and reports with headteachers (Whilst there have been meetings, this has been very brief and Headteachers could not include Governors which meant there was little options for them to act or come up with solutions) ● There were also several inaccuracies published in the consultation documents, including (but not limited to): projected pupil numbers, deficit forecasting, inaccuracies in pupil data at other school There are also areas that are misleading Finance - Within its consultation documentation, the council states: While currently both schools are in surplus (they receive more funding than they spend), Langley First is predicting a deficit (spending more than they receive) in 2026 which is projected to grow to £0.751m by 2028. At the same time Appletree Gardens is predicting it will enter deficit by 2028. School leaders have made changes and worked hard with the Council to make the financial situation better, but because low pupil numbers mean less funding, the situation is not improving. If left unchanged, the risk is that the two schools would continue to grow in deficit, and this in turn would limit their ability to sustain high quality education. Whilst these figures are not inaccurate, they are somewhat misleading. Appletree Gardens is in receipt of additional funding, known as Falling Rolls funding, to help it make up for its surplus places Langley is not in receipt of this funding, as its surplus figure is within the council's acceptable range. The council has not met - nor offered to meet - with the leadership or governing team at Langley to address its forecasted deficit SEN Provision - A large part of the consultation is promoting the impact of Woodlawn by moving to one site. This is misleading as it suggests increasing the provision where in reality it just moves 32 children to the same site at the displacement of 300 children in Langley. I am not happy that my children are displaced and have their education disrupted due to a myth of supporting SEN Children. It also doesn't take into account the SEN children within Langley and its effect. The long-term health of the mainstream school system should not be compromised to solve a logistical problem for SEND provision, however important that provision may be. By bundling the two issues - the alleged need to close a school with the need to expand Woodlawn - the council is effectively creating a false choice: asking the community to accept a suboptimal and unstable mainstream solution in exchange for a desirable SEND solution. The long-term health of the mainstream school system should not be compromised to solve a logistical problem for SEND provision, however important that provision may be. Rather than being viewed as a candidate for closure simply because it is located next to a special school, Langley's position represents a strategic opportunity. Its proximity to Woodlawn Special School allows for dual registration, enabling pupils to access targeted interventions and therapies as needed while continuing to participate in mainstream classes and interact with a diverse peer group. This approach supports the government's key priority of inclusive

education 2. If the closure does happen the proposals for my children to attend Appletree is not suitable for various reasons. Building Space The council's consultation document says Appletree "can accommodate 432 pupils, which is more than the amount of both schools combined when future birth rates and admission numbers are adjusted". However, when we checked on the gov.uk website for the capacity of Appletree, the capacity is stated as being 293. The campaign has asked for clarification on this ● As yet, the council has offered no assurance about how the Langley children could be safely accommodated on the site ● Nor has it given us any assurance on class sizes. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, there is a concern amongst us that our children will be placed in larger class sizes, which could have an adverse affect on their education and wellbeing. ● According to the government's school spending comparison tool Appletree is a more expensive building to run. Appletree spends £29 per square metre on utilities, compared to Langley which spends £4 per square metre Traffic I walk my children everyday to school and back and the route is safe and means they get to cycle their bikes or walk to school and promotes a healthy lifestyle. If the closure takes place This will no longer be the case as they will have to cross busy roads to reach Appletree and a car journey may have to be made instead. This has a negative impact on the environment and the children's health and as the data below shows this would be the reality of a significant amount of the children of Langley. The parent survey carried out by Friends of Langley asked parents how they currently travel to school: ● 78% (150) said they walk ● 18.3% (35) said they drive ● When asked how they they would travel is their children attended Appletree: ● 55% (104) said they would drive ● 37.6% (71) said they would walk No evidence has been provided in the supporting documents in relation to traffic impact as a result of these proposals ● Langley currently closes the street outside school every morning to make it safer for the children. Appletree cannot close the street to cars in the mornings or at collection times due to it being on a bus route. ● Langley also has a free public car park very close by, which Appletree Gardens does not have. Wraparound Provision As someone who has settled in the North East I do not have family close to me to support with childcare. We moved into the area to allow my children to go to Langley but also du to the childcare offering that Schools out offered as we needed to make use of the extended hours for our children from much of their early life. While that has decreased and I can be there fore school drop offs and pick ups the majority of the time I still rely on the provision some days to allow me to work my full time hours around my childcare needs and for emergency care when required. It is deeply concerning that the council has accepted that it has not taken either early years nor wraparound provision into consideration as part of the consultation.

When asked at Whitley Bay High School about wraparound, one of the officers said the council 'would look to work with providers' but could offer no further assurance. As yet, we have not been able to ascertain the availability at Little Pips so cannot provide a steer either way as to its suitability for replacing the Schools Out provision. However this is what we do know: ● "Schools Out Northern" at Langley First School provides childcare services from 7.30am-6pm and allows for flexible booking. Appletree's website shows its Little Pips provision provides childcare from 7.45am-5.30pm (4.30pm for nursery children). This is a significant time difference for working parents. ● "Schools Out Northern" at Langley First School also provides day care services, allowing parents to have one drop off and collection for their children from 9 months until 9 years; Little Pips provides from aged 2. ● "Schools Out Northern" at Langley First School provides holiday provision for all school holidays apart from Christmas from 8am-5.30pm Monday-Friday. ● Little Pips provides holiday provision from 8am-5pm Monday-Thursday and 8am-3.30pm on Fridays. The parent survey conducted by Friends of Langley found: ● Of the 190 parents who answered the question about using wraparound provision, 60.5% (115 parents) said they regularly used Schools Out, with a further 4.2% (8 parents) said they use it for last-minute emergencies When asked what they would do if Schools Out wasn't available: ● 52.8% of parents didn't have an answer ● 35.6% of parents said they would be forced to cut their hours at work ● 19% of parents said they would look for a childminder ● 14.7% of parents said they would need to rely more heavily on family ● There were several other comments from parents concerned about having to quit their job altogether, whether there would be enough childminders to support the area, and needing to change schools to one which could provide wraparound cover Separation of siblings and Parental Choice As the father to two children that are two years apart in age they are so close as siblings and the transition of our youngest to nursery in Langley this year was supported by having her older sister already gone through it and could talk to her about it and how wonderful it is. This closure at the time proposed will lead to my children being educated apart and not guaranteed to be in the same school after the closure. Despite the obvious logistical issue that creates there is also the emotional impact on the children. The closure of Langley also takes away the parental choice that we have made for our children at the sacrifice of our careers. As someone who works in education over the last 14 years and has given so much to the sector during some of the most difficult times of underfunding, social changes and the pandemic to then have my children's education negatively affected is a kick in the teeth to what i have given towards 1000s of children over my career. As previously stated I choose Langley due to its reputation and success and so many parents of Langley do the same including a significant number out of catchment including from Appletree's catchment area. Below is information gathered by the Friends of

Langley group which raises the issue that the proposal that students from Langley will just move to Appletree is not accurate. This consultation assumes parents will choose to send their children to Appletree Gardens if Langley First School is closed. This would certainly be true for the current year 2 group, where there are no spaces across the whole of Whitley Bay to house these children other than at Appletree (where we understand there are currently two spaces). However, with a surplus at many of the other schools in the area, it cannot be assumed that Appletree would be the school of choice. ● The council's consultation document shows 44% of catchment children attend Appletree compared to 73% at Langley; 12% of Langley pupils attend from the Appletree Gardens catchment area ● In the most recent 2 previous years of higher birth rates, 2020 reception and 2023 reception intakes, Appletree was the only NEPA first school with surplus spaces in admissions, 14 and 6 respectively. For the 2 lowest birth rate years, 2024 and 2025 intake, Appletree had the largest portion of surplus places in admissions against PAN, 32% and 45% respectively ● When looking at the 2025 admissions data, the distance of the last place offered at Langley was nearly 6 miles, compared to 3.6 miles for Appletree, demonstrating a far wider geographic draw and a greater ability to attract families from further afield. ● Of the 187 parents who responded to the survey carried out by Friends of Langley, 88.2% said Appletree Gardens was not one of their school preferences when they applied for their school places. ● That same survey also asked which school would be their first choice of school for their children if Langley were to close. Of the 187 responses to this question: 38.5% chose South Wellfield (72 parents) 20.3% chose Southridge (38 parents) 11.2% chose Marine Park (21 parents) 11.2% chose Appletree (21 parents) 3.2% chose Whitley Lodge (6 parents) 3.2% chose Coquet Park (6 parents) ● When asked if they would take a place at Appletree Gardens if offered, 43 parents said no. ● A further 62 parents said they would potentially consider home-schooling their children if Langley closed. ● An analysis of birth rates mapped against six years' of reception offers data for each school showed Appletree Gardens is ranked as the most sensitive school in the entire planning area to falling birth rates. Langley, by contrast, has a medium sensitivity, cushioned by its proven popularity and wider draw. ● The council's proposal is therefore not just to close the more popular school, thereby ignoring parental choice, but also to close the more demographically stable and resilient one, leading to a longer-term risk 3. The consultation does not take into account all relevant information and factors that will affect student numbers in the future. Birth Rates This consultation relies heavily on the argument that birth rates are falling. ● Whilst there is no denying the downward trend in birthrates throughout North Tyneside up to 2023, the Office for National Statistics predicts that birth rates will level off from 2026 and then begin to increase again. ● Birth rates within the NEPA have been declining since 2008.

However, despite this, the numbers within NEPA schools have been resilient to this downward trend, with the majority of schools* being within the council's 10% acceptable surplus range on average since 2020. ● Internal migration has also not been taken into account for this consultation. Aside from a decline in 2022, the Office for National Statistics shows more young children move into North Tyneside than out of it. Although these statistics don't go down to NEPA level, we do know many families move specifically to the coast to take advantage of the three-tier system. ● The parenting survey conducted by the Friends of Langley showed 58% of respondents (out of 185 responses) moved to this area specifically to send their children to Langley First School, with a further 3% who had been planning to move to the area to send their children to Langley. ● The North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 also contradicts the rationale for closing Langley due to falling birth rates as it states: "Net inward migration from neighbouring areas, primarily Newcastle, helps to sustain the overall working age population and limits the fall in the number of children in the borough" *Appletree Gardens has had a 23% surplus level on average over the last five years. Pupil projections The 'pupil projection methodology' was cited in the supporting documents provided in the Council proposals but there is no link to this methodology provided. Looking online we assume they must have used the National Pupil Projection Model since this is the only published methodology. However, the National Pupil Projection methodology only publishes projections up to 2030. Somehow, the council has forecast pupil numbers well beyond 2030. The council's projection figures also appear to be inaccurate: ● It projects 59 pupils starting in 2025 in Reception in Langley, which drops by six students to 53 in Year 1. There is no explanation of this and no indication from parents in this year group of their intention to leave ● In comparison, Appletree appears to gain 18 students between Reception to Year 1, again with no explanation as to where these additional students have come from and not in line with the school's admission records ● When these figures are corrected, we see that in 2030 (the acceptable time frame for pupil projections) Langley surplus is projected to be 14% surplus - only 4% away from the council's acceptable level - whereas Appletree's surplus is projected to be almost double at 34%. One of the main factors in the council's decision-making is the concern that the capacity at Whitley Bay High School (WBHS) is 390 pupils, and the proposed first school and middle school changes are aimed at preventing the high school from going over capacity. However, our research group has found: ● Based on the council's methodology, from the current reception onwards, it is unlikely the numbers of pupils at WBHS will reach 390. Therefore the council's focus on ensuring numbers don't exceed this figure are misguided ● This issue the council is trying to fix relates to children already in the system, rather than future pupil projections, particularly the current year 2 and year 5 year groups. Closing

Langley will not tackle this issue New Homes North Tyneside is a desirable place to live. I am an example of someone who has moved into the area and at despite council claims that those that do move to the area do not contribute to student numbers in the area this is wrong. My family is an example of this and I know many of the parents at Langley are the same. The area is seeing an increase in housing numbers and this will continue with the need and aims of government on house building. One that affects Langley directly is the Murton Gap development which will see up to 3,000 new homes being built between now and 2032. The council has consistently told us that new homes don’t automatically mean more children. However, the development proposal estimates a need for an additional 748 primary school places, and proposes to build a new two-form entry primary school to provide an additional 420 primary school places for the development. According to the council’s school catchment checker, the development is covered by New York Primary School. However, there is a considerable proportion of the development which would be considerably closer to both Langley and Appletree. Coquet Park First School Within the consultation documents, the council makes reference to considering the closure of Coquet Park but that this was not deemed financially viable. This is due to a private finance initiative (PFI) school, which the council is contractually obligated to until 2032. According to the council’s cabinet paper, 2022/23 was the first financial year that the school ended with a deficit balance, and it ended 2024/25 with a cumulative deficit of £0.325m. The school has been unable to submit a budget plan which shows it coming back into financial balance within three years. In line with Scheme for Financing Schools, the school is classified as being in a structural deficit, which means there is a long-term financial problem that requires significant, strategic changes to resolve. The school currently also has a one-form entry, something the council says is not financially viable As well as being poor value for money for the taxpayer, due to the high interest charges the PFI contract is costing the council, this school is not financially viable by the council’s own recognition. In the absence of any proposed solutions being made available, it is difficult to understand how the council proposes to stop this school from being forced to close once the PFI contract ends in 2032. 4. Merger V Closure The consultation suggests that the proposal is a 'merger' but I, every member of the community and the council themselves know that what has been proposed is not a merger in the true sense of the word. I don't believe that Langley is the right school to close but if we can't persuade you of this then at very least the proposal should be changed to be a true merger. Under department of education guidance, there are two ways to amalgamate two or more schools: 1. Close one school and move the children to another school 2. Close both (or more) schools and publish a proposal of its intention to do this. This option requires consent from the Secretary of State and then final approval from the Office of Schools Adjudicator (OSA), not

	the council. The council argues that this takes decision making away from the local area and is a longer, more complex, statutory process which would lengthen the process and increase uncertainty. A true merger is the fairer way to approach this for the following reasons: ● The current consultation has already created divides within our community which are unhelpful. Both schools are good schools, it's not fair to penalise one over the other. A true merger would mean both schools - and most importantly the children - could have an input into a new school's name, ethos, uniform etc and would mean we could keep the best bits from both schools, including staff. It would also make the transition smoother for the children. ● The requirement to ask permission from additional routes (the Secretary of State and then final approval from the Office of Schools Adjudicator) increases the scrutiny over the decision making process, which we see can only be a good thing ● This should be about doing the right thing, not the easier thing. Surely if we want to get this right for our children, we shouldn't be rushing the process. Given Langley isn't yet in deficit, why does it matter that it will take longer? Conclusion Langley School matters to my children, to its staff, and to our entire community. It deserves to remain open so it can continue to change lives for the better, just as it has changed ours. To lose Langley would be to lose the very spirit of what education should be: supportive, inspiring, and focused on giving every child the best possible start in life. My children and the Children of Monkseaton today and in the future deserve Langley to guide their education.
Screen Name Redacted 11/06/2025 03:02 PM	See question 4 above.
Screen Name Redacted 11/06/2025 05:20 PM	In response to the consultation documents on the closure of Langley school, please see below my comments. Overall, there are inaccuracies about Langley's facilities and financial status that paint a skewed picture that doesn't reflect the reality of the current school environment. Moreover, the consultation process lacks transparency and does not consider the real impact on the community and the children involved. It's crucial to address these discrepancies and advocate for a more accurate representation of the school's strengths and needs. We deserve a fair decision that truly reflects our community's values and priorities and will ensure that a correct decision is made to support children who will be affected by these proposals. The methodology on birth rates underlying the argument is one-dimensional, failing to consider other relevant factors, and is therefore fundamentally flawed. Indeed, pupil project numbers used are flawed in that they appear to be based on data that does not exist. This decision appears rushed and is clearly based on a limited evidence base. It's unsettling that decision-makers have not taken the initiative to visit Langley school. Making significant choices without a

thorough understanding of our environment and needs is unacceptable. It's imperative that those in charge engage with our community to gather the necessary insights before proceeding. Our children and educators deserve thoughtful consideration of their unique circumstances, and we must advocate for that before any final decisions are made. General issues with the process The initial documentation given to the council's cabinet, which the decision to move to consultation was based upon, contained several inaccuracies, including: • Langley has a field separated by a public highway, meaning groups of children are escorted 'off site' for each PE/sporting activity and have no access to playing fields for lunch and dinner breaks - (This isn't true. The school does in fact have a well-used playing field immediately adjacent to the building,and children have their own wellies that are kept at school all the time for them to access the field at playtime in any weather. There is a larger separate field across a minor road which is used once a year for sports day. Langley also has an outdoor space in the reception garden, which follows a forest school ethos and is also used for children with SEND as well as a potting garden and an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming) • The school is in financial deficit (This is incorrect. The school has only predicted a deficit for the year 25/26, for the first time ever and is working with an independent financial advisor to see where the budget can be improved) The majority of dwellings [currently in Langley catchment] can access [Appletree] without crossing major roads (This is incorrect. Many of our children would need to cross Seatonville Road and/or Cauldwell Lane) – my child would have to cross cauldwell lane to access Appletree school. • There were briefings and reports with headteachers (Whilst there have been meetings, this has been very brief and Headteachers could not include Governors which meant there was little options for them to act or come up with solutions) There were also several inaccuracies published in the consultation documents, including (but not limited to): ● Projected pupil numbers ● Deficit forecasting ● Inaccuracies in pupil data at other schools ● There has been no community impact assessment done in relation to the closure of Langley First School. A community impact assessment was done in December 2024 but this was in relation to the Monkseaton High School closure. Neither early years provision nor wraparound provision have been considered as part of this consultation No governing body or senior manager of 'School's Out' (out of hours provision) at Langley has been contacted as part of external communication I would consider this bad practice. Merger vs closure I do not believe Langley is the right school to choose for closure. However, if we cannot persuade the council on this, we would like it to be a true merger. It isn't currently and use of that terminology is false and misleading. • Under the department of education guidance, there are two ways to amalgamate two or more schools: 1. Close one school and move the children to another school

2. Close both (or more) schools and publish a proposal of its intention to do this. This option requires consent from the Secretary of State and then final approval from the Office of Schools Adjudicator (OSA), not the council. The council argues that this takes decision making away from the local area and is a longer, more complex, statutory process which would lengthen the process and increase uncertainty – however I believe that although more time consuming it would be best practice. • A true merger is the fairer way to approach this for the following reasons: ● The current consultation has already created divides within our community which are unhelpful. Both schools are good schools, it's not fair to penalise one over the other. A true merger would mean both schools - and most importantly the children - could have an input into a new school's name, ethos, uniform etc and would mean we could keep the best bits from both schools, including staff. It would also make the transition smoother for the children which I think is key and what has been missing from the information and considerations. • The requirement to ask permission from additional routes (the Secretary of State and then final approval from the Office of Schools Adjudicator) increases the scrutiny over the decision making process, which we see can only be a good thing – why would getting it right not be deemed as best practice? • This should be about doing the right thing, not the easier thing. Surely if we want to get this right for our children, we shouldn't be rushing the process. Given Langley isn't yet in deficit, why does it matter that it will take longer? Building space at Appletree • The council's consultation document says Appletree "can accommodate 432 pupils, which is more than the amount of both schools combined when future birth rates and admission numbers are adjusted". However, when we checked on the gov.uk website for the capacity of Appletree, the capacity is stated as being 293. The campaign has asked for clarification on this • As yet, the council has offered no assurance about how the Langley children could be safely accommodated on the site, and we are concerned that some children will not have access to a close school which will impact development and education. • The Council has not given us any assurance on class sizes. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. • Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, there is a concern amongst us that our children will be placed in larger class sizes, which will have an adverse affect on their education and wellbeing. • According to the government's school spending comparison tool Appletree is a more expensive building to run. Appletree spends £29 per square metre on utilities, compared to Langley which spends £4 per square metre. Traffic No evidence has been provided in the supporting documents in relation to traffic impact as a result of these proposals: • Langley currently closes the street outside school every morning to make it safer for the children. Appletree cannot close the street to cars in the mornings or at

collection times due to it being on a bus route. • Langley also has a free public car park very close by, which Appletree Gardens does not have. The assumption appears to be that children will walk to school. The parent survey carried out by Friends of Langley asked parents how they currently travel to school: ● 78% (150) said they walk ● 18.3% (35) said they drive When asked how they they would travel is their children attended Appletree: ● 55% (104) said they would drive ● 37.6% (71) said they would walk This is an increase in driving to school – how can this be accommodated? Also, these answers reflect that many parents will not be able to continue to walk their children to school if they were in Appletree – affecting traffic, health of children and emissions. Impacting on the carbon emissions. Finance Within its consultation documentation, the council states: • “While currently both schools are in surplus (they receive more funding than they spend), Langley First is predicting a deficit (spending more than they receive) in 2026 which is projected to grow to £0.751m by 2028. At the same time Appletree Gardens is predicting it will enter deficit by 2028. School leaders have made changes and worked hard with the Council to make the financial situation better, but because low pupil numbers mean less funding, the situation is not improving. If left unchanged, the risk is that the two schools would continue to grow in deficit, and this in turn would limit their ability to sustain high quality education.” • Whilst these figures are not inaccurate, they are somewhat misleading: • Appletree Gardens is in receipt of additional funding, known as Falling Rolls funding, to help it make up for its surplus places Langley is not in receipt of this funding, as its surplus figure is within the council’s acceptable range – thus affecting these figures and making it look like it is better off financially. Langley school does not need this money and seems to be disadvabtaged because of this. This situation is unfair, and it’s clear that the figures being presented are misleading. The inaccuracies about Langley’s financial status paint a skewed picture that doesn't reflect the reality of the school environment. • The council has not met - nor offered to meet - with the leadership or governing team at Langley to address its forecasted deficit. Children with special educational needs (SEN) There are 40 children out of 297 on the SEN register at Langley, equating to 13.5%. However, there are an additional 24 children who are receiving additional support following early identification, which takes this figure up to 24%. Whilst Mrs March carries the overall responsibility for SEN as SENCO, there are several other key members of staff across school with additional training and roles as both mental health ambassadors and thrive specialists which have been pivotal in support for children. ● Langley offers the following support for children with additional needs: • The building is all on ground level with ramp access, accessible toilets and a specially adapted changing space with bed for a child with a catheter. • The sensory room has no windows allowing a fully darkened experience if needed, and has a padded wall and floor • The outdoor space in the

reception garden follows a forest school ethos, used for children with SEND through their time at Langley, and there is a potting garden to offer gardening opportunities for small groups of children. • The teachers offer a lunchtime club away from the dinner hall. • There are three specially adapted spaces - The Nest in Nursery, The Sensory Room (Hive), which offers an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming, and a specifically adapted KS2 space. These spaces allow for breathing space as well as targeted intervention for children who struggle with the demands of the classroom and are well used. • Every classroom has a 'haven' area which children can use to regulate and re-set. • The following classroom adaptations are regularly used throughout the school; flexible seating arrangements, visual timetables (both universal and bespoke)use of 'Now and Next', incorporating special interests, movement breaks, 'soft landings' and additional support/intervention for reading. The school presents as 'Neurodiversity Affirming' with subtle adaptations to the environment; soft lighting, clear visuals, adapted seating arrangements, resources for movement and heavy work in place, strategies for regulating emotions throughout ● No guarantees have been given about what, if any, adapted provision, SEN specific places or breakout spaces would be available at Appletree following the closure of Langley ● It is also unclear how all children will be accommodated into classrooms before even considering the need for SEN specific spaces. Appletree was in the process of applying for the development of an Additionally Resourced Provision (ARP) to accommodate SEN but we understand this plan has been put on hold due to this consultation. ● The Inclusive culture and staff expertise have been developed over time at Langley. This culture is authentic and reliant on the staff team – their strong relationships, communication skills, connection and dedication to the children. ● Rather than being viewed as a candidate for closure simply because it is located next to a special school, Langley's position represents a opportunity to share this best practice. Indeed, its proximity to Woodlawn Special School allows for enabling pupils to access targeted interventions and therapies as needed while continuing to participate in mainstream classes and interact with a diverse peer group. This approach supports the government's key priority, keeping children with additional needs in mainstream settings wherever possible. Birth rates This consultation relies heavily on the argument that birth rates are falling. Whilst there is no denying the downward trend in birthrates throughout North Tyneside up to 2023, the Office for National Statistics predicts that birth rates will level off from 2026 and then begin to increase again. ● Birth rates within the NEPA have been declining since 2008. However, despite this, the numbers within NEPA schools have been resilient to this downward trend, with the majority of schools* being within the council's 10% acceptable surplus range on average since 2020. Internal migration has also not been taken into account for this consultation. Aside from

a decline in 2022, the Office for National Statistics shows more young children move into North Tyneside than out of it. Although these statistics don't go down to NEPA level, we do know many families move specifically to the coast to take advantage of the three-tier system. ● The parenting survey conducted by the Friends of Langley showed 58% of respondents (out of 185 responses) moved to this area specifically to send their children to Langley First School, with a further 3% who had been planning to move to the area to send their children to Langley. ● The North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 also contradicts the rationale for closing Langley due to falling birth rates as it states: "Net inward migration from neighbouring areas, primarily Newcastle, helps to sustain the overall working age population and limits the fall in the number of children in the borough" *Appletree Gardens has had a 23% surplus level on average over the last five years. Pupil projections The 'pupil projection methodology' was cited in the supporting documents provided in the Council proposals but there is no link to this methodology provided. Looking online we assume they must have used the National Pupil Projection Model since this is the only published methodology. However, the National Pupil Projection methodology only publishes projections up to 2030. Somehow, the council has forecast pupil numbers well beyond 2030. The council's projection figures also appear to be inaccurate: • It projects 59 pupils starting in 2025 in Reception in Langley, which drops by six students to 53 in Year 1. There is no explanation of this and no indication from parents in this year group of their intention to leave • In comparison, Appletree appears to gain 18 students between Reception to Year 1, again with no explanation as to where these additional students have come from and not in line with the school's admission records • When these figures are corrected, we see that in 2030 (the acceptable time frame for pupil projections) Langley surplus is projected to be 14% surplus - only 4% away from the council's acceptable level - whereas Appletree's surplus is projected to be almost double at 34%. • One of the main factors in the council's decision-making is the concern that the capacity at Whitley Bay High School (WBHS) is 390 pupils, and the proposed first school and middle school changes are aimed at preventing the high school from going over capacity. However, our research group has found: • Based on the council's methodology, from the current reception onwards, it is unlikely the numbers of pupils at WBHS will reach 390. Therefore the council's focus on ensuring numbers don't exceed this figure are misguided This issue the council is trying to fix relates to children already in the system, rather than future pupil projections, particularly the current year 2 and year 5 year groups. Closing Langley will not tackle this issue. Parental choice This consultation assumes parents will choose to send their children to Appletree Gardens if Langley First School is closed. This would certainly be true for the current year 2 group, where there are no spaces across the whole of Whitley Bay to house these children other than at Appletree

(where we understand there are currently two spaces). However, with a surplus at many of the other schools in the area, it cannot be assumed that Appletree would be the school of choice. The council's consultation document shows 44% of catchment children attend Appletree compared to 73% at Langley; interestingly 12% of Langley pupils attend from the Appletree Gardens catchment area. In the most recent 2 previous years of higher birth rates, 2020 reception and 2023 reception intakes, Appletree was the only NEPA first school with surplus spaces in admissions, 14 and 6 respectively. For the 2 lowest birth rate years, 2024 and 2025 intake, Appletree had the largest portion of surplus places in admissions against PAN, 32% and 45% respectively. When looking at the 2025 admissions data, the distance of the last place offered at Langley was nearly 6 miles, compared to 3.6 miles for Appletree, demonstrating a far wider geographic draw and a greater ability to attract families from further afield. Of the 187 parents who responded to the survey carried out by Friends of Langley, 88.2% said Appletree Gardens was not one of their school preferences when they applied for their school places. That same survey also asked which school would be their first choice of school for their children if Langley were to close. Of the 187 responses to this question: ● 38.5% chose South Wellfield (72 parents) ● 20.3% chose Southridge (38 parents) ● 11.2% chose Marine Park (21 parents) ● 11.2% chose Appletree (21 parents) ● 3.2% chose Whitley Lodge (6 parents) • 3.2% chose Coquet Park (6 parents) • When asked if they would take a place at Appletree Gardens if offered, 43 parents said no. • A further 62 parents said they would potentially consider home-schooling their children if Langley closed. An analysis of birth rates mapped against six years' of reception offers data for each school showed Appletree Gardens is ranked as the most sensitive school in the entire planning area to falling birth rates. Langley, by contrast, has a medium sensitivity, cushioned by its proven popularity and wider draw. ● The council's proposal is therefore not just to close the more popular school, thereby ignoring parental choice, but also to close the more demographically stable and resilient one, leading to a longer-term risk. New homes The Murton Gap development will see up to 3,000 new homes being built between now and 2032. The council has consistently told us that new homes don't automatically mean more children. However, the development proposal estimates a need for an additional 748 primary school places,and proposes to build a new two-form entry primary school to provide an additional 420 primary school places for the development. According to the council's school catchment checker, the development is covered by New York Primary School. However, there is a considerable proportion of the development which would be considerably closer to both Langley and Appletree. Current year 2 children This section is specifically for parents with a parent in year 2, who would be in year 4 at the point that these proposals go ahead as they currently stand. ● All schools within the North East Planning

Area (NEPA) are currently full for this year group, apart from Appletree Gardens, which we understand currently has two spaces ● A merger with Appletree would mean 118 children in year 4. ● As yet, the council has not provided any information as to what the class sizes would be in the 'merged' school. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, there is a concern amongst us that our children will be placed in larger class sizes, which could have an adverse affect on their education and wellbeing. Implementing this merger in 2027 would mean disrupting the largest cohorts of pupils currently moving through the system. If this merger is to go ahead, a far more logical approach is to wait until the smaller birth-rate cohorts are in the schools. Early years and wraparound provision The council has accepted that it has not taken either early years nor wraparound provision into consideration as part of the consultation. When asked at Whitley Bay High School about wraparound, one of the officers said the council 'would look to work with providers' but could offer no further assurance. As yet, we have not been able to ascertain the availability at Little Pips so cannot provide a steer either way as to its suitability for replacing the Schools Out provision. However this is what we do know: ● "Schools Out Northern" at Langley First School provides childcare services from 7.30am-6pm and allows for flexible booking. Appletree's website shows its Little Pips provision provides childcare from 7.45am-5.30pm (4.30pm for nursery children). This is a significant time difference for working parents. ● "Schools Out Northern" at Langley First School also provides day care services, allowing parents to have one drop off and collection for their children from 9 months until 9 years;Little Pips provides from aged 2. ● "Schools Out Northern" at Langley First School provides holiday provision for all school holidays apart from Christmas from 8am-5.30pm Monday-Friday. ● Little Pips provides holiday provision from 8am-5pm Monday-Thursday and 8am-3.30pm on Fridays. The parent survey conducted by Friends of Langley found: ● Of the 190 parents who answered the question about using wraparound provision, 60.5% (115 parents) said they regularly used Schools Out, with a further 4.2% (8 parents) said they use it for last-minute emergencies ● When asked what they would do if Schools Out wasn't available: ● 52.8% of parents didn't have an answer ● 35.6% of parents said they would be forced to cut their hours at work ● 19% of parents said they would look for a childminder ● 14.7% of parents said they would need to rely more heavily on family ● There were several other comments from parents concerned about having to quit their job altogether, whether there would be enough childminders to support the area, and needing to change schools to one which could provide wraparound cover There are already 23 children on the waiting list for nursery at Langley for 2026, with a further nine on the list for 2027 and one already on the list for 2028. Other schools relevant to this

consultation Although the proposal focuses on Langley First School and Appletree Gardens, there is a wider impact on all schools within the NEPA area and long-term implications which are not covered in the council's consultation documents. 1. Woodlawn ● The consultation outlines the intention for the council to repurpose the Langley site and move the post-16 provision from Marden High School (32 children in total according to Ofsted), thereby displacing 300 children for the benefit of 32 children ● By bundling the two issues - the alleged need to close a school with the need to expand Woodlawn - the council is effectively creating a false choice: asking the community to accept a suboptimal and unstable mainstream solution in exchange for a desirable SEND solution. ● The long-term health of the mainstream school system should not be compromised to solve a logistical problem for SEND provision, however important that provision may be. 2. Coquet Park First School ● Within the consultation documents, the council makes reference to considering the closure of Coquet Park but that this was not deemed financially viable. This is due to a private finance initiative (PFI) school, which the council is contractually obligated to until 2032. ● According to the council's cabinet paper, 2022/23 was the first financial year that the school ended with a deficit balance, and it ended 2024/25 with a cumulative deficit of £0.325m. The school has been unable to submit a budget plan which shows it coming back into financial balance within three years. In line with Scheme for Financing Schools, the school is classified as being in a structural deficit, which means there is a long-term financial problem that requires significant, strategic changes to resolve. ● The school currently also has a one-form entry, something which even the council says is not financially viable. ● As well as being poor value for money for the taxpayer, due to the high interest charges the PFI contract is costing the council, this school is not financially viable by the council's own recognition. In the absence of any proposed solutions being made available, it is difficult to understand how the council proposes to stop this school from being forced to close once the PFI contract ends in 2032. Overview. Lack of transition planning: As a concerned parent, I am deeply worried about the lack of information regarding how the transition will take place should a decision be made to close Langley school. The uncertainty surrounding this process is alarming. I fear that if we move forward without a clear and well-structured plan, our children and the staff will be left to deal with the fallout. If a decision is made it is essential for us as a community to ensure that there is adequate support in place for everyone during any transition. Without proper communication and preparation, I believe there could be significant negative impacts on our children's education and emotional wellbeing. I urge the council to provide more clarity on the transition process and to involve parents and staff in these important discussions. We all want what is best for our children, and a thoughtful approach is vital in achieving that goal.

Screen Name Redacted
11/06/2025 07:34 PM

I live near Appletree Gardens and the traffic is already a nightmare at school drop off and pick up. I also have a goddaughter, and worry about the number of schools being closed and how this will affect her schooling. They're building loads of houses by Rake Lane and there are plans for loads more behind Wellfield...and yet you're closing several schools in that area - Monkseaton High, Monkseaton Middle and Langley First. This will increase class sizes, and mean more travel for young people and parents. The plan to close Langley in particular is nonsensical when both Langley and Appletree aren't under subscribed

Screen Name Redacted
11/06/2025 11:41 PM

The council's current proposal would be hugely detrimental to my children and my family. I have a son in year 2 (the most disrupted year) and a daughter who has just started reception. My children are the most important thing to me in the world and their education is hugely important to me. Myself and my husband moved to North Tyneside for the schools for our children, we hoped our children would go to Langley First, Valley Gardens Middle then Whitley Bay High. We chose our house based on these catchments and paid an extremely high property price, doubling our mortgage [redacted] We did this for the schools. I worry the councils proposal will devalue the properties in this area, including my property. I viewed Langley (and Wellfield, Marine Park) and immediately loved Langley. I liked their high standards, amazing Ofsted history, warm welcoming nurturing teachers and knew it was the right school for my children. I was so happy when both my children got their place in Langley. I felt I had done the best for my children and I was happy and looking forward to the years ahead. My son is quite sensitive, quiet and shy and can be anxious at times. He has thrived and flourished at Langley due to the amazing teachers. They go above and beyond. They put my son in a free wellbeing club after school with one of the teachers where they learned to talk about their worries and built their confidence. [redacted] I would worry about my son being put in a overcrowded school with no familiarity and none of his teachers. This would be hugely detrimental to him and would give him huge anxiety and cause him to go back into his shell. Moving schools twice in a year would also be incredibly disruptive to him. My daughter has just started reception, after also going to Langley for School Nursery. She has thrived there and made an amazing friend group already. [redacted] Langley is the most amazing, inclusive school full of lovely children and families and creates such a nurturing community environment. [redacted]

[redacted] She continues to be the happy, beautiful, quietly confident, funny girl she is. I would really worry about her being thrust into another school with different kids and teachers that I haven't chosen. I would look to move her to a different school if the worst happens and the councils proposal goes ahead that I felt comfortable with. My husband and myself are both working parents and rely heavily on the amazing wrap around provision at Langley and the holiday club. Neither of us have family nearby so we are on our own and have no other child care options. I pick the children up just before 6pm which allows me to do a full working day. [redacted] Langley's wraparound allows me to work full days. If I was forced to Appletree and to an inferior wraparound provision I would have to cut my working hours which would affect my workplace and pay and disadvantage my family and our disposable income and create money worries. Labour should be supporting working parents not forcing them out of the workplace. The thought of this proposal going ahead gives me the horrible feeling of feeling like I have failed my children to give them the best school that I had picked for them. I have been crying most days since this was announced and it has given me huge anxiety and worry for the future. This should not be happening to a school that is doing so well, good OFSTED, no deficit, full classrooms excellent teacher. We should not deprive the children and this area of this excellent school. Ultimately if this goes ahead as the council have proposed we would be so unhappy, we would look to try get our children into another school that we felt happy with and would even consider leaving North Tyneside even though we absolutely love living here. We pay a high council tax here which I am happy to pay if the public services provided are good. However if after paying all that council tax, we are losing one of the best schools in the area then what is the point. I have previously voted labour in local and general elections as I thought I could trust them with the NHS and with schools but this has shocked me, how a proposal could be made without even visiting the school and realising what an important school it is. I am not sure I would trust this council again if this current proposal went ahead. Langley First school is an outlier in the 6 schools highlighted by the councils proposals as it is a thriving, successful school with no deficit. It does not deserve this. Langley really is a special school where all the staff, pupils and families get on well and come together to create a lovely environment and community. This should be saved.

Screen Name Redacted
11/07/2025 12:06 AM

When I first heard about the proposal to close Langley and merge the pupils with Appletree Gardens First school, my initial reaction, I was shocked at how we have got to the point where we are shutting fantastic, well performing, schools that have severed as the heart of a

community for 70+ years. Five weeks into the consultation process my view hasn't changed. In fact, now knowing what I know about Langley my view has strengthened, this is the wrong decision. My wife and I moved into the area in part for the schools, North Tyneside is renowned for the schools, Langley was the school I wanted my son and daughter to go to, grow up in and become like the many high performing students that leave at the end of their journey through Langley. Langley has had 19 years rated ofsted outstanding and 2 years ofsted good. We moved here for schools like Langley, we bought a home here, I worry that North Tyneside Council are shooting themselves in the foot by shutting a school that attracts families to the area, for what they see as short term solution. We are at a low point for North Tyneside when we are shutting schools like this. In regard to the background data, its disappointing to see so many inaccuracies for such a large and important decision. One of the reasons we chose langley was for the outdoor space, which it has an abundance of. The Nursery has a garden, the reception has a garden, the school has a yard and the school has a large field that is connected to the school (not across a road). such a blatant mistake makes me worry that the people who are putting the proposal together have not visited the school? IN regard to wrap around, both my wife and I work in Newcastle, we are completely reliant on the excellent service provided by Schools Out Langley which opens from 7.30am - 6pm which allows us to do a full working day. As a full working family, contributing to the council that are trying to shut our children's school, I'm again disappointed that the proposal does not take into account wrap around provision. Appletrees little Pips opens from 7.45am - 5.30pm again penalising working parents. In regard to the finance, i can't understand how the predicted deficit drops so dramatically in the near term, has this ever happened historically? I understand that Langley has never been in debt and at the time of the proposal is in surplus, whereas Appletree Gardens is in receipt of additional funding to help make up for its surplus places. I understand that Langley is predicted to go into the council's acceptable range of debt in 2026 however is it right to compare the figures from one school receiving additional funding with one that is not and use this as a justification to close the latter. It feels from the outside like the figures are being used to fit a particular narrative. In regard to my sons year, year 2, when the merger goes through he will be in year 4. A merger with appletree gardens would mean 118 children in year 4. I am concerned regarding the class sizes. I understand that no class sizes in Appletree Garden are the recommended 55m2 and only two are over 50m2. In comparison all of Langleys classrooms (bar one reception room) meet the 55m2 requirement. What is the plan to accommodate this large cohort of children. would it not be more sensible to delay two years and allow the larger years to move onto middle school and if that is sensible does this impact on the council choice of Appletree being the sensible choice of school, particularly

with the falling birth rates? I understand that, according to the goverments school spending comparison tool that Appletree is a more expensive school to run. Appletrees £29 per m2 utility cost compared to Langleys £4 per m2 utility cost would suggest that Langley is the more energy efficient school. Are there plans to retrofit Appletree with an aim to better the energy performance, is this money well spent while the council closes a more energy efficient school? how does this align with local and national sustainably policies? Ultimately we chose to move to Monkseaton in part for the school, we doubled our mortgage to achieve this. Langley First School was our first choice, and we were over the moon when our children got into this fantastic school. The leadership is outstanding, the teachers are outstanding and the community is outstanding as Im sure everyone can see by the response to this unfortunate time in Langleys History. When I first heard about the proposal to close Langley First School and merge pupils with Appletree Gardens First School, I was shocked that we have reached the point of shutting a fantastic, well-performing school that has served as the heart of its community for over 70 years. Five weeks into the consultation process, my view has not changed — in fact, it has strengthened. Having learned more about Langley, I am even more convinced this is the wrong decision. My wife and I moved into the area in part because of the schools. North Tyneside is renowned for its excellent education, and Langley was the school we wanted our children to attend, to grow, thrive, and become the kind of high-achieving students who leave Langley every year. Langley has achieved 19 years rated Outstanding by Ofsted and 2 years rated Good. We moved here for schools like Langley. We bought our home here. I worry that North Tyneside Council is shooting itself in the foot by closing a school that actively attracts families to the area, for what appears to be a short-term solution. Closing such a school marks a low point for North Tyneside. External Space It is deeply disappointing to see so many inaccuracies in the background data supporting such an important decision. One of the reasons we chose Langley was for its exceptional outdoor space: the nursery has a garden, reception has a garden, the school has both a yard and a large field that is directly connected to the site (not across a road). In the proposal it states that Langley has a field across a public highway and that pupils need escorting off site..Such a basic factual error makes me question whether those responsible for the proposal have even visited the school. Wraparound Provision: As two full-time working parents commuting to Newcastle, we are completely reliant on the outstanding wraparound care provided by Schools Out Langley, which operates from 7:30am to 6:00pm. This provision allows us to maintain full-time employment while contributing to the local economy and the very council now proposing this closure. The consultation fails to recognise the importance of this service. Appletree’s Little Pips operates on shorter hours (7:45am–5:30pm), which would make things far more difficult for working families and

effectively penalise us for our commitment to work. Financial Concern: I cannot understand how the projected deficit changes so dramatically over the coming years. Has such a swing ever occurred historically? Langley has never been in debt and, at the time of this proposal, holds a surplus. Appletree Gardens, meanwhile, receives additional funding to support its surplus places. It seems disingenuous to compare Langley's finances directly with a school receiving additional funding and then use those figures to justify closing Langley. From the outside, it appears that the data has been shaped to fit a particular narrative. Classroom Sizes: When the merger is proposed to take effect, my son will be in Year 4 and part of a combined cohort of 118 pupils. I am deeply concerned about class sizes. I understand that no classrooms at Appletree Gardens meet the recommended 55m² space standard, with only two exceeding 50m². In contrast, all of Langley's classrooms (except one reception room) meet the 55m² standard. How does the council intend to accommodate such a large cohort? Would it not be more sensible to delay the merger by two years, allowing larger year groups to progress to middle school first? And if such a delay is required, does this not undermine the rationale for selecting Appletree sire as the "sensible" choice, particularly given the falling birth rates? Sustainability and Efficiency Government data shows that Appletree Gardens is a more expensive school to run, with utility costs of £29 per m² compared to Langley's £4 per m². Langley is clearly the more energy efficient site. Are there plans (and costs) to retrofit Appletree to improve its energy performance? Is this a wise use of public funds when closing a school that already performs so well environmentally? The choice of Appletree site seems at odds with both local and national sustainability policies. Merger: The proposed merger feels fundamentally unfair to both staff and children. In reality, it would mean the end of Langley First School, its leadership, its ethos, and its unique place within the community. Pupils would be merged into an unfamiliar environment with few, if any, familiar teachers. North Tyneside Council would not only lose a well-performing school, but also a valuable community asset that has contributed to the area's identity and success for decades. Langley should be seen as a model of what a successful community school looks like. Its consistently low absence rates demonstrate strong pupil engagement and parental support. Its relative resilience to falling birth rates, as shown in elasticity modelling, further underlines its stability. And its continued popularity with over 75% of in-catchment parents choosing Langley shows the high level of trust and confidence families place in the school. If the merger is to go ahead despite the clear opposition, would it not be more beneficial to undertake a fair amalgamation, one that genuinely takes the best of both schools? Such an approach could allow Langley to retain some of its staff, helping children through what will be a difficult transition and preserve parts of Langley's ethos and culture that have made it such a high-performing,

much-loved school. This would show respect for both school communities and ensure the merger, if unavoidable, is implemented in a way that minimises harm and preserves the strengths that make Langley exceptional. Ultimately, we chose to move to Monkseaton because of Langley First School. We doubled our mortgage to make that possible. We were overjoyed when our children gained a place at this outstanding school. The leadership, the teachers, and the community are exceptional, as the overwhelming public response to this consultation shows. In my opinion, closing Langley would be a serious mistake for the children, for working families, for the community, and for the reputation of North Tyneside's education system.

Screen Name Redacted
11/07/2025 12:29 PM

1) Disruption to my child's education My child is settled at Langley, where they feel safe, confident and happy. Being forced to move earlier than necessary would cause anxiety and disruption. He is already waking during the night as he is worried about these changes. [redacted] Also, with the increased numbers of his year group and the school overall, I am not convinced that he would receive adequate support. A transition during Year 4 would be particularly challenging because it coincides with preparing for middle school. My child would have to cope with: Moving school Adjusting to new staff and routines Starting middle-school visits almost immediately Completing applications within weeks This would greatly increase stress and reduce their ability to focus academically. Also, in Year 4 children are usually encouraged to walk to school alone. Appletree is further away than Langley and involves crossing unfamiliar roads on a route that we don't usually use and will have less experience walking. I would not be confident allowing my child to walk alone to Appletree and feel they will then be less prepared for walking to middle school. Also, as my son would be in a huge Year 4 cohort of 118 children during the proposed year of the merger, I worry that he will be deprived of important educational experiences. It would be more difficult to plan safe trips to the library and other educational visits with such a big group of children. 2) Impact on my child's emotional wellbeing My child has strong bonds with staff who know them well and help them thrive. Losing these trusted relationships could negatively affect their confidence, sense of belonging, and willingness to engage in learning. [redacted] The uncertainty and tension caused by the proposal has already affected children; maintaining stability is essential for their mental health. He is already having sleepless nights about being in such a large year group with potentially large class

sizes - as the council refuses to promise that class sizes will be no larger than 32 as is comparable to the other local NEPA first schools. 3) Impact on SEND support The continuity of relationships is vital for children needing additional support. Staff at Langley understand pupils' needs and have established effective strategies — moving site risks losing this stability. A merger under Appletree's structure could dilute support systems, whereas a true amalgamation would retain expertise from both schools. 4) Practical and financial impact on families Langley is easier and safer for school drop-off due to nearby public parking. Appletree's residential roads and limited parking would make drop-off stressful, time-consuming, and less safe for my child. Increased travel time would disrupt work schedules and increase childcare and transport costs. If siblings end up split during transition, this would make daily routines unmanageable. Often grandparents travel to help with drop offs and pick ups - this will be challenging at Appletree as there is no clear parking and it's a highly residential area. The free public car park at Langley encourage a park and stride approach. The street is also closed to cars to ensure pupils have a safe route to Langley - this does not currently happen at Appletree. 5) Community & social impact My child has developed close friendships at Langley; an unequal merger risks children feeling unwelcome or "second-class" if moved under another school's identity. A true amalgamation would help all pupils feel ownership of their school — without this, many families would feel displaced. Current proposals have already damaged community relationships; a fair process would help rebuild trust. 6) Impact on learning environment Appletree classrooms are smaller. If my child were placed into larger class groups in smaller rooms, this would: Reduce the quality of their learning environment Make it harder to concentrate Increase noise / distraction Reduce access to adults and individual attention 7) Effect on school choice and future planning As Langley is the more popular and higher-performing school, families chose it deliberately. We are losing the school we selected for its ethos, leadership, culture and reputation. When I submitted my application for first schools I could enter 3 schools and Appletree was not on this list as it is not a popular school in the area and I did not want either of my children to go here. The Ofsted reports of 19 years outstanding and 2 years good for Langley in comparison to 9 years satisfactory and 11 years good for Appletree are very influential. The current plan removes parental choice and puts children at a disadvantage. I am a teacher and if the merger went ahead as proposed it would leave me little choice and I would want to home-school my child. I do not want them to be part of a 120 year 4 cohort in a school that I did not choose. I do not think this is good educational value for my child. I want my child to have the best start in life so they can be happy and thrive at school - I don't think the proposed merger with Appletree as the dominant school will deliver that.

Screen Name Redacted
11/07/2025 12:48 PM

My niece struggles with anxiety and can easily become overwhelmed, which means they rely heavily on consistency, predictability, and reassurance in their daily routine. Any major change—such as merging schools—can be very unsettling and overwhelming for them. A new environment, new teachers, and unfamiliar classmates would likely increase their anxiety levels and make it harder for them to focus and feel secure. My neice benefits from constant reassurance and “pre-coaching” to prepare for changes and new experiences. A merger would require significant extra support to help them adjust emotionally and academically. For the family, this transition would be stressful as well. They would need to spend a lot of time helping our child manage their worries and adapt to the new setting. Without clear communication, gradual transition plans, and strong emotional support from staff, the merger could lead to heightened anxiety, loss of confidence, and regression in their progress. It’s important that any plans for a merger take into account the needs of children like my neice, who thrive on stability and familiar support systems.

Screen Name Redacted
11/07/2025 12:58 PM

General concerns about the process: The initial documentation given to the council’s cabinet, which the decision to move to consultation was based upon, contained several inaccuracies, including: ● Langley has a field separated by a public highway, meaning groups of children are escorted ‘off site’ for each PE/sporting activity and have no access to playing fields for lunch and dinner breaks (This isn’t true. The school does in fact have a well-used playing field immediately adjacent to the building, with a separate field across a minor road which is used once a year for sports day. Langley also has an outdoor space in the reception garden, which follows a forest school ethos and is also used for children with SEND as well as a potting garden and an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming) ● The school is in financial deficit (This is incorrect. The school has only predicted a deficit for the year 25/26, for the first time ever and is working with an independent financial advisor to see where the budget can be improved) ● There were briefings and reports with headteachers (Whilst there have been meetings, this has been very brief and Headteachers could not include Governors which meant there was little options for them to act or come up with solutions) ● There were also several inaccuracies published in the consultation documents, including (but not limited to): Projected pupil numbers, deficit forecasting, and inaccuracies in pupil data at other schools There has been no community impact assessment done in relation to the closure of Langley First School. (A community impact assessment was done in December 2024, but this was in relation to the Monkseaton High School closure). Neither early years provision nor wraparound provision have been considered as part of this consultation, and no governing body or senior manager of ‘School’s Out’ (out of hours

provision) at Langley has been contacted as part of external communication. Building space: The council's consultation document says Appletree "can accommodate 432 pupils, which is more than the amount of both schools combined when future birth rates and admission numbers are adjusted". However, when we checked on the gov.uk website for the capacity of Appletree, the capacity is stated as being 293. Can this be clarified? As yet, the council has offered no assurance about how the Langley children could be safely accommodated on the site, nor has it given us any assurance on class sizes, despite public requests for this. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, there is a concern that children will be placed in larger class sizes, which could have an adverse effect on their education and wellbeing. According to the government's school spending comparison tool, Appletree is a more expensive building to run. Appletree spends £29 per square metre on utilities, compared to Langley which spends £4 per square metre. Traffic: I am highly concerned about the environmental impact of this proposal due to inevitable increase in traffic, as well as logistical problems the proposal will undoubtedly cause with traffic flow. No evidence has been provided in the supporting documents in relation to traffic impact as a result of these proposals. Langley currently closes the street outside school every morning to make it safer for the children. Appletree cannot close the street to cars in the mornings or at collection times due to it being on a bus route. Langley also has a free public car park very close by, which Appletree Gardens does not have. Where will parents park when taking their children to school? The assumption appears to be that children will walk to school. However, the parent survey carried out by Friends of Langley asked parents how they currently travel to school: - 78% (150) said they walk - 18.3% (35) said they drive When asked how they would travel if their children attended Appletree: - 55% (104) said they would drive - 37.6% (71) said they would walk Finance: Within its consultation documentation, the council states: While currently both schools are in surplus (they receive more funding than they spend), Langley First is predicting a deficit (spending more than they receive) in 2026 which is projected to grow to £0.751m by 2028. At the same time Appletree Gardens is predicting it will enter deficit by 2028. School leaders have made changes and worked hard with the Council to make the financial situation better, but because low pupil numbers mean less funding, the situation is not improving. If left unchanged, the risk is that the two schools would continue to grow in deficit, and this in turn would limit their ability to sustain high quality education. Whilst these figures are not inaccurate, they are somewhat misleading. Appletree Gardens is in receipt of additional funding, known as Falling Rolls funding, to help it make up for its surplus places Langley is not in receipt of this funding, as its surplus figure is within the council's

acceptable range. The council has not met - nor offered to meet - with the leadership or governing team at Langley to address its forecasted deficit. Birth rates: This consultation relies heavily on the argument that birth rates are falling. Whilst there is no denying the downward trend in birthrates throughout North Tyneside up to 2023, the Office for National Statistics predicts that birth rates will level off from 2026 and then begin to increase again. What will happen in the future when there are too many children, but you have closed all the schools? Birth rates within the NEPA have been declining since 2008. However, despite this, the numbers within NEPA schools have been resilient to this downward trend, with the majority of schools* being within the council's 10% acceptable surplus range on average since 2020. (*Appletree Gardens has had a 23% surplus level on average over the last five years) Internal migration has also not been taken into account for this consultation. [redacted] I know many other local families who have moved to the area after their children have been born elsewhere. Aside from a decline in 2022, the Office for National Statistics shows more young children move into North Tyneside than out of it. Although these statistics don't go down to NEPA level, we do know many families move specifically to the coast to take advantage of the three-tier system. The parenting survey conducted by the Friends of Langley showed 58% of respondents (out of 185 responses) moved to this area specifically to send their children to Langley First School, with a further 3% who had been planning to move to the area to send their children to Langley. The North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 also contradicts the rationale for closing Langley due to falling birth rates as it states: "Net inward migration from neighbouring areas, primarily Newcastle, helps to sustain the overall working age population and limits the fall in the number of children in the borough" Pupil projections: The 'pupil projection methodology' was cited in the supporting documents provided in the Council proposals but there is no link to this methodology provided. Looking online we assume they must have used the National Pupil Projection Model since this is the only published methodology. However, the National Pupil Projection methodology only publishes projections up to 2030. Somehow, the council has forecast pupil numbers well beyond 2030. The council's projection figures also appear to be inaccurate: It projects 59 pupils starting in 2025 in Reception in Langley, which drops by six students to 53 in Year 1. There is no explanation of this and no indication from parents in this year group of their intention to leave. In comparison, Appletree appears to gain 18 students between Reception to Year 1, again with no explanation as to where these additional students have come from and not in line with the school's admission records. When these figures are corrected, we see that in 2030 (the acceptable time frame for pupil projections) Langley surplus is projected to be 14% surplus - only 4% away from the council's acceptable level - whereas Appletree's surplus is projected to be almost double at 34%. One of

the main factors in the council's decision-making is the concern that the capacity at Whitley Bay High School (WBHS) is 390 pupils, and the proposed first school and middle school changes are aimed at preventing the high school from going over capacity. However, our research group has found that, based on the council's methodology, from the current reception onwards, it is unlikely the numbers of pupils at WBHS will reach 390. Therefore, the council's focus on ensuring numbers don't exceed this figure are misguided. This issue the council is trying to fix relates to children already in the system, rather than future pupil projections, particularly the current year 2 and year 5 year groups. Closing Langley will not tackle this issue. New homes: The Murton Gap development will see up to 3,000 new homes being built between now and 2032. The council has consistently told us that new homes don't automatically mean more children. However, the development proposal estimates a need for an additional 748 primary school places and proposes to build a new two-form entry primary school to provide an additional 420 primary school places for the development. According to the council's school catchment checker, the development is covered by New York Primary School. However, there is a considerable proportion of the development which would be considerably closer to both Langley and Appletree. Current year 3 children: If these proposals go ahead, I am concerned that many of the Langley staff, concerned about loosing their jobs the following year, will start to look for alternative work. My concern is that the education of next year's year 4 pupils (including my son) will be significantly disrupted due to lack of permanent staff. Other schools relevant to this consultation: Although the proposal focuses on Langley First School and Appletree Gardens, there is a wider impact on all schools within the NEPA area and long-term implications which are not covered in the council's consultation documents. 1. Woodlawn - The consultation outlines the intention for the council to repurpose the Langley site and move the post-16 provision from Marden High School (32 children in total according to Ofsted), thereby displacing 300 children for the benefit of 32 children. However, I note that no investigations/surveys/assessments have been carried out to determine whether it is possible or financially feasible to adapt the Langley site to meet the needs of the Woodlawn children. By bundling the two issues - the alleged need to close a school with the need to expand Woodlawn - the council is effectively creating a false choice: asking the community to accept a suboptimal and unstable mainstream solution in exchange for a desirable SEND solution. The long-term health of the mainstream school system should not be compromised to solve a logistical problem for SEND provision, however important that provision may be. 2. Coquet Park First School - Within the consultation documents, the council makes reference to considering the closure of Coquet Park but that this was not deemed financially viable. This is due to a private finance initiative (PFI) school, which the council is contractually obligated to until 2032.

According to the council's cabinet paper, 2022/23 was the first financial year that the school ended with a deficit balance, and it ended 2024/25 with a cumulative deficit of £0.325m. The school has been unable to submit a budget plan which shows it coming back into financial balance within three years. In line with Scheme for Financing Schools, the school is classified as being in a structural deficit, which means there is a long-term financial problem that requires significant, strategic changes to resolve. The school currently also has a one-form entry, something the council says is not financially viable. As well as being poor value for money for the taxpayer, due to the high interest charges the PFI contract is costing the council, this school is not financially viable by the council's own recognition. In the absence of any proposed solutions being made available, it is difficult to understand how the council proposes to stop this school from being forced to close once the PFI contract ends in 2032. Merger vs closure: Based on my comments above, I do not believe Langley is the right school to choose for closure. However, if the community cannot persuade the council on this, I would at the very least like it to be a true merger. It isn't currently. Under department of education guidance, there are two ways to amalgamate two or more schools: 1. Close one school and move the children to another school 2. Close both (or more) schools and publish a proposal of its intention to do this. This option requires consent from the Secretary of State and then final approval from the Office of Schools Adjudicator (OSA), not the council. The council argues that this takes decision making away from the local area and is a longer, more complex, statutory process which would lengthen the process and increase uncertainty. My opinion is that a true merger is the fairer way to approach this for the following reasons: ● The current consultation has already created divides within our community which are unhelpful. Both schools are good schools, it's not fair to penalise one over the other. A true merger would mean both schools - and most importantly the children - could have an input into a new school's name, ethos, uniform etc and would mean we could keep the best bits from both schools, including staff. It would also make the transition smoother for the children. ● The requirement to ask permission from additional routes (the Secretary of State and then final approval from the Office of Schools Adjudicator) increases the scrutiny over the decision making process, which we see can only be a good thing This should be about doing the right thing, not the easier thing. Surely if we want to get this right for our children, we shouldn't be rushing the process. Given Langley isn't yet in deficit, why does it matter that it will take longer?

Screen Name Redacted
11/07/2025 01:51 PM

I had children attending Langley from 1989 to 1998, we moved house so they could be in catchment and they thrived there. My 2 grandchildren are now pupils and they love their school and settled in immediately because of the nurturing environment and great teaching

staff. They will be devastated to lose their school and neither myself nor my daughter would have chosen Appletree as the school for our children

Screen Name Redacted
11/07/2025 05:51 PM

Langley First School is a really important part of our community and my own son went there and thrived, as did multiple generations of my neighbours. I can't understand how the birthrates have been calculated either- has there been forward planning for all the new houses being built in our area? Langley is not massively undersubscribed at the moment and how will it benefit existing and future pupils to be put into huge classes? Langley is a lovely nurturing environment which is so important to the preparation of our children for the large middle schools and extremely large high school they will attend in the future. My son is now at university and his education at Langley gave him such good grounding for a successful future. It will be so sad for our local community if this local school is lost - the history is there to be seen and there are plenty more pupil stories which deserve to start at Langley.

Screen Name Redacted
11/07/2025 11:55 PM

Nephews who attend Langley will be disrupted; Further to school, needing to drive. Difficulties of busy roads to cross. Lack of Langley identity - merged into Appletree. Uncertainty about nurture provision. Uncertainty about staffing and class sizes. Closure of an Ofsted better rated school and keeping open a weaker and more expensive school to run. Appears councils sly way to expand Woodlawn on Langley site.

Screen Name Redacted
11/08/2025 10:15 AM

First of all there isn’t another space if like the above only 50% of the planned homes have children to attend the local first schools. Apple tree is also got a terrible reputation. Langley first school does not. You’re doing a disservice by closing Langley first school.

Screen Name Redacted
11/08/2025 11:49 AM

The proposed closure of Langley would mean I lose my job through redundancy. This would have a serious impact on my ability to pay my mortgage and support my children, [redacted] Due to funding pressures, opportunities for experienced teachers are limited, with many schools now only employing Early Career Teachers. This not only affects my personal situation but also damages the stability and quality of education within the wider system. Langley is one of the best schools I have ever worked in. It is an inclusive, neuro-affirming environment with dedicated staff, supportive leadership, and a strong sense of community. Staff turnover is low, and visitors immediately recognise

its special ethos. The closure would not just mean the loss of my employment — it would mean the loss of a school that nurtures both children and staff. It would be a huge blow to the community and a step backwards for inclusive education in North Tyneside.

Screen Name Redacted
11/08/2025 12:41 PM

My child is currently in nursery at Langley First School and we are planning to send him there for Reception in 2026. Langley is our catchment school and we specifically moved into the area in 2022 to send him to Langley school. Given this, we are extremely disheartened to hear that the school may close when it is such a fantastic education provision for children in our area. Importantly, the proposal to close Langley completely ignores parental choice. It is clear from the data that Langley is the preferred school in the area - 73% of children at Langley are from catchment area, compared to only 44% at Appletree. Furthermore, another 12% of pupils at Langley attend from the Appletree catchment. This clearly demonstrates parental preference for Langley, making the proposal to close the school completely in contrast to what parents desire for their children. If you choose to close Langley, we will be forced to send our child to a school that is not our preference and is not what we believe will give him the best education. "Merging" the two schools on the Appletree site also clearly poses lots of risk factors regarding education for all of the pupils attending. You have given absolutely no guidance regarding how all of the children will fit into the school and, when attending an open day at Appletree, the Appletree Headteacher could provide no assurances wither. When looking round Appletree, it is clear that the school is already full with classrooms. Whilst there are some "additional" rooms, these are being used as libraries and break out rooms for children with additional needs. It is absolutely not appropriate to remove these and replace with classrooms; this would be a the detriment of ALL pupils attending the school. We do not feel comfortable sending our child into this setting and would be seeking other schools instead. Your proposal also gives absolutely zero consideration for wraparound and nursery provision, which is absurd considering that the vast majority of families attending schools in North Tyneside are working families who rely heavily on these provisions. The wraparound care at Langley (School's Out) offers a far more extensive service than Little Pips - longer opening hours both during term time and holiday and, importantly to us, a nursery provision for babies from 9 months old. We have our younger son booked to start at School's Out in April 2026 aged 1 - if you close Langley and we have to move our son to Appletree, there will be no like for like provision for our younger baby (Little Pips only take children aged 2+) and we will be left without a childcare option. This could have a huge impact on our family financially as well as logistically. Even if Little Pips were to extend their provision, how are they going to be able to accommodate all of the additional families

coming from Langley? I have seen their physical space and it just will not work. This must be considered or you are effectively going to be forcing families out of the workplace and leaving us in financial hardship. This is unacceptable. We strongly oppose the proposal to merge the two schools an urge you to please reconsider. At minimum, if this must go ahead, this needs to be a true merger. This means a closing of both schools and the creation of a new one on the Appletree site, with a merging of governing bodies and senior leadership and a fair opportunity for all staff to apply for their roles. This would also allow the two wraparound services to discuss what a merger may look like for them, or at least come up with a solution that will ensure all families are catered for in the short and long term. We know this involves a longer, statutory process, however, we all feel this is a far better way of dealing with the issues at hand than what you have proposed.

Screen Name Redacted
11/08/2025 12:49 PM

This proposal will have a direct and devastating impact on me personally, as I stand to lose my job if it goes ahead. With so many staff members affected across this consultation, there will be very few alternative positions available locally. I have a mortgage and am about to start a family, and this level of uncertainty places an immense strain on my financial stability and future security. The situation has also had a significant impact on the mental health and wellbeing of myself and my colleagues. There has been very little support, communication, or guidance provided regarding what options or assistance will be available to us should the proposal proceed. The lack of clarity and reassurance has left staff feeling anxious, undervalued, and uncertain about how to move forward.

Screen Name Redacted
11/08/2025 02:03 PM

[redacted] Even with an EHCP in place, I have no assurance that another setting could offer the same level of care and understanding that Langley provides. The thought of him struggling in a new school is terrifying. If he cannot cope, I may be forced to leave my job to

home-school him. This would place our family under immense financial strain. I am all for developing your SEN provision - but please not at the detriment of SEN children who are currently having their needs met.

Screen Name Redacted
11/08/2025 02:17 PM

My children are currently at middle school and high school. It feels as though North Tyneside is moving towards a two-tier system, which would be a great shame. The three tier system is so much better for transition, for their learning and mental health. The extra pressure a two tier system would place on existing schools would be catastrophic.

Screen Name Redacted
11/08/2025 02:51 PM

I take my grandchildren to Langley at least once a week. I will be unable to do this if the children have to move to apple tree. I can not walk far and can just manage the walk to Langley which is 5 minute from my daughter's house. This would have a big financial impact on my daughter if she is forced to pay for breakfast club after school club. My granddaughter suffers from anxiety and going into school in the morning can be a challenge. She is now settled and has plan with the school of how we get her there in the mornings. This will have a massive impact on her. My grandson is in the nursery and is due to go to reception in September. He will not be going to appletree so this would mean 2 drop offs at 2 different schools. How would be so this? And how would my daughter and her partner do this? Have you looked at the traffic issue as more families will be taking there car. The traffic around that area is already bad. The safety of our families have not been looks at. You are trying to close a thriving school where they have the best teachers and pupils are thriving. I urge you to reconsider. The amount of inaccuracies in the proposal shows the lack of care for you community

Screen Name Redacted
11/08/2025 04:45 PM

Langley First School has provided an outstanding education for my sons—one of whom is currently in Year Three. The teachers and staff are inspirational, nurturing, and wholly dedicated to helping every child reach their potential. The school's strong sense of community has taken years to build and is a cornerstone of Monkseaton's identity. To dismantle this is not simply a change—it is a devastating setback with lasting consequences for children, families, and the wider community. Closing a thriving, high-performing school is indefensible. I am particularly worried about the effect this proposal will have on my son. He will be in the final year at Langley, and I am deeply concerned about the inevitable staff turnover and the resulting instability. This disruption will directly affect his transition to middle school and could cause long-term anxiety about education—something we already manage carefully, with Langley's incredible

staff providing a safe and nurturing environment that allows him to thrive. The council meeting held at Whitley Bay High School on 8th October was deeply disappointing. Parents attended in good faith, expecting clear answers and reassurance. Instead, we were met with vague “hopes,” and generalisations—when what was needed were facts, plans, and accountability. For a proposal of this scale and potential disruption, such a lack of clarity and transparency is unacceptable. The accompanying FAQs only add to the frustration, continuing in the same vague and dismissive tone. For example, the section on wraparound care. The statement, “...the exact offer may change. Schools will aim to maintain or improve wraparound care,” is not a plan. Over 60% of Langley families rely on wraparound care, and when asked what they would do if it were lost, over a third said they would have to reduce their working hours. This will cause immense strain on families, harm the local economy, and directly contradict Labour’s commitment to expand childcare and help parents stay in work. Even more concerning is that Langley’s wraparound care providers were never contacted about this proposal. The repeated assurances that the council will “work closely with schools” and “ensure a smooth transition” ring hollow when the proposal itself contains glaring factual errors, including: - Langley has a field separated by a public highway where children have PE - this is totally incorrect. The field is on the school grounds. - The school is in financial deficit- false These are not minor oversights—they represent a serious disregard for accuracy and due process. I urge the council, in the strongest possible terms, to pause and reconsider this proposal. There is a community of passionate parents putting together alternative proposals, its frustrating that working parents have had to do this. Any future plans must be grounded in genuine consultation, transparent evidence, and a clear commitment to protecting the educational and emotional wellbeing of our children. The people of Monkseaton deserve better than vague assurances and flawed data that this proposal is based on. We deserve honesty, diligence, and respect.

Screen Name Redacted
11/08/2025 08:11 PM

Firstly, a merger would increase class sizes, thereby decreasing the one on one tuition time that children need in order to develop educational and social developmental skills. Additionally those children with SEND needs will be hugely affected. Secondly, closing Langley first school will be detrimental to the larger community as it has been a staple for more than 74 years and has seen multiple generations of students flourish and serve the aforementioned community. Furthermore, sending both my children to 2 different locations at a greater than walking distance is unworkable for our family.especially as we only have one car and it is used for work early hours of the morning before the school run most weekdays.

Screen Name Redacted

11/08/2025 09:14 PM

Langley First School has been an exceptional and nurturing environment for both of my children. I have one child in Year 1 and one in Nursery, and both are thriving socially, emotionally, and academically because of the quality of teaching, the care of the staff, and the inclusive, community-centred ethos of the school. The teachers at Langley don't just educate- they nurture confidence, curiosity, and kindness. [redacted] I see every day the challenges schools face due to funding constraints, increased SEND needs, and the rising demands on staff. I also recognise that falling birth rates are creating pressures across the system. However, Langley stands out as one of the few schools operating efficiently and not in financial deficit, supported by strong leadership and achieving excellent outcomes for children. For my family, Langley is not just a school- it's a safe and inspiring place where my children's love of learning has grown, and where they are known, cared for, and supported as individuals. The thought of losing this stability, and the relationships they have built with staff and friends, is deeply distressing. It is profoundly frustrating to see such a successful, stable, and inclusive school- one that continues to thrive despite wider demographic and financial challenges- being unfairly targeted for closure when it should instead be celebrated and supported. 1. Inaccuracies and Misleading Information in the Consultation Documentation The published consultation materials contain several inaccuracies and omissions which undermine the credibility of the proposal: • Playing field and facilities: The documentation claims that Langley has no field on site and that children must be escorted across a public highway for PE and sport. This is incorrect. Langley has a well-used playing field adjacent to the school, along with an additional field across a minor road that is used once a year for Sports Day. The school also benefits from a Reception garden, outdoor classroom, potting garden, and forest-school-style learning area regularly used for outdoor learning and SEND support. • Financial position: The consultation document incorrectly suggests that Langley is in financial deficit. In reality, the school has never run a deficit and has only forecast a small one for 2025/26, which leadership are actively addressing with an independent financial advisor. Langley is one of only a small number of North Tyneside schools not currently in deficit- proof of strong management, not financial failure. • Accessibility and geography: The claim that most children within Langley's catchment could access Appletree Gardens "without crossing major roads" is completely false. Many families, including mine, would need to cross Seatonville Road or Cauldwell Lane- both extremely busy roads. • Capacity and class sizes: The council states that Appletree "can accommodate 432 pupils." Yet the government's own data lists Appletree's capacity as 293. No clear evidence has been given to show how both cohorts of children could be accommodated safely on site, nor has the council offered reassurance about class sizes. At the

Whitley Bay High School meeting, officers could not deny the possibility of classes of up to 45 children. • Lack of consultation with key stakeholders: Despite the proposal's significant implications, the council has not met with Langley's full leadership team or governors to discuss alternative solutions. No governing body or senior manager of Langley's wraparound provider, Schools Out Northern, has been consulted either. These inaccuracies and omissions are unacceptable in a document of this importance and should invalidate the current consultation in its present form. 2. Educational and Staffing Impact From my professional experience, I know that increasing class sizes and reducing access to specialist spaces significantly harms all children's learning and teacher wellbeing. The proposals offer no guarantees around class sizes, SEND provision, or how children will be accommodated safely. At Langley, spaces such as the sensory room, The Nest, and outdoor learning areas are essential for supporting pupils with additional needs. These would be lost if the school were to close, further reducing the inclusivity of education in the area. Langley's proximity to Woodlawn is a strength that the council should build upon, not erase. There is untapped potential for a model of partnership that bridges mainstream and specialist education- something we are increasingly being asked to do in our own schools across North Tyneside. Closing Langley removes this opportunity entirely. 3. Wraparound Care and Working Families As a full-time educator and working mother, the availability of wraparound care is not a convenience- it is essential. My husband and I do not have family nearby and rely on Schools Out Northern for before- and after-school childcare. If my husband cannot collect our children due to work, [redacted] The council's admission that wraparound provision was not considered in the consultation is extremely worrying. Langley's Schools Out provision runs from 7.30am–6.00pm, offers flexible booking, and includes full holiday cover. Appletree's Little Pips runs shorter hours (7.45am–5.30pm, closing at 4.30pm for nursery) and with limited holiday coverage. These hours are not compatible with full-time employment in education or other professions. The Friends of Langley parent survey found that 60% of families regularly use the current wraparound, with many saying they would have to cut working hours or leave their jobs without it. This would disproportionately affect working mothers and further strain local childcare options. For families like mine, the loss of wraparound provision is not just inconvenient- it is life-changing. It would directly affect our ability to work and support our children. 4. Safety, Travel, and Environmental Impact At present, my children can safely walk to Langley every day- something that promotes health, independence, and community connection. If Langley closes, my children's journey would involve crossing Seatonville Road, a fast and busy main route that will see even heavier traffic if Woodlawn expands and Appletree absorbs additional pupils. Friends of Langley's data shows that 78% of current

Langley families walk, but 55% would need to drive if the merger goes ahead. This will inevitably increase congestion and emissions, and make the school run far less safe for pedestrians and cyclists. Parking around Appletree is already inadequate, with nearby streets congested at drop-off and collection times. The addition of so many more families travelling by car will have a significant negative impact on safety for pupils and residents alike. Appletree is also located on a bus route, making road closures impossible during busy periods- unlike Langley, which benefits from a managed road-closure scheme that keeps children safe. The lack of safe walking routes and realistic parking solutions at Appletree has not been properly assessed and poses a serious risk to children's safety. 5. Impact on Families and Siblings The proposed timing of the closure means my two children would attend different schools. As both parents work full-time, this creates serious logistical and emotional challenges. My husband would need to collect children from two sites at overlapping times, which is simply impractical. Equally important is the emotional impact on my youngest child, who has just settled happily into Nursery at Langley and feels secure knowing her sister is nearby. Splitting siblings and forcing young children into new, unfamiliar environments will cause distress and disrupt their education. My youngest would lose the sense of safety and belonging that comes from seeing her sister in the same playground- something that cannot be replicated elsewhere. This is not simply a matter of logistics; it is about emotional wellbeing, consistency, and security for our children- values that Langley has always upheld. 6. A Question of Fairness and Process This proposal is described as a "merger," but it is in reality a closure of Langley and an expansion of Appletree. Both are good schools; it is unjust and divisive to penalise one community over another. A fairer, more transparent route- as set out by the Department for Education- would be a true merger process involving the closure of both schools and the creation of a new school through the Office of the Schools Adjudicator. This would allow for greater scrutiny, ensure both communities are treated equally, and preserve the best aspects of each school's ethos and staff expertise. Doing what is right for the children, not what is easiest administratively, should be the council's priority. Conclusion Langley First School is a thriving, inclusive, and financially responsible school that serves its community with dedication and excellence. The inaccuracies and omissions in the consultation documents, coupled with the lack of meaningful consideration for wraparound care, safety, SEND support, and family impact, make this proposal deeply flawed. [redacted] I know how rare it is to find a school that truly gets it right for every child. As a parent, I see every day how Langley makes that difference- how it has shaped my children's confidence, joy, and sense of belonging. To lose it now would not only disrupt their education but dismantle something truly special- the heart of a community that works. I strongly oppose the closure of Langley First

School.

Screen Name Redacted
11/08/2025 09:31 PM

We write to formally object in the strongest possible terms to the council's proposal to close Langley First School and transfer its pupils to Appletree Gardens. This proposal is deeply flawed on safeguarding, educational, procedural and factual grounds and, if implemented, would cause significant harm to our children and the wider community. 1. Harm to children — disruption and emotional impact Our daughter is a settled, happy pupil at Langley and will face two school moves within a short period if this proposal proceeds: a transfer to Appletree in her final year of first school and then transition to middle school. She has endured severe losses in her young life — most notably the death of an older brother — and is a sibling to a child with additional needs. Stability and continuity at school are crucial to her wellbeing. This proposal would be traumatic and would put her progress and mental health at risk. 2. Inaccurate consultation information We have identified numerous inaccuracies in the consultation materials that materially affect the fairness of the process: • The consultation claims Langley lacks outdoor/play space. This is false: Langley uses multiple fields (for break/lunchtime play and sports day), an on-site potting garden used for SEN work, a nursery/reception outdoor area with a forest-school ethos, and an outdoor classroom used daily. • Langley is not currently in deficit; it is forecasting budget pressures and is working with an independent financial adviser to manage its budget. • The council's assertion that most Langley children can safely access Appletree without crossing major roads is incorrect and would require pupils to cross Seatonville or Cauldwell Lane — a real safety concern for our younger children and those with additional needs. 3. Wraparound care and family impact Many families — including ours — depend on Langley's breakfast club and the Schools Out Northern wraparound provision. These essential services were omitted from the consultation. We are concerned that the council did not contact the provider or include arrangements for continuity of wraparound care. Removing or disrupting these services would severely impact working families and take away a critical lifeline. 4. Capacity, safeguarding and classroom environment The consultation provides no credible assurances that Appletree has the safe physical capacity to absorb Langley pupils without using temporary outside cabins or overcrowding classrooms. We object to the prospect of larger class sizes and temporary accommodation: both would harm educational outcomes and increase safeguarding risks — especially for children with SEN who require tailored, consistent spaces. 5. SEN provision and specialist support Langley currently provides daily, specific SEN interventions and safe spaces (for example, the potting garden and outdoor classrooms). There are no clear guarantees that Appletree can replicate these provisions given its current footprint and the council's stated plans.

We must have written assurances about how every child's current support package, therapies and interventions will be maintained or enhanced, and about where those services will be delivered. 6. Financial modelling and pupil projections are misleading The consultation's financial narrative appears to omit key matters: Appletree currently receives falling-rolls funding to mitigate surplus places; Langley does not. Presenting headline numbers without this context produces a misleading picture. Moreover, the projection methodology used in the consultation is unclear and appears to project beyond recognised national pupil projection horizons. The council should publish full, auditable data and modelling assumptions, and explain why it did not consult Langley's leadership and governors on these figures before publishing. 7. Local demographics and housing growth The Muton Gap housing development is expected to deliver significant new primary-age demand (the development estimate is ~748 primary places). The council's catchment and capacity analysis does not transparently account for this development nor for likely internal migration effects. Many families chose to move close to Langley specifically for access to this school; closing it removes legitimate parental choice. 8. Process and fairness — call for a true merger or delay We do not accept Langley as the correct school to close. If the council is unwilling to withdraw the proposal, we request instead that the council implement a true merger rather than a closure/transfer. A true merger — planned collaboratively with both school communities — would protect staff, retain the best practices from both schools, preserve SEN provision and reduce disruption. If a merger is not accepted, we ask that the council pause the proposal until: • Full, independent verification of the council's financial and pupil modelling is completed and published; • A proper risk assessment of routes to Appletree (safety for walking routes and transport implications) is shared; • The council meets with Langley's governing body, senior leadership and key providers (Schools Out Northern) to co-produce transition plans; and • The potential pupil demand from regional developments (e.g., Muton Gap) is fully incorporated. 9. Specific requests for immediate information / action We request the council provide, in writing, the following before any decision is taken: • Full data and methodology for pupil projections beyond 2030, and clarification about use of national projection methodology. • Full financial models showing current balances, falling-rolls funding allocations to Appletree, and the basis for Langley's projected pressures. • A detailed capacity plan for Appletree that demonstrates where every year group and every SEN provision would be taught — including contingency for wraparound and breakfast club. • A safety audit of pedestrian routes from Langley catchment areas to Appletree, including independent assessment of crossings on Seatonville and Cauldwell Lane. • Evidence of any contact made with Schools Out Northern and the outcome of those discussions. Conclusion Langley has been a lifeline for our family in

very difficult times. The consultation as presented is rushed, contains factual inaccuracies and does not safeguard our children's welfare. We therefore object to the proposal and call for either withdrawal or a properly planned true merger backed by transparent evidence and meaningful community engagement.

Screen Name Redacted
11/08/2025 09:40 PM

Whilst my husband and I are not directly affected by the proposals at the moment, our children were educated at Langley and Monkseaton Middle and we feel very impassioned by the proposed changes. Our children both received a quality education which enabled them to flourish educationally, personally and gave them the foundation to build their lives upon. [redacted] Our grandson will be living within the catchment area of Langley.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 08:35 AM

I am deeply concerned about the communities you're shattering here. The campaigns for the schools are showing bonds of over 30 years. Parents use local facilities (Allard's, co-op, the car garage and other nearby businesses). Langley uses the library and I've seen many a child in the nearby coop too as enrichment opportunities with teachers.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 09:32 AM

● ● ● The current consultation has already created divides within our community which are unhelpful. Both schools are good schools, it's not fair to penalise one over the other. A true merger would mean both schools - and most importantly the children - could have an input into a new school's name, ethos, uniform etc and would mean we could keep the best bits from both schools, including staff. It would also make the transition smoother for the children. The requirement to ask permission from additional routes (the Secretary of State and then final approval from the Office of Schools Adjudicator) increases the scrutiny over the decision making process, which we see can only be a good thing This should be about doing the right thing, not the easier thing. Surely if we want to get this right for our children, we shouldn't be rushing the process. Given Langley isn't yet in deficit, why does it matter that it will take longer? Building space ● ● ● ● The council's consultation document says Appletree "can accommodate 432 pupils, which is more than the amount of both schools combined when future birth rates and admission numbers are adjusted" . However, when we checked on the gov.uk website for the capacity of Appletree, the capacity is stated as being 293. The campaign has asked for clarification on this As yet, the council has offered no assurance about how the Langley children could be safely accommodated on the site Nor has it given us any assurance on

class sizes. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, there is a concern amongst us that our children will be placed in larger class sizes, which could have an adverse affect on their education and wellbeing. According to the government's school spending comparison tool Appletree is a more expensive building to run. Appletree spends £29 per square metre on utilities, compared to Langley which spends £4 per square metre. Children with special educational needs (SEN) ● ● ● ● ● ● ● There are 40 children out of 297 on the SEN register, equating to 13.5%. However, there are an additional 24 children who are receiving additional support following early identification, which takes this figure up to 24%. [redacted] ● The building is all on ground level with ramp access, accessible toilets and a specially adapted changing space with bed for a child with a catheter ● The sensory room has no windows allowing a fully darkened experience if needed, and has a padded wall and floor ● The outdoor space in the reception garden follows a forest school ethos, used for children with SEND through their time at Langley, and there is a potting garden to offer gardening opportunities for small groups of children. ● The teachers offer a lunchtime club away from the dinner hall ● There are three specially adapted spaces - The Nest in Nursery, The Sensory Room (Hive), which offers an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming, and a specifically adapted KS2 space. These spaces allow for breathing space as well as targeted intervention for children who struggle with the demands of the classroom and are well used. ● Every classroom has a 'haven' area which children can use to regulate and re-set. ● The following classroom adaptations are regularly used throughout the school; flexible seating arrangements, visual timetables (both universal and bespoke), use of 'Now and Next' , incorporating special interests, movement breaks, 'soft landings' and additional support/intervention for reading. ● The school presents as 'Neurodiversity Affirming' with subtle adaptations to the environment; soft lighting, clear visuals, adapted seating arrangements, resources for movement and heavy work in place, strategies for regulating emotions throughout No guarantees have been given about what, if any, adapted provision, SEN specific places or breakout spaces would be available at Appletree following the closure of Langley It is also unclear how all children will be accommodated into classrooms before even considering the need for SEN specific spaces. Appletree was in the process of applying for the development of an Additionally Resourced Provision (ARP) to accommodate SEN but we understand this plan has been put on hold due to this consultation. The Inclusive

culture and staff expertise have been developed over time at Langley. This culture is authentic and reliant on the staff team – their strong relationships, communication skills, connection and dedication to the children. Rather than being viewed as a candidate for closure simply because it is located next to a special school, Langley's position represents a strategic opportunity. Its proximity to Woodlawn Special School allows for dual registration, enabling pupils to access targeted interventions and therapies as needed while continuing to participate in mainstream classes and interact with a diverse peer group. This approach supports the government's key priority of inclusive education, keeping children with additional needs in mainstream settings wherever possible. Pupil projections The 'pupil projection methodology' was cited in the supporting documents provided in the Council proposals but there is no link to this methodology provided. Looking online we assume they must have used the National Pupil Projection Model since this is the only published methodology. However, the National Pupil Projection methodology only publishes projections up to 2030. Somehow, the council has forecast pupil numbers well beyond 2030. ● The council's projection figures also appear to be inaccurate: ● ● It projects 59 pupils starting in 2025 in Reception in Langley, which drops by six students to 53 in Year 1. There is no explanation of this and no indication from parents in this year group of their intention to leave In comparison, Appletree appears to gain 18 students between Reception to Year 1, again with no explanation as to where these additional students have come from and not in line with the school's admission records When these figures are corrected, we see that in 2030 (the acceptable time frame for pupil projections) Langley surplus is projected to be 14% surplus - only 4% away from the council's acceptable level - whereas Appletree's surplus is projected to be almost double at 34%. One of the main factors in the council's decision-making is the concern that the capacity at Whitley Bay High School (WBHS) is 390 pupils, and the proposed first school and middle school changes are aimed at preventing the high school from going over capacity. However, our research group has found: ● ● Based on the council's methodology, from the current reception onwards, it is unlikely the numbers of pupils at WBHS will reach 390. Therefore the council's focus on ensuring numbers don't exceed this figure are misguided This issue the council is trying to fix relates to children already in the system, rather than future pupil projections, particularly the current year 2 and year 5 year groups. Closing Langley will not tackle this issue.

Screen Name Redacted

11/09/2025 11:12 AM

I am 100% AGAINST this proposal. [redacted]

[redacted] Why the proposal is wrong: 1. Financial Arguments Don't Add Up • Both Langley and Appletree Gardens are projected to run deficits by 2028. The merger does not solve the underlying funding problem—it just delays it. • There's no clear evidence that merging will prevent future deficits, as the merged school will still face falling pupil numbers and funding challenges. 2. Langley First Is More Popular Locally • 73% of children in Langley's catchment attend the school, compared to only 44% for Appletree Gardens. Closing Langley would force more families to travel further or look outside the area. • Langley has fewer surplus places (9%) than Appletree Gardens (14%), so the "surplus places" argument is weaker for Langley. 3. Impact on Families and Community • Closing Langley will leave some homes more than 800m from their nearest First school, which is a real issue for families with young children. • The proposal doesn't fully address the loss of a valued, high-retention community school. • It's the staff, ethos and culture that makes Langley 'Langley' so if the building needs to be taken by Woodlawn, you need to move all of Langley staff to Appletree if you want 'buy-in' from the Langley parents for the children to 'merge' successfully. A true merger of both schools is fairer for all, rather than what is currently proposed. 4. SEND Provision Justification Lacks Detail • While expanding Woodlawn Special School is positive, there's no clear evidence that this requires closing Langley First. What benefit does this have for the Woodlawn children? None! It may make the head teacher's management easier but it will not directly impact the children. The 6th form could be anywhere. • The older children at Woodlawn are hardly there as they have more vocational sessions. Is a 300 capacity first school with bust residential streets surrounding it or adequate carpark available the best space for these children to be placed? No, it should be a new purpose-built facility or a one form-entry school, e.g. Coquet Part First School. 5. Lack of Transparency on Future Growth • The council's assumptions about new housing and future pupil numbers aren't fully explained. If birth rates rise or more families move in, we could face a shortage of places. • This feels like a short term fix with no real plan for the future. Or if there is a plan, it is not being shared so that the community understand why. Are the council willing to share their 5 year/10 year plans for schools in the area?

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 11:13 AM

This proposal has been rushed, the data is wrong, there has been very little impact of what this would mean. It would mean that a school that has served the local community for 70 years is closed and lost. It will impact upon people moving into the local area due to the lack of school choices in monkseaton - impacting upon house prices. I am

worried what year 4 would look like for my child, what teachers would stay if the school were to close, how many agency teachers would be teaching him, what the school environment would be like. Would he get the same level of care in Year 4 that he would receive if the school were to remain open. Would year 4 parents try and secure other schools for the children leaving langely feeling like a ghost town.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 12:08 PM

[redacted] I know and understand firsthand exactly what each child receives in their classroom experience and in their school day. In the course of a 5 hour teaching day with 30 children in one class, one child will have a 5minute opportunity to work 121 with their class teacher- if there are support assistants available to manage the behaviour and classroom climate, and if there are Higher Attaining pupils who can lead group work. That is a miniscule window of time for one child to benefit from sole intervention from their teacher's expertise. In a class size of 32, that 121 time dwindles to 2 minutes per child- again, only if whole class conditions allow it. Now factor in that an average 20% of UK classrooms' students have an EHCP or SEN tier need, and in NEPA nearly 20% will be Pupil Premium. When class sizes exceed 30, these children- with legal documentation to ensure their continued intervention and support- miss out on quality first teaching and appropriately adapted teaching and learning. Merging Langley First with Appletree effectively ensures that not only do the high proportion of SEN students receive a shockingly poor education, it also guarantees that the one educational practitioner per classroom will have less than 30 seconds to spend 121 with all the pupils in their class. This is, quite blatantly, appalling. If you refuse to invest in Quality First Teaching you will detriment the attainment of your council's children; if you refuse to invest in thriving and supportive schools you will force hardworking and community oriented families away from the council area to move somewhere where their children are actually offered better opportunities in life; if you force the closure of an outstanding school and merge it with another you will disadvantage hundreds of YOUR council's children, and make your teachers' workloads utterly unbearable. The facts are indisputable: you must keep Langley First school operational and under no circumstances merge with another school.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 12:38 PM

[redacted] We talk as a society about the need for inclusion of SEN pupils in mainstream education and provisions such as forest schools and alternative learning environments. This includes, at Langley, several sensory and breakout rooms for SEN children who find the classroom environment

overwhelming in addition to several outdoor spaces which are linked directly to the school with zero need to cross a road (the consultation papers do not mention our outdoor spaces such as the potting garden, the field which we use several times a day and the school yard, the reception garden or the nursery garden). Within my role I use these additional spaces to support both SEN and other children several times a day. These areas are utilized correctly and appropriately by the appropriate number of children. If both schools are merged on one site, the additional spaces for break out areas and which currently enrich SEN and all children's learning will be lost. The sheer school size of the proposed merged school, for some children, particularly SEN children will be overwhelming and may even result in EBSA increasing for these children, note the number of parents who will consider home schooling, should this proposal go ahead (62 Langley parents consider this as an option). This proposal is completely inappropriate and the fact that no one in this area of expertise has visited Langley first school site, in advance of these proposals to look at and consider these proposals at this level of detail, prior to publishing them for public review, for me shows that the council have not considered this plan with the best interests of the community, our children, our future generation of North Tyneside, at the heart of the plans, and who will suffer the most, when they completely deserve to be the primary consideration.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 02:02 PM

Pupils and families living locally to Langley should have access to a local school and maintain the close community they have built over the years.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 02:15 PM

[redacted]

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 02:56 PM

My son is in Year Two at Langley, [redacted] As a family, we feel incredibly thankful that my son attends Langley, that he is so well supported, accepted and understood. He is thriving thanks to excellent levels of support and skill of the staff team and most particularly, through relationships he has with so many adults in school - he is genuinely appreciated and valued as a member of the school community. Should this merger take place, there is a very real risk that we would see significant regression and disengagement with

his education. Transitions are very hard, as is change for him. I know that throughout Year 4 at Langley, a significant amount of time and resources are invested in preparing these children for their transition to middle school, including a residential and a focus on developing resilience and independence. [redacted] Should expectations that he 'transitions' to a new school building with all new staff, culture and expectations be too high, I will be forced to home educate him as I cannot take the risk that he returns to the levels of dysregulation and overwhelm that he struggled with through the Early Years. I am extremely worried that he will face two huge transitions in one year through this proposal - the risks associated with this are significant and the exceptional progress he has made would be at stake. These risks for the current Year Two cohort are significant, with two major transitions in one year. Should Appletree not be able to meet the needs contained within this cohort of 118 children, there are no other spaces across the borough. Parents will either have to travel a long distance, or home school children. [redacted]. I am extremely anxious about the future now. My sons success at school and his social life have been very hard won and would easily unravel with such disruption. I have asked questions at all of the opportunities given to parents but have been given no assurances that my child's needs would be met. Not enough consideration has been given to the impact on this community - I sincerely hope that you can look again and come up with a better option.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 03:06 PM

Not against a merger but a good school like Langley shouldn’t close

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 03:11 PM

As point 4. There is also the stability and welfare of the pupils that strongly needs to be considered.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 03:43 PM

All my family have attended this fantastic school Langley for a number of years. Langley should stay and Appletree gardens should merge with them and work with Woodlawn together Langley is most popular and higher achieving with better facilities

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 03:49 PM

Better facilities and results at Langley

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 04:16 PM

My granddaughter, who started at Langley First School just this year, and her brother are among the children and families who live outside all the rings around the schools, other than Langley, so would be among those who have the greatest distance to walk to whichever alternative school they are either allocated or have to choose. This greatly adds to the length of any school day and does include some busy roads to cross. Long school days in the early school career makes for tiredness and subsequently poor learning. I am very keen for my granddaughter to remain happy and fully engaged in her learning journey throughout life. I have grave concerns that the move to subsume Langley First school into Appletree First school will mean that all the children from both schools will be put under undue stress and pressure for the duration of whatever transition period it takes for the number of children placed into Appletree's Real Estate which was not built to accommodate the numbers moved into it. The reality of 4 extra class base spaces in Appletree First school compared to Langley First School is not going to accommodate all the children moving from Langley First school and it will take several years to reach the Council's aim of equilibrium in the year groups as they move through the newly aligned three tier system. The children, my grandchildren included, will all be adversely affected by this. The fact that Appletree First School will be keeping its DfE identity and Governing body is also of concern to me. If this was truly a merger then the DfE would be allowing, nay, telling the council that any newly formed school should have a new DfE number, governing body and identity in order to bring about a whole new school and ethos so that everyone feels involved and valued in the making of a new school not having one school lose its identity completely to another. Every single one of these are children who have already had to deal with the hugely adversely impactful decisions taken about babies, children and young people throughout the pandemic years. They deserve to be so much better treated now especially until, as a society, we actually find out what the impact has been on this cohort of society from decisions taken over which there is only now an Inquiry being undertaken. While I am aware that each and every school offers and becomes a beating heart of a local community, it would seem that Langley First School has a very special place in its community and further beyond because parents from further out of its immediate catchment area choose to place their children there and feel privileged to have a place. The figures that the council will be referring to clearly demonstrate that Langley First School is popular. Appletree First School, sadly and for whatever reasons, is much less so with 56%of those parents who could choose to go there opting not to. The youngest children who were born into the lockdowns where they were not allowed to see even the full faces of members of society for months and years will forever remain voiceless and will have to rely on the rest of us to speak on their behalf through different

avenues, including the education system, about the effects these various lockdowns and other social exclusion tactics have had on them. We owe them more than pushing them into over-crowded classrooms now.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 05:03 PM

as a deeply concerned resident of North Tyneside regarding the proposed ‘merger’ between Langley First School and Appletree Gardens. Based on Department for Education guidance, this proposal does not constitute a true merger, and I am concerned that the council has not made this distinction clear to the public. The decision to close a thriving, inclusive, nurturing, and highly regarded first school raises serious concerns about how such actions may be repeated whenever the council faces financial pressures in the future. Langley First School is demonstrably the more popular of the two schools, as evidenced by enrolment data, statistics, and the fact that it currently has only a 10% surplus. According to your own published standards, a 10% surplus is considered acceptable. It is therefore both surprising and concerning that Langley has been selected as the school to close. The campaign initiated by Langley parents clearly demonstrates the strength of feeling within the community. Their passion and commitment to preserving this exceptional school are undeniable. It is difficult to understand why more viable, creative approaches to achieving the council’s financial and educational objectives have not been fully explored. Closing a successful and well-loved school should never be viewed as the only solution. As a resident of North Tyneside, I would like to highlight several specific concerns: The proposal has contained numerous inaccuracies, many of which were only corrected after being identified by parents. The term “merger” has been misleading, as it gave families the impression that Langley staff would transfer with the children, which is not the case. The current Appletree Gardens site does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate additional pupils without sacrificing essential facilities such as the library, computer suite, breakout rooms, and SEND regulation spaces. This would negatively affect both Langley and Appletree pupils. The increase in traffic volume around Appletree Gardens raises serious safety concerns for children and families during drop-off and collection times. Appletree Gardens recently received additional funding to offset falling rolls, which has prevented a financial deficit. It feels unfair that Langley, a school which did not require such funding due to its success and stable numbers, is now being penalised as a result. In summary, it appears that Langley is being unfairly targeted for closure precisely because it is successful—nearly full, financially stable, and connected to a SEND school. This approach is deeply concerning. The council should be proactively developing and assessing alternative options, rather than relying on members of the public to propose solutions. I strongly urge you to reconsider and explore more viable and forward-

thinking alternatives.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 05:59 PM

I have great concerns over the future of the children in my family, that's three schools closing in Whitley Bay so far, who will be next for the mess the council have made and need to save money, thank goodness all the money was spent on having all the cycle tracks in place! Such a waste when all the schools are closing and the others within North Tyneside. Who will be the next School? It seems a total lack of care and support for the children, who have many complex needs which is fully supported by Langley, the teachers who are all to face an uncertain future. I have a family member who teaches and they face a very uncertain future. Unemployment is going to soar, all the time, money, learning and expertise these teachers have will be lost, how on earth will they be able to find further teaching roles. It's digesting the way the teachers, parents and children are being treated. Shame on you. I hope sense is seen and wonder how long will it be before NT Education realise a mistake was made and they need more schools. The disruption is enormous and repercussions will be felt across the borough for many years to come if this goes ahead.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 07:51 PM

Langley is more popular and higher achieving with better faci

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 08:43 PM

As a local resident, I am very concerned about the proposal to close and merge the school in our area. Although I do not have children of my own attending, my niece and nephew are current pupils, and I have seen first-hand how important the school is to both the children and the wider community. The closure of Langley First School could reduce local property values, make the area less appealing to young families, and weaken the long-term vibrancy of the community.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 09:02 PM

When we chose to move and settle in Whitley Bay, one of the main reasons was knowing the reputation of Langley with an eye on starting a family. We had known families of friends and colleagues who had had their children schooled at Langley and they had nothing but good things to say about it. We now have two children; one in Year 1 and one who attends the Schools Out nursery and wraparound centre on the school grounds. Our eldest also attends the wraparound before and after school most days of the week. [redacted] We drop our children off the earliest we can at 7.30am and we pick them up after 5pm. We rely on this service to be able to do our jobs. It is another reason we chose Langley. Without such extended hours of care then I fear we might be

looking for new jobs. It is hard to evidence the standard of care and standard of education at Langley using simple facts and figures such as those that have been used as reasoning by the council to close Langley. The class sizes and available staff in the classroom have made for an excellent teaching environment for our eldest. She has thrived. They recognise the individual child, their needs and support them in their growth so well, holistically in their education and in their social development. Our daughter has developed into a confident, caring and well-mannered young girl. She and us as parents have also developed such a strong network of friends borne out of Langley and its ethos, which sits at the heart of our community. To close Langley, would rip apart our local community. It would destroy the friendships our children have built leaving them more anxious, unsupported and insecure, I fear. They would have to start all over again in another school with a different ethos, different method of teaching and would be disadvantaged by that. As well, they would have to work hard to break into new friendship circles and we'd have to hope they are welcomed, but it is a source of great anxiety. It is unnecessary anxiety that once again hits these poor children hard when they are the years that we born into the pandemic and had such a bad and disadvantaged start to life already. It sounds like by moving the children of one school into another there is going to be overcrowding, inadequate facilities and increased class sizes with a greater child:staff ratio. There seems to be inadequate evidence as to how these concerns are to be addressed. Langley is a school that is only slightly under its full capacity. Bear in mind these are the years that are a lower birth rate because peoples genuinely had concern about giving birth in hospitals in the time of the pandemic. The rest is just predictions and crystal ball gazing but I would expect numbers to increase as we move further away from the pandemic, people move into the monkseaton area as we did because it is developing and growing in reputation and also people from outside of Langley's catchment opt to go to it because of its excellent reputation. For example, adjacent Langley is the huge new housing development. Rather than waste money building new schools to accommodate these families, lets prioritise filling those excellent schools we have. At this point, a little extra space sounds perfect to me. I also know friends' families whose children have SEND. These children and their families so value being in mainstream education for a more normalised education and reasons of social integration and Langley excels in its support for these children. I know such children in moments of feeling overwhelmed need a little excess space to have 'down time'. To deny them this is going to be hugely detrimental and I fear for their health and wellbeing long term. I don't want to dance around the fact that proposing to close Langley is quite blatantly a move of convenience given that there is political pressure to fund and develop SEND schools. Woodlawn develops out of the Langley grounds and now amongst the public it looks like it is wanting to push

Langley out to expand into its buildings. Metaphorically biting off the hand that fed it. What I don't understand is that there is now a redundant educational site and Monkseaton High School that is not being used. If the council wants to centralise SEND education under one roof and expand it then why not use that site? The grounds are huge and the facilities would more than accommodate all the taxis and disabled transport that is required for SEND pupils.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 09:13 PM

I am a parent of two children [redacted] I did not, do not, and never have had any intention of sending my children there. Langley was my first choice, despite being geographically further for me to go. The Schools Out Northern childcare is of utmost importance, and losing Langley would mean losing one of the few flexible childcare options locally. If the merger is to go ahead, I would absolutely still not send my children to Appletree. [redacted] I would be more than happy and able to home school.

Screen Name Redacted
11/09/2025 09:40 PM

A member if my family has worked at Langley for done years and I have come to recognise the value of school community and reliable surrounding and environment for children of all abilities. This school represents these in spades. To disrupt this equilibrium fir these pupils and hard working staff would be detrimental to all involved

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 09:58 AM

There are several inaccuracies published in the consultation documents, including (but not limited to): ● Projected pupil numbers ● Deficit forecasting ● Inaccuracies in pupil data at other schools ● There has been no community impact assessment done in relation to the closure of Langley First School. A community impact assessment was done in December 2024 but this was in relation to the Monkseaton High School closure. ● Neither early years provision nor wraparound provision have been considered as part of this consultation ● No governing body or senior manager of 'School's Out' (out of hours provision) at Langley has been contacted as part of external communication. As yet, the council has offered no assurance about how the Langley children could be safely accommodated on the site - this is worrying for my child's future learning ● Nor has it given us any assurance on class sizes. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, there is a concern amongst us that our children will be placed in larger class sizes, which could have an adverse affect on their education and wellbeing. Ultimately Langley is a thriving school where my child is doing well in, it has a strong community feel, nurturing and goes above and beyond offering children an amazing

start to their education, it certainly feels like this proposal has been rushed with flaws and not taking into account parental choice and ultimately the emotional well being of the children involved and how this will impact them greatly.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 11:13 AM

N/A

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 12:28 PM

Formal Objection to the Proposed Closure of Langley First School To Whom It May Concern: Subject: Statutory Objection to the Proposed Closure of Langley First School I wish to formally object to the proposal to close Langley First School under Section 16 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006, and to request that North Tyneside Council undertake a lawful and evidence-based reconsideration of this proposal. My objection is grounded on the following key issues: 1. Failure to Conduct Due Diligence and Ensure Accuracy of Data The documentation presented to Cabinet and the public consultation contains demonstrable factual inaccuracies and omissions that materially undermine the validity of the decision-making process. Specifically: - The council's documentation incorrectly states that Langley lacks accessible playing fields, when in fact the school has an adjacent, regularly used field and outdoor learning spaces. - The claim that Langley is in financial deficit is false. The school has never been in deficit and only projects a potential shortfall in 2025–26, for which corrective financial advice is already being sought. - Pupil number projections and capacity figures for both Langley and Appletree are inconsistent with published data on the DfE and gov.uk websites. Appletree's stated capacity is 293, not 432 as claimed by the council. Decisions of this magnitude must be based on accurate, verifiable data. Proceeding on the basis of erroneous information breaches the council's Public Sector Equality Duty and its duty to make rational decisions under Administrative Law principles of Wednesbury reasonableness. 2. Inadequate Consideration of Statutory and Community Impacts The council has not conducted an adequate Community Impact Assessment specific to this proposal, as required by statutory guidance (School Organisation: Maintained Schools, Annex B). The December 2024 impact assessment related to the Monkseaton High closure is irrelevant to this distinct proposal. Furthermore, there has been: - No assessment of the impact on early years provision or wraparound care. - No consultation with the providers of these services, contrary to the statutory requirement to consider the wider community effects. - No environmental or traffic impact assessment, despite clear evidence that relocating pupils to Appletree would significantly increase car journeys and congestion on a major bus route. 3. Insufficient Pupil Places and Building Constraints The council has provided no credible evidence that Appletree Gardens can safely and legally accommodate all displaced

Langley pupils. Published data confirms Appletree's capacity is 293 pupils, yet the combined roll of both schools exceeds this. Early years class sizes cannot exceed 30 pupils by law (Infant Class Size Regulations 2012), and without assurances on class organisation, there is a clear risk of non-compliance. Appletree's higher operational cost per square metre (£29 vs Langley's £4) also raises serious value-for-money concerns. Until the council can produce an independent verification of capacity and cost feasibility, the proposal cannot lawfully proceed. 4. Failure to Properly Assess Educational Need and Demographics The council's justification relies heavily on falling birth rates, yet the Office for National Statistics projects that rates will stabilise and begin rising again from 2026. Local migration patterns show that North Tyneside continues to experience net inward migration of families with young children. The Murton Gap development, providing 3,000 new homes, will generate substantial demand for school places within this catchment. The council's own Local Plan acknowledges this. By ignoring both national projections and local housing data, the council has failed to demonstrate that closure is a proportionate or forward-looking response. 5. Predetermination and Conflicted Motives It appears that the decision to close Langley has been influenced by the desire to repurpose the site for expansion of Woodlawn School. While the need for additional SEND provision is recognised, it is unlawful to make such a decision without first establishing whether the existing site is suitable or whether alternative solutions exist. Bundling two unrelated policy objectives (mainstream school rationalisation and SEND expansion) risks breaching the requirement for fair and transparent consultation under the Gunning Principles — namely, that a proposal must be at a formative stage and not a foregone conclusion. 6. Financial Inconsistency and Unequal Treatment The council's own documents show that: - Coquet Park First School operates at a structural deficit and depends on an expensive PFI contract until 2032. - Langley, by contrast, is financially stable and only projects a temporary shortfall. It is therefore irrational and potentially discriminatory to close a viable, community-focused school while retaining one that is known to be financially unsustainable. 7. Breach of Statutory Guidance on School Amalgamations The current proposal is a closure and transfer, not a true merger, which would require approval from the Office of the Schools Adjudicator and the Secretary of State. The council's choice of the "simpler" process undermines transparency and removes independent oversight. Given the strength of community opposition and the inaccuracies identified, this proposal should be reclassified as a merger of equals, triggering statutory external review. Conclusion For the reasons above, I submit that: - The council has failed to follow lawful process and has relied on demonstrably inaccurate data; - The consultation does not meet statutory or procedural fairness standards; - The decision to close Langley First School is premature, irrational, and contrary to both local need and the council's own policy

objectives. Accordingly, I request that: 1. The proposal to close Langley First School be withdrawn pending independent review of the data, projections, and site feasibility assessments; 2. A new, transparent process be undertaken that includes a full community impact assessment, verified capacity data, and external oversight by the Office of the Schools Adjudicator. [redacted]

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 01:26 PM

This would reduce individual care for my family, and child soon to apply for reception at Langley first school. Merging schools would affect parents as it would remove choices, and increase commute times.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 02:27 PM

The proposed merger will affect our grandchildren. Whilst I understand the need to look closely at finances and pupil roll it does appear that Landley has been consistently achieving good outcomes with pupils. Better unless I am mistaken than Appletree Gardens. You describe this as a merger but it is effectively a takeover by Appletree as their head and staff are to remain in post. If this was truly a merger and what I think would have been accepted better, is for all staff at both schools to be given notice and then invited to apply for a job at the new merged school. The introduction of a new Head Teacher who has no allegiances with either school would have given some comfort at impartiality going forward. This would also apply to Governors. Will the governors remain as they are at Appletree I wonder. Doing it this way there would not be any increase in redundancy costs as the same number would be displaced but it would help to make sure the best staff were retained and there would be a more even split of teachers which would help children settle in to the new site. You could even consider a switch of heads with another school so that again it is someone new with no previous allegiances or immovable views on what should be happening. Someone with experience of setting up a new school would be ideal. I am sorry but the way this is being handled is far from impartial and will naturally create objections from Langley parents who see it as a takeover and anything but a merger! There is still time for the Council to rethink the way this is being done and reduce the resistance to the change and I would like to hope be considered with any other "mergers" in the Borough!

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 05:41 PM

First of all we feel it is disingenuous of the council to call this a ‘merger’ when the objective is clearly to close Langley. As Appletree does not have the capacity to take more than a fraction of Langley pupils it has left parents very worried about these proposals. [redacted]

[redacted] One of the main reasons for moving into Monkseaton was to be in Langleys catchment which is without doubt an excellent school. Both boys are happy, secure and very settled there. Moving to Appletree school would have the following disadvantages 1. An extremely busy road would have to be crossed. Even with the pelican crossing it is stilla dangerous road . 2. There is a lack of car parking at Appletree school and consequently far more inconvenience for parents dropping off and residents. Working parents will not have the luxury of walking their children to school. 3. The ‘merger’ will mean the wraparound childcare is inferior at Appletree and I doubt it would have to capacity for the extra intake. Langley first school does not have a history of being in deficit and measures are in place to see if shortfalls can be rectified there. The falling birth rate has been calculated over a very short term sample period of 5 years. It is difficult to believe that a falling birth rate will continue in the light of all the new house building currently going on and indeed being forced upon local authorities to meet the proposed 1.5 million homes over the 5 years of the Parliament. To close schools when they cost millions of pounds to build is a very short term solution to possibly what is a temporary problem.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 06:00 PM

The merger reduces choice for children in the local area and results in the closure of a very good school in the local area. This level of performance is likely to be impacted as the schools come together. Children I know of, will have their education further disrupted.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 07:42 PM

There are three children in this family which it would affect . They are perfectly happy where they are but disruption changing classes,possibly bigger classes could change that. Also logistics of getting there and back further away

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 07:46 PM

I absolutely do not support the proposed closure of our local school! I have two children, aged 7 and 4, who currently attend. We are fortunate to live close enough to walk each day — this not only benefits their health and wellbeing but also helps build strong connections within our local community. We moved back to the area in 2021 when my daughter was 3 and I was pregnant with my son as we knew Langley was where we wanted to send both of our children. We didn’t view any other schools. One of the main reasons in your proposal is falling birth rates. Whilst there is no denying the downward trend in birthrates throughout North Tyneside up to 2023, the Office for National Statistics predicts that birth rates will level off from 2026 and then begin to increase again. The council have not considered internal migration for this consultation. The office for

National statistics shows more young people move into North Tyneside than out of it. Families move to the coast specifically for the 3-tier system. I attended Langley myself which was another reason we moved back as wanted my children to go through the 3 tier system. The North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 also contradicts the rationale for closing Langley due to falling birth rates as it states: “Net inward migration from neighbouring areas, primarily Newcastle, helps to sustain the overall working age population and limits the fall in the number of children in the borough” What methodology has been used when looking at pupil projection? The council has forecast pupil numbers well beyond 2030. Where have these figures come from? The projection figures also appear to be inaccurate. The council projects 59 pupils starting in 2025 in Reception in Langley, which drops by six students to 53 in Year 1. There is no explanation of this and no indication from parents in this year group of their intention to leave In comparison, Appletree appears to gain 18 students between Reception to Year 1, again with no explanation as to where these additional students have come from and not in line with the school’s admission records. If you correct these figures, you can see that in 2030 (the acceptable time frame for pupil projections) Langley surplus is projected to be 14% surplus - only 4% away from the council’s acceptable level - whereas Appletree’s surplus is projected to be almost double at 34%. Within the proposal it states one of the main issues is the capacity at Whitely Bay High school which is currently 390. You think the closure is going to stop the school going over capacity? But based on your methodology, from the current reception onwards, it is unlikely the numbers of pupils at WBHS will reach 390. Therefore, focusing on ensuring numbers don’t exceed this figure are misguided This issue you are saying you are trying fix relates to children already in the system, rather than future pupil projections, particularly the current year 2 and year 5 year groups. Closing Langley will not tackle this issue. Again, the council is only looking at the short-term financial gain. If the school were to close, we would be forced to drive to the new location. This would increase traffic congestion around the new school site, add to local pollution, and make daily routines far more stressful for families like ours. It would also remove the independence and sense of belonging that walking to school provides for young children. Our Daughter is currently in year 2 and will be forced to spend her last year of primary school in a new environment with teachers she does not know and possible larger class sizes. You have not yet offered assurance on how the children in Langley can be safely accommodated in Appletree or give us assurance the class sizes will not exceed 30. This would have a huge impact on my daughter’s wellbeing who already struggles with anxiety when it comes to change. My partner and I have discussed at length what we would do, and we are prepared to take our daughter out of school for 1 year and homeschool before she starts Middle School. This is something many

parents are looking into. Implementing this in 2027 would mean disrupting the largest cohorts of pupils currently moving through the system. If this closure is to go ahead, a far more logical approach is to at least wait until the smaller birth-rate cohorts are in the schools. Why is this being rushed through? All schools within the North east Planning Area are currently full for my daughter's year group, apart from Appletree Gardens, which we understand currently has two spaces . A merger with Appletree would mean 118 children in year 4. The majority of parents that live in catchment to Appletree do not send their children there. Our 4-year-old son, [redacted] is due to start Reception in September, and this decision will completely disrupt his start to school life. The closure would mean having to manage two separate school drop-offs and pick-ups, which is simply not possible for our family. We can not afford to pay for more days of breakfast club or afterschool club. We are not prepared to move him to Apple Tree, as this is not a school we would consider for our children. [redacted] has already been integrated into his current school — he has lunch in the hall, plays in the yard, and knows many of the teachers and children. He feels settled, confident, and excited to begin his education there. Forcing him to start somewhere new will cause unnecessary stress and anxiety. The proposal does not appear to take into account the impact on wrap-around care and early years provision. These services are vital for working families and younger children, yet they seem to have been overlooked in the planning. We put our children in breakfast club 2 days a week from 7:30am. After doing some of own research and speaking to Little Pips at Appletree provision provides childcare from 7.45am-5.30pm (4.30pm for nursery children). This is a significant time difference for working parents when schools out runs from 7:30am – 6pm. Schools Out Northern at Langley First School also provides day care services, allowing parents to have one drop off and collection for their children from 9 months until 9 years; Little Pips provides from aged 2. Schools Out Northern at Langley First School provides holiday provision for all school holidays apart from Christmas from 8am-5.30pm Monday-Friday. Little Pips provides holiday provision from 8am-5pm Monday-Thursday and 8am-3.30pm on Fridays. The traffic around Appletree is a massive concern. It is already very busy with little to no parking. How are you going to deal with this? Has the council looked at the traffic impact of this if these proposals go ahead? I currently walk my children to school then walk back to my car and go to work in Longbenton via Backworth as the traffic along Seatonville Road/ Foxhunters is already so bad. I know this is the same for many parents. In the past Fire engines have not been able to get through for cars parked on the street at Apple Tree. This is a major concern for us as parents when dropping off our children. This isn't going to be a safe environment for them. Langley currently closes the street outside school every morning to make it safer for the children. Appletree cannot close the street to cars in the mornings or at

collection times due to it being on a bus route. I am also deeply concerned about the potential for higher class sizes and reduced individual attention for students. My children thrive in a smaller, nurturing environment where staff know them well — something that could be lost if they are moved to a larger setting. Overall, I believe the closure would have a massively negative impact on my children's wellbeing and the wider community. I urge decision-makers to reconsider this proposal and explore alternatives that preserve local access to education, community identity, and family-friendly support.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 08:45 PM

One of our children would need to move from Langley to Appletree. Class sizes are a concern as are teaching staff if none are trained from Langley.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 08:46 PM

My children attended langley first school in the 1990's. Now both my grandchildren attend. Langley always has and always will be a massive part of my families past, present and future. A fantastic school with brilliant, dedicated staff. An integral part of the local community.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 08:52 PM

The current proposal means that my daughter and my younger son would have to attend two different schools for at least a year which is logistically impossible. My timings are already tight for getting to work on time and if this was an even busier period I'd have to request to change my hours. My children couldn't both get to and from school on time if they attended different settings. Our current walk to langley is along a closed road with no traffic but to access appletree we'd have to cross seatonville road in rush hour, as well as navigate all the parked vehicles and taxis around woodlawn. We rely heavily on the extended wraparound and holiday provision provided at langley and appletree does not currently offer the same hours. My children would be disrupted by losing their close knit school community, especially my y2 child who would move for a year and then move again to middle school. This is too much disruption on children that have already been impacted by the pandemic. As a resident I'm also concerned about the extra traffic and parking around both langley and appletree and navigating that with young children, as well as the pollution aspect. I do not want my child being taught in classrooms that don't meet the required size and in classes bigger than the classes they are in now (due to the lack of upper limit on ks2 classes) this compromises the standard of education available to her. Appletree would not be my second choice but none of the other first schools have a space in y2, removing my parental choice to choose the best provision for my child.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 09:07 PM

As a parent of a child at Langley First School, I am concerned that the proposed merger could cause unnecessary disruption for pupils and families when both schools are performing well and financially stable. My child is settled and happy at Langley. The school has a strong sense of community and a caring environment that supports children's confidence and progress. Moving pupils to the Appletree Gardens site could increase travel time and parking pressure, making walking or cycling to school more difficult for many families in the Langley area. It would also mean leaving behind a familiar and nurturing environment that children feel safe in. Staff relationships, routines, and friendships would all be disrupted for reasons that appear to be based mainly on projections several years into the future. A federation model would achieve many of the Council's goals without closing a valued school, while giving time to confirm whether pupil numbers really do fall as forecast.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 09:09 PM

My sons do not cope well with change, and a move to another school would deeply affect them. They find overcrowded and noisy environments very difficult, so adding around 300 more pupils to the existing school would make dinner halls and classrooms much louder and more overwhelming for them. [redacted]
A merger would mean even more crowded classrooms, which would inevitably affect the quality of their education. [redacted] He has built strong, trusting relationships with his teachers and support staff, which helps him feel safe and confident in his learning. I am very concerned that he would not receive the same level of support and understanding in a much larger, overcrowded school. The uncertainty around the proposed merger has already affected my children's mental health — they have been worrying about losing their friends and teachers, whom they care deeply about. Our current school is within walking distance from our home, allowing us to maintain a healthy lifestyle by walking daily. If the merger goes ahead, we would have to drive, as it would not be safe for the children to cross the busy main roads. There would also be a financial impact. We paid £10,000 over the asking price for our home specifically because of its proximity to a brilliant local school. If the school closes, demand for houses in the area will likely drop, reducing property values and affecting our equity. Finally, I would need to change my working hours to manage longer drop-offs and pick-ups, as I would not send my children to Appletree School. For all of these reasons, I strongly oppose the proposed merger.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 09:13 PM

This proposal has already caused significant distress to my family and many others in our community. As a parent of three young children,

the potential closure would create an impossible situation for us. I would be faced with three separate drop-offs and pick-ups, forcing me to drive rather than walk, which would increase both traffic congestion and pollution in the area. The roads surrounding Appletree Gardens are already extremely congested, with previous complaints—including from the fire service—raising safety concerns about access. Our family deliberately chose to move to Monkseaton and pay a premium for our home because of Langley First School. It is a key part of why we chose this area, as it is for many other families. We have one child currently attending Langley and two younger children whom we hoped would follow. The sense of community and the quality of education at Langley are central to our lives and to the character of this area. The data clearly shows that a far higher percentage of families living in the Langley catchment area send their children to Langley than those in the Appletree area sending theirs to Appletree. There are valid reasons for this: Langley is the preferred and trusted school for local families. Appletree Gardens simply does not have the capacity to accommodate all Langley pupils. For example, my son's year group (Year 2) is already at full capacity, so moving him for one final year before middle school makes no sense. Such disruption would have a negative impact on children's emotional wellbeing, social development, and education. Currently, all schools within the North East Planning Area (NEPA) are full for this year group except Appletree Gardens, which reportedly has only two spaces. A merger would result in 118 children in Year 4 alone, yet the council has provided no details on proposed class sizes. While legislation limits early years classes to 30 pupils, there is no such safeguard for older children, leaving us deeply concerned that our children may be placed in overly large classes, to the detriment of their learning and wellbeing. Implementing a merger in 2027 would be particularly ill-judged, as it would disrupt the largest cohorts currently moving through the system. If such a merger were ever to take place, it would be far more logical to wait until the smaller birth-rate cohorts reach these year groups. The consultation appears to rely heavily on the argument of declining birth rates, but this is misleading. The Year 1 and Reception cohorts were born during the COVID-19 pandemic, a period of global uncertainty which should not be used as a reliable data point. Furthermore, while there has been a downward trend in birth rates up to 2023, the Office for National Statistics predicts that rates will stabilise from 2026 and begin to rise thereafter. Despite falling birth rates since 2008, the majority of NEPA schools have remained within the council's acceptable surplus range since 2020. Internal migration has also not been properly accounted for—data from the ONS shows that more young families move into North Tyneside than leave, particularly to coastal areas, specifically to benefit from the three-tier school system. A survey conducted by the Friends of Langley found that 58% of respondents (from 185 responses) moved to this area specifically to send their children to

Langley First School, with a further 3% planning to move for the same reason. The council's own North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 supports this pattern, stating: "Net inward migration from neighbouring areas, primarily Newcastle, helps to sustain the overall working age population and limits the fall in the number of children in the borough." This directly contradicts the rationale for closing Langley based on birth rate decline. Meanwhile, Appletree Gardens has had an average 23% surplus capacity over the past five years, suggesting the issue lies not with excess capacity overall, but with uneven distribution and parental choice. Langley's wraparound and holiday provision also plays a vital role in the community. It is the only service in the area offering care from as early as nine months, allowing siblings to attend together during holidays. It provides flexible booking options and significantly longer hours than comparable local providers, such as Little Pips. The council admitted that it had not taken early years or wraparound provision into account in its consultation, and at the Whitley Bay High School meeting, officers could give no assurance about how these services would be replaced. This is deeply concerning, as hundreds of families across North Tyneside rely on this provision, not only those with children attending Langley. Langley First School is far more than just a school —it is the heart of our community. Its closure would have wide-reaching consequences, not only for current pupils and families but for the future of Monkseaton as a family-oriented area. I strongly urge the council to reconsider this proposal and to work collaboratively with the community to find a sustainable solution that protects the quality of education, wellbeing, and cohesion that Langley provides.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 09:21 PM

Langley First is an excellent school with a holistic ethos that supports academic achievement and personal development. Their take on oracy is fantastic and their way of nurturing maths, history, science is excellent. They include outdoor learning brilliantly and have a great reputation for including SEND children. I have a lot of trust in the teachers. My child is year 2 and will bear the brunt of the changes. You are disingenuous in your information by not stating that his year are facing enormous class sizes if they are meant to be taught in Apple tree. This will cause significantly poorer education. As you have not said the class sizes you expect, I can only assume that you know that they will be very large and this will be shared after the consultation has closed. This is another reason wnt the closure should not go ahead as you have set out - there is no parental trust that our children's education will not suffer and that they will be treated as a sacrificial year. We are also not being given enough information on the changes to the middle school places. If they are being reduced and one school removed, how do we know if our children will have a place? I do not agree that the large amounts of housing being built at Murton Gap won't bring in larger numbers of

children. I moved from out of area for better quality of life, including good schools so my child will not have been counted in your birth rate. The houses at Murton Gap are large family homes - this is who will buy them. The proposal for the development states that 748 additional primary school places will be needed and a large number of these will live nearer to Langley and apple tree. I believe you are treating Langley as the sacrifice for temporary savings, especially when there have been so many inaccuracies such as claiming they have to cross a road to get to a field, claiming deficit which is untrue and then writing your documents to imply that Langley has a similar lack of pupil numbers to apple tree when it is in fact within acceptable limits. No community impact assessment has been done around closing Langley - making the six week consultation period even more insulting. I have real concerns around the wraparound offer. Without this, my partner or I would need to reduce work hours, a huge financial hit. Apple tree offers wraparound for a reduced age group and for less time. How does this support working parents? I am concerned at the 15% non attendance rate at Apple tree. There are either issues in the local community or there are children who are not being supported and therefore cannot attend. This suggests a negative effect on my own child's experience, made even more concerning as he is year 2, the most affected year. There is nothing in your proposal to make me think he will have the same quality of education if you continue with your plans and there is certainly nothing to make me believe that you recognise the issue here. Your plans for Woodlawn involve moving over post 16 children, which implies no additional places for these children, just single site. While I can see that this has some benefits, not offering additional SEND places is not persuasive of closing a good school, especially as this school has an excellent reputation for including children who may not have an EHCP but do need an inclusive environment. I know of two parents who actively moved their children to Langley after poor experiences in other schools. Only 44% of catchment children attend apple tree so why is Langley the school being closed and not even merged? Why would you break up the ethos approach and success of a school for a school that is far less chosen? Langley is the more stable school in terms of choice and population. Your forecasts are supposed to be based on a pupil projection methodology but you have provided no link. The National Pupil Projection Model only goes to 2030 but you have managed to project way beyond this. Where are you getting your information and why have you not shared your source? Your figures are also inaccurate in Apple trees favour and against Langley. Closing Langley does not solve your concerns about Whitley bay high places - plus based on your own methodology, Whitley bay will not reach these numbers. Apple tree has lots of space for breakfast out for SEN children. All of this will be needed for mainstream classea if the merger goes ahead. These children will also be in huge class groups, which I am worried about enough for

my own child, never mind what this means for SEND children. Woodlawn and Langley could work in tandem, allowing mainstream access for pupils and therapies as needed, with all children benefiting from a diverse school population and a nurturing ethos. The whole way this consultation is being managed feels disrespectful and built.to silence the community rather than have us heard and feel part of decisions. I am very very concerned about my child's last year at first school, that it will be chaos with insufficient attention from teachers, no matter how good or enthusiastic they are, and not enough time or attention to cope with all the anxiety and upheaval for the children. Nothing in the proposal gives me any comfort on this, especially your inability to address the huge issue of current year 2 being a bulge year so if Langley is closed, apple tree will somehow be teaching a huge number.of.children, far larger cohorts than any of their.teacher have delay with before. This is being very much elided plus I have no idea what.our middle school option will be. I have no trust in the process or you.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 09:26 PM

Appletree Gardens is a large site with lots of outdoor play areas, it's a wonderful school with great staff and a stable team. Merging the schools makes sense in the context of the falling birth rate. If the decision had gone the other way, ie to absorb Appletree into Langley, I know our parents and staff would feel upset and want to save our school. I am sure there are many wonderful things to save from Langley and I am confident that the team at Appletree will work their hardest to ensure that the essence of Langley, the reasons that it is loved by the community, will be properly integrated into Appletree However, I think it makes sense to expand rather than move Woodlawn, even just on the basis it would be more disruptive to that community than it would to either Langley or Appletree pupils to move schools. I am so pleased that this exercise is being done so that the school teams can really understand what is important to the Langley community and ensure it is honoured in the process. But I don't see how anything other than a merger for Langley and Appletree can work

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 09:32 PM

My child is currently in year 2 at Langley (a full cohort). Closing Langley and moving to another first school for 1 year before transitioning again to middle school the following year would be highly disruptive. We specifically chose Langley rather than Appletree gardens as our preference and feel Langley has a much more favourable reputation. All schools are currently full for this year group apart from Appletree which currently has 2 spaces. As yet, the council has not provided any information as to what class sizes would look like for this cohort should they merge, which is a huge concern. Implementing the merger in 2027 would mean disrupting the largest

cohorts of pupils currently moving through the school system. A more logical approach would be to wait until the smaller birth rate cohorts are in the schools. The council has offered no assurances about how Langley children could safely be accommodated on site or what SEN provision would look like. We live a couple of streets away from Langley with no need to cross a major road and our children can safely walk to school. If the proposal goes ahead this will mean crossing a main road to get to Appletree and possibly using cars to allow drop off on route to work given the further distance/time. Langley closes the street outside school every morning to make it safer for children. Appletree cannot close its street due to being on a bus route. No evidence has been provided in the supporting documents in relation to traffic impact as a result of the proposals. Wrap around and holiday provision is something that as working parents with no family locally we rely upon. The council have offered no assurances around continued provision if a merger takes place. Without this provision this would potentially have a huge impact on our working lives. Many other local provisions do not offer the longer hours that Schools Out offers. I am also concerned that initial documentation sent to the councils cabinet contained a number of inaccuracies including the provision of the school field. The school does have a field adjacent to the building which is used on a daily basis with no need to cross a road. Also, there has been no community impact assessment done on the closure of Langley first school. I do not believe that Langley is the right school to choose for closure it has a fabulous reputation and there are other local schools in greater financial difficulty e.g Coquet. However if the proposals were to go ahead it would feel much fairer for this to be a true merger with a school with a new name, ethos ,uniform and keeping some staff from both sites and to wait until the larger cohorts have moved through the school causing less disruption.

Screen Name Redacted

11/10/2025 09:47 PM

[redacted] We have been so impressed with the ethos, culture and education at the school that even when we moved house to Southridge catchment, we still chose to send our youngest to Langley. Our children have all become even better young people by attending this school. My oldest children have said the ‘Langley children’ stand out at their middle school as being ‘really lovely’. I feel so passionately about the need to keep this school open and not destroy such a special community which has been built up over years and by a group of dedicated and professional staff who clearly love their jobs. The headteacher and staff are outstanding and deeply care for the students and are clearly happy working at the school. The disregard shown to the staff through these proposals is a disgrace. I feel Langley has been

targeted unfairly and that the proposals have been based on incorrect information and do not take account of all relevant factors. If the proposals were to go ahead, this would result in my daughter Moving schools twice in the space of one year. She would attend Appletree in Year 4 of September 2027 and then would move to Middle school in September 2028. She would be in a school which we didn't choose, with teachers she doesn't know and in an over-crowded environment. My daughter's year group is full at Langley (60 students) and the same year group in Appletree is almost full (around 57 students). The current capacity of Appletree Gardens Primary School is 293 (as per government website) but the move would mean there would be 407 students in the school in 2027, 39% over the given capacity. At the parent's information evening hosted by North Tyneside Council, the issue of how they plan to host all the children from both schools at Appletree - the answer given was 'to build an extension or something'. To spend money building extensions to a school to solve a short term issue feels like a complete misuse of public money. I find this extremely disappointing and upsetting that it was felt that this is an acceptable answer. We were told that these were just proposals and that they were not 'allowed. How can you propose to close a school without a plan for where the displaced students would go - especially proposing to close a school which is operating at the acceptable level of 10% surplus resulting in a large cohort of students needing to be displaced? Of course this would be an emotive and sensitive topic which results in extreme anxiety for parents and children and the lack of this consideration has exacerbated this anxiety. We used to live across the road from Appletree Gardens First School but still chose to send our children to Langley.When we viewed both schools, the difference was significant and we both decided that it was worth sending our children to the school which was furthest due to these differences. We loved the bright, airy classrooms at Langley and we were impressed by the calm learning environment. The classrooms at Appletree were messy and there was a child crying in the lesson which was just ignored by the teacher. [redacted] I can speak from first hand experience from seeing it every day that the traffic is awful outside Appletree. Bear in mind Appletree has significant surplus so with a 136% cohort this will be significantly worse. Appletree Gardens First School entrance is on a bus route. The buses often end up driving on the pavement to get past parked cars. I used to get people parking across from my driveway and when I politely asked them to move so I could either get out of my drive or to park on my drive, I often got verbally abuse in return. This situation will be amplified if there are to be an additional few students added to Appletree's roll. We will have to drive to drop my daughter off since we live over a

mile away from Appletree and it wouldn't be practical to walk there and then walk back to get to work on time. I really don't know where we will park. I really don't think the Council have considered this issue at all. I deeply fear how unsettling the move will be and I am extremely disappointed at the disregard the Council have shown towards the children who will be affected by the proposals especially for those children with SEND. My daughter loves Langley. She enjoys school, is resilient and academic and I fear how she will cope with this disruption. I couldn't imagine the disruption this would cause to students who have additional needs and who find change particularly challenging. There are currently no spaces in any other First School in my daughter's year group. If this proposal goes ahead my daughter would be put into a school that not only we didn't choose but one that we actively chose not to send our children to. There will be no other options for her locally.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 10:14 PM

As a parent of a child currently in Year 2 at Langley First School, I feel deeply concerned about the possibility of the school being closed or merged. My son is thriving at Langley — not just academically, but emotionally and socially. He feels safe, supported, and genuinely happy to go to school each day. That's something you can't put a price on. Langley isn't just a school to us — it's part of our family's story. My wife attended Langley as a child, and so did our older daughter. Both of them flourished there, thanks to the warm, nurturing environment and the exceptional standard of teaching. The staff at Langley don't just teach — they care. They know the children, they understand their needs, and they create a space where every child feels valued. To disrupt that — especially for children like my son who are right in the middle of their early education — would be incredibly damaging. These are formative years, and the relationships he's built with his teachers and classmates are crucial to his development. A merger would risk unsettling that stability and breaking the continuity that's so important at this age. Langley is clearly a school that families trust. Over 70% of children in the catchment choose it, and even families from Appletree Gardens are opting for Langley because they recognise the quality of teaching and care. That speaks volumes. Please don't take away a school that's working so well for so many. Keep Langley open. Keep the staff who make it what it is. And let children like my son continue to grow in a place that truly puts their wellbeing and education first.

Screen Name Redacted
11/10/2025 10:27 PM

I strongly reject the councils plans to merge Langley First School and Appletree. [redacted]

[redacted]

The choice to move here was underpinned by our desire to walk our children to school, and to have them grow up with friends nearby, to have access to a solid community base where parents know each other and can rely on each other. [redacted] and what I've seen from our new community has completely validated our choice to move here. What we've seen from the council on the other hand, seeks to undermine all of that. We knew that taking on our property in this area, while being challenging in the short term, secured us financially for the foreseeable. We made financial projections which gave us home security: a property with a little room to grow, but with the confidence that a house on this street, in this particular area, with safer roads and access to good schooling, would sell comfortably in the future. Having Langley close could potentially affect house prices on these streets, especially with the proposal to extend Woodlawn, creating more traffic from out of area children in taxis. These are quiet, narrow streets that cannot support a rise in traffic to the area. Has an assessment of this nature been carried out when considering parking and accessibility in this regard? I question whether the council has actually considered this aspect, in regards to local residents- aside from parents from the school- who don't have children or a vested interest in keeping the school open. On the point of extending Woodlawn into the Langley site, I have some issues that seem obvious to everyone but the council: The consultation outlines the intention for the council to repurpose the Langley site and move the post-16 provision from Marden High School (32 children in total according to Ofsted), thereby displacing 300 children for the benefit of 32 children. But by bundling the two issues - the alleged need to close a school with the need to expand Woodlawn - the council is effectively creating a false choice: asking the community to accept a suboptimal and unstable mainstream solution in exchange for a desirable SEND solution. I agree with the Save Langley campaign that the long-term health of the mainstream school system should not be compromised to solve a logistical problem for SEND provision, however important that provision may be. [redacted] While I see this as a personal problem, rather than the councils problem, my aim here is to state that a number of people move from out of area to this part of Monkseaton so they have the best chance of sending their kids to Langley First School. This is not to mention that 12% of children from the Appletree catchment go to Langley instead; showing a clear preference for Langley. Sending our kids to Appletree also undermines our decision to move here: we would have to cross the incredibly busy and unsafe Seatonville Road, then Bromley Avenue, to walk them to school, all at rush hour. This point also undermines the councils argument in relation to 'crossing a

road for field access,' when in reality, "merging" these schools will drive more children across unsafe routes to go to school. While the council promotes healthy lifestyles and celebrates walking to school, they are actively creating an environment whereby parents are forced to drive their kids to school just to get them there on time. If I had to send my children to Appletree, I foresee the car being utilised more on late mornings, or to avoid crossing busy traffic. At this point in time, Langley currently closes the street outside school every morning to make it safer for our children, which is a huge factor for us as local residents too. Appletree cannot close the street to cars in the mornings or at collection times due to it being on a bus route. This is not encouraging. Langley also has a free public car park very close by, which Appletree Gardens does not have. On the point of a "merger," I also take umbridge. This proposal is not a merger but a closure. Langley would cease to exist, with no security for staffing, no retention of school ethos and Appletree keeping their DfE number whilst Langley would be stripped of theirs. This is only a merger in respect of the children joining the classroom of another school and nothing more. To close a school that has been open for decades, without any transition time, is truly shocking. I have seen that the current consultation has already created divides within our community in this regard, effectively pitting one school against another, which are unhelpful. Both schools are good schools, it’s not fair to penalise one over the other. A true merger should mean both schools - and most importantly the children - could have an input into a new school’s name, ethos, uniform etc and would mean we could keep the best bits from both schools, including staff. It would also make the transition smoother for the children. The requirement to ask permission from additional routes (the Secretary of State and then final approval from the Office of Schools Adjudicator) increases the scrutiny over the decision making process, which I see can only be a good thing, especially if the interest here is truly on making our childrens education better. At the end of the day, this should be about doing the right thing, not the easier thing. Surely if we want to get this right for our children, we shouldn’t be rushing the process. Given Langley isn’t yet in deficit (as incorrectly stated in the councils proposals) why does it matter that it will take longer? I am also concerned that not enough information has been considered when it comes to placing Langley children in Appletree: only two of the proposed thirteen classrooms at Appletree meet the government guidance of 62m2 for 30 reception children and 52m2 for 30 KS1+. I am concerned as a parent that this is not a safe environment for any child to learn in. Langley however have 10 of 11 classrooms that exceed this guidance. Would it not make more sense to join Appletree with Langley, and have a more solid, long-term plan to ensure childrens education comes first? The council’s consultation document says Appletree “can accommodate 432 pupils, which is more than the amount of both schools combined when future birth

rates and admission numbers are adjusted". However on the gov.uk website states the capacity of Appletree as being 293. As yet I understand the campaign has received no clarification on this. The council has also offered zero assurance about how the Langley children could be safely accommodated on the site, which troubles me greatly as a parent. There has also been no assurance I can see on class sizes. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, I am concerned that our children will be placed in larger class sizes, which could have an adverse affect on their education and wellbeing. While we are at the beginning of our school journey with our young family, and there is a lot to understand, I understand this: closing a school with such a fantastic local reputation is deplorable. I find the councils actions here to be underhand and manipulative. There has been little effort to include the schools in the conversation, effectively forcing them into a short window of time to create alternative proposals inside of while this has been in the councils planning books for months. While our government speaks on prioritising childrens education, it seems the council has proposed something that seems clean on paper but in reality does not prioritise the childrens welfare first and foremost. I will be sending my daughters to Langley, and if the strength of this community and campaign is anything to go by, [redacted]

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 06:34 AM

[redacted] and I strongly oppose the proposal to close Langley first school. [redacted], one lesson was constant: where a community identity and belonging are strong, anti social behaviour falls: where they are weakens disorder rises. Schools like Langley are anchors of community life, they are places where children, parents staff and neighbours form the everyday relationships that prevent problems before they start. Removing such an anchor risks fraying the social fabric that keeps our streets safe and our young people supported. [redacted] The papers suggest Langley lacks an on site playing field. (it does had one) imply the school is already in financial deficit.(it has only projected a possible deficit in 2025/26 and is actively addressing it), and claim many families already attending Langley could reach apple tree gardens without crossing major roads, assertions that anyone familiar with the area will know to be untrue with seaton like road or cualdeell lane , likely likely r route for most families. From a community safety perspective, the practical risks are clear. Applyree sits on a bus route and lacks a nearby unlicensed car park. Shifting

families there would increase traffic pressure and peak time hazzards. Langley by contrast benefits from street closures at drop off and pick up and has parking provision nearby, a safer arrangement that reduces conflict points and poor driver behaviour around children. Beyhond safety, the social consequences of closure are profound. My grandchildren attend Langley and I have see first hand how the schools inclusive , forward thinking ethos helps pupils thrive. If Langley closes, we lose not just provision, but trustedrelationships: the everyday interactions between staff, families, and local residents that build respect, accountability, and a sense of belonging. When these ties are cut, communitiesfragment, and fragmented cocommunities experience more anti social behaviour. There is also a humans cost the period AI treats as incidental. Job lossses are inevitable and redundancies of this kind don't just impact households, they remove positive adult role models and reduce the informal guardianship that helps keep children on the right path. Taken together- the data inaccuracies, the heightened traffic and safety risks, the loss of of local employment, and role models and, most importantly, the damage to community cohesion, this proposal is likely to increase the very problems the council should be working to prevent. Strong schools make strong communities; strong communities reduce anti social behaviour. It is that simple. I urge the council to withdraw the current proposal, correct the record, and work collaboratively with the school and residents on sustainable alternatives that protect education, jobs , community safety , and the sense of belonging that keeps north tyneside a good place to live. [redacted]

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 09:42 AM

My daughter is currently in year 2 and the current proposal put forward by the council Would mean she has to leave Langley early in year 3 and hopefully find a space in a new provision and then again move on for a middle school, potentially being split up from friends and learning disrupted. [redacted] We will have to potentially drop our working hours. My daughter struggles academically too and Langley make adaptations to suit her learning style. We feel this level of support will be lost.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 09:49 AM

[redacted] she would move to appletree for one year then have to move again to a middle school. This would be detrimental to her health. [redacted] We are prepared for one change to a middle school but not 2 changes in a short period of time. Langley

know my daughter really well, give her 1:1 with her learning with out the need for an EHCP. [redacted] Will she get her additional lessons and 1:1s. [redacted] For working parents who heavily reply on wrap around Langley how will this be supported?

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 10:00 AM

Having 3 godchildren who attend Langley, with the proposed merger. It would have a significant impact on them and their friends. They're in a happy routine and working well with their peers. Merging to a school further away would have a great impact on both their learning and development. Not only on the students who attend themselves. But the teachers who work tirelessly day in and day out to provide such a great and important service in educating our future.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 10:11 AM

[redacted] with high paid jobs contributing to the local economy we moved to the region for the sterling reputation of the schools, specifically Langley. [redacted] Moving our daughter (currently in Year 2) to the Appletree site would almost double our walk every morning, and involve crossing the busy Earsdon Road. We are both working parents and balance the walk to school with starting work. It would be extremely difficult to continue to satisfy our employers and add additional time to our school drop offs. No evidence has been provided in the supporting documents in relation to traffic impact as a result of these proposals . Langley currently closes the street outside school every morning to make it safer for the children. Appletree cannot close the street to cars in the mornings or at collection times due to it being on a bus route. . Langley also has a free public car park very close by, which Appletree Gardens does not have. . The assumption appears to be that children will walk to school. . The parent survey carried out by Friends of Langley asked parents how they currently travel to school: . 78% (150) said they walk . 18.3% (35) said they drive . When asked how they they would travel is their children attended Appletree: . 55% (104) said they would drive . 37.6% (71) said they would walk Additionally, we currently use wrap around after school club which my daughter is settled in to. Is there an alternative at apple tree? Have you considered Parental choice? As I've said, we moved and live here speficially because of the schools and Langley. We contibute to the economy as people who have no other ties to the local area. We have made this our home but if it doesn't work out for our daughter, we will be forced to move, [redacted] to ensure she gets the education and environment she needs. That's the loss of two people who earn >100K per year, own a house here, plan to buy a bigger house and shop local where we can.

Extrapolating that beyond ourselves, have you considered the economic impact of closing one the most popular and well respected schools in the area? This consultation assumes parents will choose to send their children to Appletree Gardens if Langley First School is closed. This would certainly be true for the current year 2 group, where there are no spaces across the whole of Whitley Bay to house these children other than at Appletree (where we understand there are currently two spaces). However, with a surplus at many of the other schools in the area, it cannot be assumed that Appletree would be the school of choice. . The council's consultation document shows 44% of catchment children attend Appletree compared to 73% at Langley; 12% of Langley pupils attend from the Appletree Gardens catchment area . In the most recent 2 previous years of higher birth rates, 2020 reception and 2023 reception intakes, Appletree was the only NEPA first school with surplus spaces in admissions, 14 and 6 respectively. For the 2 lowest birth rate years, 2024 and 2025 intake, Appletree had the largest portion of surplus places in admissions against PAN, 32% and 45% respectively . When looking at the 2025 admissions data, the distance of the last place offered at Langley was nearly 6 miles, compared to 3.6 miles for Appletree, demonstrating a far wider geographic draw and a greater ability to attract families from further afield. . Of the 187 parents who responded to the survey carried out by Friends of Langley, 88.2% said Appletree Gardens was not one of their school preferences when they applied for their school places. . That same survey also asked which school would be their first choice of school for their children if Langley were to close. Of the 187 responses to this question: . 38.5% chose South Wellfield (72 parents) . 20.3% chose Southridge (38 parents) . 11.2% chose Marine Park (21 parents) . 11.2% chose Appletree (21 parents) . 3.2% chose Whitley Lodge (6 parents) . 3.2% chose Coquet Park (6 parents) . When asked if they would take a place at Appletree Gardens if offered, 43 parents said no. . A further 62 parents said they would potentially consider home-schooling their children if Langley closed. . An analysis of birth rates mapped against six years' of reception offers data for each school showed Appletree Gardens is ranked as the most sensitive school in the entire planning area to falling birth rates. Langley, by contrast, has a medium sensitivity, cushioned by its proven popularity and wider draw. . The council's proposal is therefore not just to close the more popular school, thereby ignoring parental choice, but also to close the more demographically stable and resilient one, leading to a longer-term risk. My daughter is currently in Year 2, therefore will be one of the most affected children by all of this as she will move schools twice. She is also of one of the worst-affected year groups from the pandemic, missing out on socialising at such a long age. This upheaval is already taking it's toll on her as she is anxious abut the school closures and states ' Langley has done nothing wrong, it's our home'. Have you considered the longer term toll of this on children's

mental health? Mental health of children and young people in England is already trending upwards. In 2023, about 1 in 5 children and young people aged 8 to 25 years had a probable mental disorder (NHS Digital). Why can't you consider a staged approach to this merger to minimise the impact on this year group? All schools within the North East Planning Area (NEPA) are currently full for this year group, apart from Appletree Gardens, which we understand currently has two spaces . A merger with Appletree would mean 118 children in year 4 . As yet, the council has not provided any information as to what the class sizes would be in the 'merged' school. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, there is a concern amongst us that our children will be placed in larger class sizes, which could have an adverse affect on their education and wellbeing. Implementing this merger in 2027 would mean disrupting the largest cohorts of pupils currently moving through the system. If this merger is to go ahead, a far more logical approach is to wait until the smaller birth-rate cohorts are in the schools. . "Schools Out Northern" at Langley First School provides childcare services from 7.30am-6pm and allows for flexible booking. Appletree's website shows its Little Pips provision provides childcare from 7.45am-5.30pm (4.30pm for nursery children). This is a significant time difference for working parents. . "Schools Out Northern" at Langley First School also provides day care services, allowing parents to have one drop off and collection for their children from 9 months until 9 years; Little Pips provides from aged 2. . "Schools Out Northern" at Langley First School provides holiday provision for all school holidays apart from Christmas from 8am-5.30pm Monday-Friday. . Little Pips provides holiday provision from 8am-5pm Monday-Thursday and 8am-3.30pm on Fridays. The parent survey conducted by Friends of Langley found: . Of the 190 parents who answered the question about using wraparound provision, 60.5% (115 parents) said they regularly used Schools Out, with a further 4.2% (8 parents) said they use it for last-minute emergencies . When asked what they would do if Schools Out wasn't available: . 52.8% of parents didn't have an answer . 35.6% of parents said they would be forced to cut their hours at work . 19% of parents said they would look for a childminder . 14.7% of parents said they would need to rely more heavily on family . There were several other comments from parents concerned about having to quit their job altogether, whether there would be enough childminders to support the area, and needing to change schools to one which could provide wraparound cover

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 10:20 AM

Firstly, this is not a merger. It does not matter how you try and sugar coat the proposal, it is a full shut down of Langley, then dumping all of the Langley students in a school that does not have the capacity, access or facilities to accommodate them or maintain the first class

teaching experience that they currently receive. I have two children currently at Langley who will both suffer. They will no longer be at the school which they have built up such strong relations with teacher and friends, they would no longer be able to walk or cycle to school, their wrap-around facility would have to change, they would end up in two different schools at the same time making pickup and drop off impossible, they would lose out on the opportunity to go to school together. Besides all of these personal facts, Seatonville road and the roads around Appletree are at breaking point with traffic at pickup and drop-off times, this "merger" will make the roads un-useable around those times.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 11:49 AM

I am very concerned about the merger of the schools and the resulting class sizes if the closure of Langley First School goes ahead. My child is in year 2 in Langley first school which is at capacity and would therefore result in a year group of 118 pupils in Appletree year 2. Aside from the fact that space would be an issue, I completely disagree with the Council's statement that the quality of education would not be compromised if the class sizes were larger. It is logical that more pupils per staff member would result in less 1:1 pupil-teacher time therefore the quality of education would always suffer. I am also concerned that as the children would be over 7, there would be no maximum class size. This would result in crowding, poor standard of teaching, lack of dedicated SEN space, insufficient resource for pupils e.g. computers and equipment, and crowded dinner hall. My child has already suffered disruption in her educational journey as she did not get a place in the first school where she attended Nursery due to capacity, therefore the statement about falling birth rates does not apply for the current year 2.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 12:55 PM

I have one grandchild in the school and another due to enter in September. The lack of a reception class next year would mean they would be attending different schools. How do you propose to make that work? It is impossible to get both children to school on time. Then at home time which child needs to wait possibly anything up to 30 minutes before they can be collected. Not to mention having to cross Seatonville Road at the busiest times of the day . I might add that children who are constantly late to school, or are late being collected, raises other concerns which could involve child protection issues. Have you given any thought to this at all! My family cannot be the only ones affected by this. I am also concerned about the children’s integration into Appletree School, I am sure that teaching staff will be welcoming however young children can be very cruel and it will take an enormous amount of effort to prevent a them and us situation which could have serious mental health consequences.

Screen Name Redacted 11/11/2025 12:55 PM	As a family we chose to send both of our children because of its formidable reputation for provision of a caring nurturing environment in which children are given an outstanding education. Nothing is too much trouble for this amazing group of people. Children are gently and lovingly encouraged and stretched to fulfil their potential .Kids are happy and relaxed, and have a strong sense of self and of community. The daunting experience of joining a new school, or moving through the years groups, is a piece of cake but the hard work of this wonderful team. In our search for the best start in life, private schooling never even had a look in because children here receive just as good quality an education, but alongside their friends and neighbours and within our community. Children sing carols in the library, church, and care homes. They distribute food and gifts at harvest time to elderly members of the community as well as the food bank. They take part in trips to local areas to learn about nature and marine conservation and how to look after their surroundings. They are taught responsibility and resilience. There is literally nothing that we would have changed about this school for our family. You only need to read their ofsted report to find out why. The school was not awarded outstanding because of some technicalities - if you read the report you will see that the inspectors were blown away by the quality of the provision on offer here. IF YOU READ THE OFSTED REPORTS YOU WILL SEE THAT THE 2 SCHOOLS ARE NOT EQUIVAENT AND ARE VERY MUCH AT OPPOSITE ENDS OF THE "good" SPECTRUM. To speak frankly, by closing Langley in favour of retaining Appletree, you would be getting rid of the best school in the NEPA and keeping the worst one. Appletree is the one school that we parents in the whole of the NEPA don't want our kids to go to. If you ask all parents across the whole of the NEPA to rank preferences, Appletree would be the bottom choice. Within the combined catchment of Langley and Appletree Langley is the preferred school. Only 44% of Appletree catchment children choose to go to Appletree. 12% of Langley's pupils are already drawn from Appletree catchment. In 2024 and 2025 intake, Appletree has the greatest surplus against PAN - 32% and 45% respectively - in the NEPA area, in the main, we don't want to send our kids there. Langley is the more popular, it is the more demographically stable, and is the most resilient school. Langley and not Appletree is the school most able to sustain numbers going forward to protect the middle and high school numbers in the NEPA. I understand that you are between a rock and a hard place with this one. Nobody really thinks this decision is easy. But this choice is probably the worst choice that you could make out of all the options. Rethink, please. Go and visit Langley and Appletree. Read the OFSTED reports. Don't make this decision without knowing what it is that you are planning to lose.
Screen Name Redacted	My Grandchildren attend Langley First School and we feel that the

11/11/2025 01:13 PM

proposed merger of the two schools would be detrimental to the children involved with a disruption to their education and increased class sizes. This would also result in overcrowded classrooms and lack of space in shared areas. The proposals have led us to have a deep mistrust of North Tyneside Council as Central Government has a focus on education reform and the welfare of children which NTC seems to be going against. Our local council is proposing to close a school that is not currently running at a deficit and has less than 10% surplus places which the government itself deems to be an acceptable level. To close Langley school would not only take away a place of learning, it would take away the heart of the community and also have a massive impact on all the schools in the area.

Screen Name Redacted

11/11/2025 02:09 PM

I am writing as the parent of two children attending Langley – [redacted] I STRONGLY OPPOSE the proposed merger between Langley and Appletree and believe it would have an extremely negative effect on my children, our family and the wider community. My children are extremely settled and happy at Langley. They know the staff, routines, building and their friends. Closing the Langley site and transferring the children to a different environment whilst altering staffing, priorities and resources would undermine the sense of security and belonging that is so important for young children. They need and deserve continuity in teaching, peer relationships and school identity. The merger risks causing anxiety and loss of confidence and therefore negatively impacting their education at a crucial point in their development. These proposals have also led to a deep mistrust of North Tyneside Council – how can a council who claim to have the best interests of children at the heart of everything they do propose to close an almost full and thriving school? It is clear the council do not care about the welfare of children and are willing to allow their education and wellbeing to suffer in an attempt to save money. I have several concerns surrounding the proposals and the consultation process and will list them below. Personal Impacts: - Logistics. With two children attending Langley, we have built routines around the school site. A merger would impose additional travel (note: we would be forced to drive to school instead of walking due to the dangerous route and requirement to cross two busy public highways to get to Appletree), different drop-off/pick-up times and move us further away from the familiar school environment. This would cause increased stress and less family cohesion. - Community identity. We value the local community feel of Langley First School. Closing Langley and merging into Appletree will dilute that local network and weaken the ties between family, school and neighbourhood. - Local school choice. Langley is a well-loved local institution. Merging it into Appletree removes an active, familiar school site in the local community. For many families this will reduce choice, local access and convenience.

A school isn't just a building—it is a hub of the community. - Overcrowding risks and loss of identity. Combining the pupil populations of two schools into one site will reduce space, attention and resources per pupil, whilst increasing class sizes. - Children's welfare and learning outcomes. Children thrive when they feel known, safe and supported. A merger introduces disruption, uncertainty and staffing changes which will ultimately affect children's learning, confidence and wellbeing in a negative way. - Community disruption. The proposed changes are part of a wider reorganisation which includes closing/moving other schools and adjusting admission numbers. This signals a broader upheaval, which for families and children adds to a sense of instability rather than the stability that children need. - Best interests principle. The guiding principle in all decisions about education should be "what is in the best interests of the child?". This merger does not meet that test - it places money-saving and administrative convenience ahead of continuity, familiarity and the nurturing of young children. - Loss of Langley identity: The Langley site has its own character, history and community links. Removing it will reduce parental engagement, local pride, and the sense of belonging which is so valuable for children's learning environments. Birth Rates: - This consultation relies heavily on the argument that birth rates are falling. Although there is a downward trend throughout North Tyneside up to 2023, the ONS predicts birth rates will level off from 2026 and then begin to increase again. - Birth rates within NEPA have been declining since 2008. Despite this, the numbers within NEPA schools have been resilient to this, with the majority of schools being within the council's 10% acceptable surplus range since 2020. Appletree Gardens, however, has had a 23% surplus level on average over the last 5 years, making it difficult to understand why the proposals keep Appletree open over Langley. - Internal migration has not been considered for this consultation. Aside from a decline in 2022, the ONS shows more young children move into North Tyneside than out of it. Although these statistics don't go down to NEPA level, we do know many families move specifically to the coast to take advantage of the three-tier system. - The North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 contradicts the rationale for closing Langley due to falling birth rates as it states: "Net inward migration from neighbouring areas, primarily Newcastle, helps to sustain the overall working age population and limits the fall in the number of children in the borough". Pupil Projections: - The 'pupil projection methodology' was cited in the supporting documents provided in the Council proposals but there is no link to this methodology provided. Looking online I assume they must have used the National Pupil Projection Model since this is the only published methodology. However, the National Pupil Projection methodology only publishes projections up to 2030. Somehow, the council has forecast pupil numbers well beyond 2030. I would be interested to see how this forecasting was conducted. - The council's projection figures also

appear to be inaccurate: It projects 59 pupils starting in Langley reception in 2025, which drops by 6 pupils to 53 in Year 1. There is no explanation and no indication from parents of their intention to leave. In comparison, Appletree appears to gain 18 students between Reception to Year 1, again with no explanation and not in line with the school's admission records. With these figures corrected, we see that in 2030 (the acceptable time frame for pupil projections) Langley's surplus is projected to be 14% (4% away from the council's acceptable level of 10%), whereas Appletree's surplus is projected to be almost double at 34%. Again, this makes it difficult to understand why the proposals keep Appletree open. - One of the main factors in the council's decision-making is the concern that the capacity at Whitley Bay High School (WBHS) is 390, and the proposed first/middle school changes are aimed at preventing the high school from going over capacity. However, our research group has found that based on the council's methodology, from the current reception year group onwards, it is unlikely the number of pupils at WBHS will reach 390. The council's focus on ensuring numbers don't exceed this figure are therefore misguided. This 'issue' that the council is trying to fix relates to children already in the system, rather than future pupil projections, particularly the current Year 2 and 5 groups. Closing Langley will not tackle this issue. Parental Choice: - This consultation assumes parents will choose to send their children to Appletree if Langley is closed. This would certainly be true for the current Year 2 group, where there are no spaces elsewhere across the whole of NEPA. However, with a surplus at many of the other schools in the area for the other year groups, it cannot be assumed that Appletree would be the school of choice. I personally would NOT send my current reception aged child to Appletree as it is the worst school in the area in terms of performance, popularity and reputation. Indeed, when applying for reception places I did not choose Appletree for these reasons and would rather my child attend any other school. I would also like to note that should my current reception aged child only be offered a place at Appletree, I would consider home schooling them instead. - The council's consultation document shows 44% of Appletree catchment children attend Appletree compared to 73% at Langley. Additionally, 12% of Langley pupils attend from the Appletree Gardens catchment area. This highlights the low popularity of Appletree in comparison to Langley. - In the most recent 2 years of higher birth rates (2020 and 2023 Reception intakes), Appletree was the only NEPA first school with surplus spaces in admissions (14 and 6 respectively). For the 2 lowest birth rate years (2024 and 2025 intake), Appletree had the largest number of surplus places in admissions against PAN (32% and 45% respectively), again highlighting its lack of popularity and leading to questions as to why the proposals keep Appletree open over Langley. - The 2025 admissions data shows the distance of the last place offered at Langley was nearly 6 miles, compared to 3.6 miles for Appletree,

demonstrating a far wider geographic draw and Langley's greater ability to attract families from further afield. - An analysis of birth rates mapped against 6 years of reception offers data for each school showed Appletree Gardens is ranked as the most sensitive school in the entire planning area to falling birth rates. Langley, by contrast, has a medium sensitivity, cushioned by its proven popularity and wider draw. - The council's proposal is therefore not just to close the more popular school, thereby ignoring parental choice, but also to close the more demographically stable and resilient one, leading to longer-term risk. Current Year 2 Children: - The current Year 2 children would be in Year 4 at the point at which these proposals would go ahead. All schools within NEPA are currently full for this year group, apart from Appletree Gardens, which currently has 2 spaces. A merger with Appletree would mean 118 children in Year 4. As yet, the council has not provided any information as to what the class sizes would be in the 'merged' school. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for children aged 7 and older. Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, there is concern that our children will be placed in larger class sizes, which will inevitably have a negative impact on their education and wellbeing. Implementing this merger in 2027 would mean disrupting the largest cohorts of pupils currently moving through the system. If this merger is to go ahead, a far more logical approach is to wait until the larger year groups have passed through. Merger Concerns: - Why do the proposals keep Appletree open over Langley? The birth rate and admissions data (see above) shows Langley is significantly more popular with more parents choosing it and people travelling further to attend. - The council's consultation document says Appletree "can accommodate 432 pupils, which is more than the amount of both schools combined when future birth rates and admission numbers are adjusted". However, on the gov.uk website, Appletree's capacity is stated as being 293. Langley have asked for clarification and have received no response. - As yet, the council has offered no assurance about how the Langley children could be safely accommodated on the Appletree site, nor has it given any assurance on class sizes. - According to the government's school spending comparison tool, Appletree is significantly more expensive to run. Appletree spends £29 per square metre on utilities, compared to Langley which spends £4 per square metre. This leads to questions over why Appletree has been chosen to remain open when it is more expensive to run and significantly less popular within the community. Other Schools in NEPA: - Although the proposal focuses on Langley and Appletree Gardens, there is a wider impact on all schools within the NEPA area and long-term implications which are not covered in the council's consultation documents. - Regarding WOODLAWN, the consultation outlines the intention for the council to repurpose the Langley site and move the post-16 provision from Marden High School (32 children in total according to Ofsted), thereby displacing 300 children for the

benefit of 32 children. The long-term health of the mainstream school system should not be compromised to solve a logistical problem for SEND provision, however important that provision may be. - Regarding COQUET PARK First School, within the consultation documents, the council makes reference to considering the closure of Coquet Park but that this was not deemed financially viable. This is due to a private finance initiative (PFI) school, which the council is contractually obligated to until 2032. According to the council's cabinet paper, 22/23 was the first financial year that the school ended with a deficit balance, and it ended 24/25 with a cumulative deficit of £0.325m. The school has been unable to submit a budget plan which shows it coming back into financial balance within three years. In line with Scheme for Financing Schools, the school is classified as being in a structural deficit, which means there is a long-term financial problem that requires significant, strategic changes to resolve. The school currently also has a one-form entry, something the council says is not financially viable. As well as being poor value for money for the taxpayer, due to the high interest charges the PFI contract is costing the council, this school is not financially viable by the council's own recognition. In the absence of any proposed solutions being made available, it is difficult to understand how the council proposes to stop this school from being forced to close once the PFI contract ends in 2032. Finance: - Within its consultation documentation, the council states: "While currently both schools are in surplus (they receive more funding than they spend), Langley First is predicting a deficit (spending more than they receive) in 2026 which is projected to grow to £0.751m by 2028. At the same time Appletree Gardens is predicting it will enter deficit by 2028. School leaders have made changes and worked hard with the Council to make the financial situation better, but because low pupil numbers mean less funding, the situation is not improving. If left unchanged, the risk is that the two schools would continue to grow in deficit, and this in turn would limit their ability to sustain high quality education." – the council has not met - nor offered to meet - with the leadership or governing team at Langley to address its forecasted deficit. Traffic: - No evidence has been provided in the supporting documents in relation to how these proposals would impact traffic and pollution. Langley currently closes the street outside school every morning to make it safer for the children. Appletree cannot close the street to cars due to it being on a bus route. - Langley also has a free public car park very close by, which Appletree Gardens does not have. - The assumption appears to be that children will walk to school if the proposals go ahead, however this has been grossly underestimated due to the fact that the majority of Langley children would have to cross major public highways in order to get to the Appletree site. I personally would be forced to drive to Appletree, whereas I can safely walk to Langley. New Homes: - The Murton Gap development will see up to 3000 new homes being built between now and 2032. The council has

consistently told us that new homes don't automatically mean more children. However, the development proposal estimates a need for an additional 748 primary school places and proposes to build a new two-form entry primary school to provide an additional 420 primary school places for the development. According to the council's school catchment checker, the development is covered by New York Primary School. However, there is a large proportion of the development which would be considerably closer to both Langley and Appletree. I would also like to highlight several issues with the consultation process itself. The initial documentation which was provided to the council's cabinet contained several inaccuracies, including the following: - Langley is in financial deficit – this is INCORRECT. Langley has only predicted a deficit for 25/26 (for the first time ever) and is working with an independent financial advisor to see where this can be improved. - The majority of dwellings currently in the Langley catchment can access Appletree without crossing major roads – this is INCORRECT. Many current Langley children would need to cross Seatonville Road and/or Cauldwell Lane, both of which are extremely busy roads and also bus routes. Seatonville Road specifically is a major road for access to/from the NEPA area and accommodates large HGVs and buses. - There were briefings and reports with headteachers – this is INCORRECT. Whilst there were meetings, they were brief and vague and headteachers were not permitted to include governors which meant there was little opportunity for them to act or develop alternative solutions. - Langley's field is separated from the school building by a public highway meaning children are escorted "off site" for PE/sporting activities and have no access to playing fields at break times – this is INCORRECT. Langley has a large and well-used playing field directly adjacent to the school building which is used at break times, for PE/sporting activities and before/after school. IN ADDITION to this field, Langley also has an additional field across a minor residential street which is used once a year for sports day. IN ADDITION to these two fields, Langley also has a separate outdoor space for Reception children which follows a forest school ethos, as well as a potting garden and an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground environment overwhelming. There were also several inaccuracies published in the consultation documents, including (but not limited to) the following: - Projected pupil numbers - Deficit forecasting - Inaccuracies in pupil data at other schools More general issues with the process include the following: - There has been no community impact assessment conducted in relation to the closure of Langley First School. A community impact assessment was conducted in December 2024 however this was in relation to the Monkseaton High School closure. - Neither early years provision nor wraparound provision have been considered as part of this consultation - No governing body or senior manager of 'School's Out' (out of hours provision) at Langley has been contacted as part of

external communication. Summary: For my family, for my children, and for our local community, the proposed merger of Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School is deeply concerning, and I STRONGLY OPPOSE. It threatens the stability, continuity and locality that my children benefit from, places extra strain on family routines and risks diluting the very qualities which make Langley a strong school community. It is not in the best interests of the children to proceed with this merger in its current form. I urge the council to listen to the voices of parents who know and value their children's school community. I trust that you will give full weight to the potential negative impact on families like mine, and I look forward to hearing how the consultation responses will shape the final decision.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 02:23 PM

Families who are now able to walk their children to school may now have to drive their children before travelling to work. Those who choose to walk will need to cross busy main roads. This could cause major road safety issues.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 02:31 PM

My daughter is currently in Year 1 at Langley First School. She was born in the middle of the COVID-19 lockdown and, as an only child, had very limited opportunities for social interaction during her early years. For the first two and a half years of her life, she experienced an isolated environment—no shopping trips, toddler groups, swimming lessons, or playdates—due to safeguarding vulnerable family members. This lack of social exposure deeply affected her confidence and made her extremely shy. Choosing the right school for her was a decision we approached with great care and research. Langley First School stood out as the best choice, and it has proven to be exactly that. The school worked closely with us to provide an extended transition period, helping her settle into the busy school environment at her own pace. Her teachers have drawn on their experience and expertise to nurture her confidence and encourage friendships. The bonds she has formed with her peers are strong, and the school's provision of quiet spaces during overwhelming moments has been invaluable. She feels safe and supported by staff she knows and trusts [redacted] This nurturing environment has enabled her to make remarkable progress—from a hesitant, shy child to confidently presenting an experiment to her entire class just this week. This transformation is a testament to Langley's caring and dedicated approach. The proposed closure of Langley First School threatens to undo this progress. Moving her to an unfamiliar school with significantly larger pupil numbers, unknown staff, and no guarantee of remaining with her close friends will be a huge upheaval. She is not a child who thrives in noisy, crowded environments, and the prospect of busy classrooms, corridors, and playgrounds is deeply concerning.

Furthermore, this disruption will be compounded by another move in two years when she transitions to middle school. At present, there are no clear answers about how her needs—such as access to quiet spaces—will be met in the new setting. Parental choice matters, and this proposal removes that choice entirely. Langley parents did not choose Appletree Gardens for a reason, just as Appletree parents chose their school for theirs. Adding 300 extra pupils will fundamentally change the character of that school. Practical concerns also remain unresolved: we currently walk safely to Langley, avoiding the congested area around Appletree Gardens. That site is already plagued by dangerous parking and traffic issues, which will only worsen with hundreds more pupils and no additional parking facilities. This decision will have a profound impact on my child's emotional well-being, social development, and education. I urge you to consider the long-term consequences for children like mine, who have already faced extraordinary challenges in their early years.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 02:35 PM

It affects the whole community. There will be an impact on other schools in the borough. The travelling distance is too great for those pupils who will now be further from their first school.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 03:21 PM

I strongly object to the proposed merger because of the profound impact it will have on my granddaughter's education and wellbeing. She is currently at Langley First School. She was born during the pandemic and spent her early years in isolation, which made her extremely shy and sensitive to busy, noisy environments. Choosing Langley was a deliberate decision after careful research because of its small, nurturing setting and experienced staff who have helped her build confidence and friendships at her own pace. This supportive environment has enabled her to make remarkable progress—from a child who struggled to speak up to one who is continually growing in confidence. The proposed merger would uproot her from everything familiar and place her in a much larger, louder school with unfamiliar staff and significantly higher pupil numbers. For a child who still seeks quiet spaces when overwhelmed, this change is not just disruptive—it is detrimental. There is no clear plan for maintaining the calm, safe spaces that Langley currently provides. Furthermore, this upheaval will be followed by another when she transitions to middle school, compounding the instability. Appletree Gardens is located in a densely populated housing estate with severe traffic and parking issues. Adding approximately 300 extra pupils will exacerbate congestion, increase road safety risks, and create an unsafe environment for families. There is no adequate infrastructure to support this influx. Langley is more than a school; it is a community that has supported her emotional and social development during a critical stage. Removing that stability and forcing her into an

environment that does not meet her needs will undo the progress she has made. I urge the council to consider the individual needs of children before implementing a decision that prioritises numbers and finances over wellbeing.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 03:43 PM

In response to the consultation documents on the closure of Langley school please see below my comments. Overall, there are inaccuracies about Langley's facilities and financial status that paint a skewed picture that doesn't reflect the reality of the current school environment. Moreover, the consultation process lacks transparency and does not consider the real impact on the community and the children involved. It's crucial to address these discrepancies and advocate for a more accurate representation of the school's strengths and needs. We deserve a fair decision that truly reflects our community's values and priorities and will ensure that a correct decision is made to support children who will be affected by these proposals. The methodology on birth rates underlying the argument is one-dimensional, failing to consider other relevant factors, and is therefore fundamentally flawed. Indeed, pupil project numbers used are flawed in that they appear to be based on data that does not exist. This decision appears rushed and is clearly based on a limited evidence base. It's unsettling that decision-makers have not taken the initiative to visit Langley school. Making significant choices without a thorough understanding of our environment and needs is unacceptable. It's imperative that those in charge engage with our community to gather the necessary insights before proceeding. Our children and educators deserve thoughtful consideration of their unique circumstances, and we must advocate for that before any final decisions are made. I am deeply worried about the lack of information regarding how the transition will take place should a decision be made to close Langley school. The uncertainty surrounding this process is alarming. I fear that if we move forward without a clear and well-structured plan, our children and the staff will be left to deal with the fallout. If a decision is made it is essential for us as a community to ensure that there is adequate support in place for everyone during any transition. Without proper communication and preparation, I believe there could be significant negative impacts on our children's education and emotional wellbeing. I urge the council to provide more clarity on the transition process and to involve parents and staff in these important discussions. We all want what is best for our children, and a thoughtful approach is vital in achieving that goal.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 03:52 PM

I have a grandson currently in year 2 at Langley who will potentially have to attend 3 different schools in 3 year and have concerns how this will affect his education and also his mental health. It will also impact his sister who has specifically been moved into the school

nursery so that she would progress into Reception class next year. If she cannot stay in same school as her brother this will create a logistical nightmare as they would both be in different schools at drop-off and pick-up times. It also brings environmental concerns as instead of walking to school both children would have to be transported by car due to timescales.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 04:31 PM

[redacted] This has already affected the local community, which has been demonstrated in the response and the campaign to Save Langley.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 04:54 PM

The proposal has undermined our trust in the council's ability to make fair, evidence-based decisions. Inaccuracies, lack of consultation with staff and governors, and errors in basic facts suggest the decision was predetermined rather than strategically planned, leaving us unable to have confidence that our children's education and the wider community are being prioritised. A key reason we chose Langley was its performance in direct comparison to Appletree. While Appletree has a history of mostly Good ratings and several years rated Satisfactory, Langley has consistently performed at a much higher level, with many years rated Outstanding and none below Good. This clear difference in long-term performance gave us confidence that Langley would provide a more consistently high-quality educational experience, so using our parental choice, we made a deliberate decision to select Langley over Appletree. Closing Langley First School would have a significant and negative long term impact on our family. We specifically chose Langley for a number of reasons including that it is a local, walkable school with a nurturing ethos, small community structure, and stable environment all essential for our children's wellbeing and development. Losing this would disrupt their safety, sense of belonging, and routine. Travelling to Appletree Gardens would require us to cross the extremely busy Seatonville Road, which has already become increasingly congested due to local housing developments. This raises daily safety concerns and would force us to drive, increasing stress, cost, and time pressures on our family. The area around Appletree is already heavily congested at drop-off and pick-up, and adding more pupils would make this significantly worse. The Fire station has publicly stated in previous years that the traffic and parking outside Appletree at school drop off and pick up posed an issue for emergency access. Our children would lose trusted teachers, familiar buildings, and established friendships. This sudden disruption is emotionally distressing for young children and can negatively affect their confidence, learning,

and mental wellbeing. [redacted] Thanks to Langley's inclusive ethos and specialised staff, she has not only settled but is thriving, with the transition between nursery and reception so smooth due to careful planning by the school. The transition to a new school will have a detrimental impact on her education as she will be removed from her familiar teachers, and placed in an overcrowded school with reduced SEND spaces available at Appletree in order to facilitate the merger. Whilst the proposal makes suggestions around supporting the transition they are not substantial enough to reassure us that, any of our children not only our daughter, will not be negatively impacted by the transition. Two of our children are currently on the phonics programme, which differs between Langley and Appletree, putting them at a disadvantage if moved. For our son, currently in Year 2, the proposal would force him into a school with far too many children in a year group, with no alternative local options, meaning he would attend a school we would never have chosen. He will be at the age where there are no statutory class size limits for his age group, creating serious concerns about learning quality and wellbeing. After all of this he'll be there less than 18months before he would then face another move to middle school, Forcing all children into a single school removes parental choice and ignores the needs of families who selected Langley for its inclusive ethos and stable community. The proposal creates avoidable upheaval for our children at a critical stage in early education, when consistency and belonging are essential. The uncertainty and worry caused by this proposal is already affecting my children. They have said they get "butterflies" when they hear about it and have many questions that, due to the inaccuracies in the consultation documents, we are unable to answer. This situation has caused stress and anxiety for me as well, knowing that my children's future is being determined by a proposal that initially got the school's name wrong in the letter to parents. If such a basic detail can be missed so carelessly, it raises serious concerns about what other information might be incorrect. Simple facts—such as Langley's playing field being attached to the main yard and the school having two halls—have been misrepresented, demonstrating that the proposals were not prepared with educational stability in mind. It appears that Langley was pre-selected for closure, and data was then gathered to support that decision. If a school closure is necessary, it should be based on accurate, publicly available evidence, school performance, allowing proper assessment of both financial and educational impact. If these guiding principles were applied rigorously, I don't believe based on the data available, that Langley would have been the school chosen for a proposed closure. When we selected Langley, another one of the reasons Appletree was dismissed as an option was due to its limited wraparound provision. The onsite provision at Langley is excellent, all three of our children have used it, and it is highly flexible around working patterns,

making it ideal for supporting working families. Removing this provision would create significant additional stress and logistical challenges, forcing families to find alternative childcare or reduce working hours, which is both costly and disruptive. This demonstrates that Langley is not just a school, but a vital community resource that supports families as well as children. The proposal, as it stands, has eroded our trust in the council's ability to make evidence-based, fair, and transparent decisions regarding our children's education. The inaccuracies, lack of consultation with staff and governors, and careless handling of basic facts suggest that this proposal was predetermined rather than strategically planned. We cannot have confidence that our children's educational wellbeing and the wider community's interests are being prioritised, and this undermines our faith in the decision-making process. If the genuine aim is to stabilise and protect education in North Tyneside for the long term, then this proposal, at least in its current form, will not achieve that goal, as it is not strategically sound. Meaning my children, their education and well being would be collateral damage having long term negative impact on them, my self and their wider family. Our children need the familiarity of their teachers and learning environment based on the schools ethos to give them the best start in life. This merger would remove both of those key things. We will need substantial additional support if this is to go ahead for my children and my self.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 04:58 PM

Appletree is a fantastic school. By merging this will protect the future of Appletree and the 3 tier school system in the area. Appletree has excellent facilities, staff, out of school provision and preschool services all in one place.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 05:49 PM

The proposal suggests that Langley and Appletree are merging. This seems rather disingenuous as the aim is to close Langley and move the pupils to Appletree resulting in probable redundancies of Langley staff. The suggestion that Langley could be modified to enlarge the Woodlawn capability appears to be ridiculous considering the whole strategy is about reducing costs. And finally, for a Labour council to consider any of this just weeks away from potentially disastrous council elections in May 2026 which could imperil Keir Starmer's position is absurd.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 05:54 PM

If these closure of Langley First goes ahead, I am very concerned that our grandson would be placed in a larger class. There is no guarantee that his class size would remain at 30 or below. Currently he is in a thriving school which promotes respect, resilience and provides a truly nurturing environment. The staff are extremely dedicated to inclusivity of neuro-diverse children. My grandson is very

happy, settled and thriving at Langley. This proposed closure will do him no favours. He will be in a school which is shrinking leaving him uncertain and anxious. I take him to school two days a week and he stays with me overnight. I see first hand how much he enjoys school and how much progress he is making. Closing this school is a travesty. It is not in deficit and consistently provides very high standards but more importantly it teaches holistically providing my grandson with very important grounding for his future.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 06:24 PM

We would not send our child to apple tree as we'd have to drive so we'd select a better school which isn't going to have extortionately big year groups having a negative impact on our daughters education.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 06:37 PM

[redacted] You should not close Langley, me and my mum went there and I want my [redacted] brother to have the same experience as us. The teachers are amazing! If you do close the school at least let my brother keep his lovely teachers! The trips are so fun because they were all so different and all amazing. The teachers make all the lessons fun and even when the topic is kind of boring they make it interesting and exciting. There was always something to look forward to. I love the reception garden and we used to roll down the hill and have races, if you close Langley it makes me so sad that new children won't get to play in the reception garden. SO DO NOT CLOSE LANGLEY

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 06:55 PM

The proposal to merge the schools would have a significant impact on our family. [redacted] Both children are happy, settled, and progressing well in an environment where they feel safe and supported. Any change to this routine risks unsettling them at such a crucial stage in their development. As working parents, managing two separate school locations for drop-offs and pick-ups would be extremely challenging. With full-time jobs, the additional travel time and logistical strain of getting children to different sites would place a heavy burden on our daily routine. It would also reduce the time we can spend with our children and increase stress for both parents and children alike. The wraparound care currently provided at Langley is essential for working families like ours. It allows us to contribute to the economy while ensuring our children are in a nurturing, familiar environment before and after school. Removing or disrupting this support would make it much harder for many parents to maintain full-time employment, potentially forcing some to reduce hours or leave work altogether. The council's expectations around how families can adapt to such major changes feel unrealistic. Many working parents are already stretched thin, and further disruption would negatively

affect not only family wellbeing but also children's emotional stability and learning. The sense of community and continuity at Langley plays a vital role in supporting children's confidence and happiness — something that cannot easily be replicated elsewhere. In summary, the proposed merger would have a deeply disruptive impact on our family's ability to balance work and family life, and it risks undoing the progress and wellbeing of children who are currently thriving at Langley

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 07:38 PM

I have a child in AGFS who will be in year 4 and I worry about the size of her class since there will be no legal requirement on numbers. Despite the comments on this not affecting teaching I would disagree as a parent. We like this school because of the laid back, nurturing environment that goes beyond the classroom. Such as school trips, swimming lessons, extracurricular activities, whole school events on one day like the school fairs and sports day. These will all be affected by a school year of 120 children if these schools merge. It is important for a parent to know the size of the classes and we have not been told approximate numbers per class. [redacted] We live out of catchment due to moving into the area and there being no spaces in our local Whitley Bay school. I am aware that if the Langley catchment new starters now apply for AGFS due to this merge then there is a chance he will not be offered a space. He has attended the early years setting at AGFS since he was 2yrs old. He has had years of settling in, transitions and the early years inclusion service has visited him for over 1yr. We have focussed on getting him settled here due to the smaller numbers and higher chance of getting into a school with his 2 sisters. The merge could mean I have 3 young children in 3 different schools across the borough. I cannot move my older daughters into our catchment school [redacted] because there are no spaces for older children. Initially both my husband and I needed to reduce our working hours until our son settled. He is finally in 5 days and we can work full time. If he does not get into this school following the merge then we will need to drop our hours again until he is settled in his new school. [redacted] I have attended numerous meetings over the last year organised by the council where I was told the focus was early years. The aim being to identify SEN needs earlier in order to help settle in future mainstream. I was then informed of the amount of money that is being pumped into these proposals. The Early Years Inclusion Service which started only last year in North Tyneside has been helping my son, along many others, prepare for nursery and reception. This school merge is disrupting years of hard work, money and contradicts many other proposals and commitments already made by the LA. Not only is it disrupting the children's planned transitions but you will be making staff redundant who are highly experienced with SEN. Parents of children with SEN

spend years looking at schools and getting their children settled. I cannot see a plan for the children affected by these closures. We have not been given any idea of what the new AGFS would look like. It is important for my children to have SEN breakout rooms, library, computer rooms. Where will the new classrooms be and can these additional spaces be protected? Will the wrap around still be guaranteed before and after school for all ages? If the proposals do proceed, I do not want my children experiencing a long merge with a negative atmosphere of staff having to reapply for their jobs, high staff sickness, buying new uniforms, wasting more money on rebranding of AGFS that is already in my opinion thriving and my children are happy.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 08:07 PM

I am responding as a resident of North Tyneside, please see my comments in section 4. [redacted] However they benefited massively from their years at Langley First School and Nursery due to the excellent ethos and teaching staff. We were one of many parents in Monkseaton who chose to send their children to Langley First School, due to its unique and nurturing approach. It is not right that other families with young children in Monkseaton will potentially not have this choice and I absolutely disagree with the proposal to merge Langley First and Appletree Gardens First School, due to the impact on local families and the community in Monkseaton and that this will negatively impact on the health and wellbeing of children and their families.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 08:15 PM

Formal Objection to the Proposed Closure of Langley First School I wish to register my strong objection to the proposal to close Langley First School. Although I live outside the catchment area, my granddaughter is a pupil, and I have seen first-hand the excellent support, ethos and inclusive environment that Langley provides. Having reviewed the consultation documentation and supporting reports, I am concerned that the process appears designed to justify a decision already reached, rather than to conduct a fair and balanced evaluation. The documentation contains selective information and omits material considerations, while placing weight on factors that are legally irrelevant. For example, there is reference to the falling roll grant to Appletree Garden. That grant exists to help schools manage temporary dips in pupil numbers; it cannot sensibly or lawfully be used as a reason to close another school. This amounts to taking into account an irrelevant consideration. Equally concerning is the way pupil projections appear to be used retrospectively to support closure based on assumptions that closure has already occurred. These projections ignore the likely population growth from new housing in the Murton Gap development, which may generate significant new primary places. It is premature and irrational

to plan a permanent school closure on data that fails to adequately reflect such significant housing growth. There is also no evidence that the Council has properly considered the alternative of a true merger between Langley and Appletree under the Department for Education's two-school amalgamation process, which would require external scrutiny and ensure fair treatment of both communities. Nor does there appear to have been any proper assessment of community, early years, or wraparound childcare impacts, despite the importance of these services to working families. Langley is a thriving, inclusive school, not a failing one. Its financial position is presently sound, with only a projected future deficit —something that could and should be addressed collaboratively rather than used to justify closure. There are other schools financially less sound. The underlying motive appears to be the creation of additional SEND places at the expense of a good mainstream school. The proposal risks dismantling a well-functioning school community to solve problems elsewhere in the education system. The government is in the process of formulating advice to local education authorities on how to tackle the unsustainability of the financial crisis arising from increased SEND placements. This advice is likely to include requirement for greater mainstream schooling for SEND pupils. Closure of a good mainstream school which includes some SEND placements is both premature and divisive. Owing to the flaws in the consultation process, the most appropriate step would be for the proposal to close Langley School to be withdrawn or, if not, a referred for a decision by the Secretary of State. [redacted]

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 08:38 PM

I moved into the area in order for my two children to attend this successful, inclusive and nurturing school. I really do feel that by closing Langley, house prices and local businesses will suffer. Both of my boys are so happy at Langley and as a parent there is no other school that I feel offer such a strong and positive start to their education. By closing Langley you are limiting choice for parents in this area. I know from data shared by Friends of Langley, far more parents choose Langley as first choice than Appletree. It does not make any sense to me why Langley has been the school chosen to close.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 08:54 PM

The proposed merger would have a significant impact on our son's emotional wellbeing, education, and our family's daily life. Our main concern is that this plan would force him to go through two major transitions within a short period of time — first to a new primary school, and then again to middle school soon after. This double disruption would increase his stress and anxiety, affecting his emotional stability and confidence. Starting again with new teachers,

leadership, and routines twice in such quick succession would be very difficult for him. We are also concerned about the wraparound care provision. The current before- and after-school care at Langley is flexible and well-run, but it is unclear whether equivalent facilities will be available at the new site, how many children can be accommodated, how places will be allocated, or what the costs will be. This uncertainty creates additional strain for working families like ours. Safety is another serious issue. [redacted] The surrounding roads are already congested and parking is difficult and unsafe, especially for children crossing roads. Increasing the number of families travelling to that area will only heighten the risks and make access more problematic. We also have concerns about class sizes and capacity. There are currently 60 pupils in our son's year group, yet there has been no clear explanation from the council about how these numbers will be managed or what additional classroom space will be provided. Larger class sizes would negatively impact learning and the quality of support children receive. Finally, this proposal removes an important element of parental choice. We deliberately chose Langley because of its outstanding reputation, nurturing environment, and excellent staff. Our older daughter attended and thrived there, and we have complete confidence in the school's ethos and care for the whole child. Forcing children to move to a different school they and their families did not choose feels unfair and unnecessary. There are also practical financial implications, such as the need to buy new uniforms for only one year before purchasing another set for middle school. We would like to know if the council plans to support families with these costs. Overall, we feel this proposal shows a lack of planning and foresight. We urge the council to reconsider or delay the merger to minimise disruption and ensure children's wellbeing, safety, and educational experience are properly protected.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 08:56 PM

The schools will not Merge I have a child in year two who is being forced to leave the school they're very happy at and go to another school. This is a big upheaval learning not just new ways of doing things but having to get to know new staff as well. This is unnecessary stress to force onto a child. Then of course they will have to do it all again the following year when they transfer to middle school. The current year 2 is also full. Combing them with Appletree while create a huge year group. There is no actual plan for this. It will of course result in larger class sizes which will impact the education of the children involved. It will also require changes to Appletree school again with seemingly no plan for this. If there is a plan then why was this not included in the proposal? Again impacting the education of children. I'm incredibly disappointed in how this has been handled by the council. The focus has been fully on solving a problem that has not yet happened with seemingly very little thought

to the children who are actually in the schools now. Impacting those children's education to save money in the future is morally wrong

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 09:17 PM

My children went to Langley and it is a really good school. It is at the heart of the community and would be detrimental to the local area if this school closed. There are young families living in my street and newly married couples who are keen to start a family. They have specifically chosen this area to raise or start their families because of the fantastic local first school (Langley). There is no need for Woodlawn to occupy the site as they are accommodated fully within their own site and Malden CLC site for their older school provision. The amount of money it would cost for Langley to be adapted to meet any needs for the disabled children from Woodlawn must sure be massive. Pupils having to travel from the area surrounding Langley would have much further to walk to school but those really young children will struggle with the journey. Parking in the area around Appletree gardens is so limited it will be an accident waiting to happen.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 09:26 PM

My child attended Langley First School and this was a major formative experience for him which we would like to remain an option for family members. We have friends and family at the school at present. We chose this area to live based on the wonderful school provision, specifically the three tier system, and in particular due to friends whose children had attended Langley. Langley is a huge part of our community, and I do not support the merger with Appletree. They are very different schools and each has a different remit. Both are valuable for different reasons, which would inevitably be lost in a merger. This would be devastating for our community.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 09:29 PM

I strongly object to the proposal to close Langley First School and move all pupils to the Appletree Gardens site. My family will be directly and unfairly affected by this. I have a child in Year 2 at Langley, If this proposal goes ahead, she will be forced to move schools twice in two years, once to Appletree Gardens in September 2026 and again to middle school in Year 5. This level of disruption is unacceptable for any child. I also have a younger child who is due to start nursery in September 2026. Langley is within easy walking distance of our home, which is why we chose it for our eldest. Appletree Gardens whilst isnt too much further away but isnt walkable on a morning before work. Walking to school is a healthy, sustainable choice that keeps cars off the road and builds independence. Taking that away is a huge loss for our community if the merger happens, I will not choose Appletree for my youngest, meaning my children will end up at two different schools. This creates

two separate school runs, doubling travel time and costs, and splitting siblings who should be together.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 09:31 PM

I love Appletree and the suport my child receives. He has SEN. I love to small class numbers and taking on Langley will be overwhelming. Plus they don't want to be with us. How can we build a good relationship on resentment.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 09:33 PM

Both of my sons would be significantly affected by the proposed closure of Langley First School. They do not cope well with change, and moving to a different, larger school would be deeply unsettling for them. They already find noisy and crowded environments overwhelming, so adding approximately 300 more pupils to an already busy school would make dining halls, corridors, and classrooms far louder and more difficult for them to manage. My children are currently in Year 1 and Year 2, which are already among the biggest year groups. A merger would inevitably make these classes even more crowded, reducing the amount of individual attention teachers can provide and affecting the quality of their learning experience. [redacted] He has built strong, trusting relationships with his teachers and support staff, which give him confidence and stability. I am extremely concerned that, in a much larger and more impersonal school, he would lose this vital support network and the progress he has made could be lost. The uncertainty surrounding the merger has already begun to affect both boys emotionally. They are anxious about the possibility of losing their teachers and friends, and these worries have had a noticeable impact on their general wellbeing. Langley's location also allows us to walk to school every day, which contributes to a healthy routine and reduces our reliance on cars. If the merger went ahead, we would have no choice but to drive, as the journey to Appletree involves crossing busy main roads that are unsafe for young children on foot. There would also be a financial consequence. We paid £10,000 above the asking price for our home specifically because of its proximity to Langley First School. If the school were to close, property values in the area would likely fall, affecting the equity in our home. Finally, I would be forced to adjust my working hours to accommodate longer school runs and drop-offs, as I would not send my children to Appletree Gardens. For all these reasons — emotional, educational, practical, and financial — I strongly oppose the proposed merger and urge the Council to keep Langley First School open.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 09:40 PM

[redacted]

[redacted]

It is my belief that the proposal is based on inaccurate and inconsistent information, and that its adoption would have a profoundly negative impact on our children, our families, and the wider community. 1. Council Errors and Discrepancies The documentation underpinning the consultation contains multiple factual inaccuracies that call into question the validity of the evidence used to justify closure. Among these are: • Incorrect statements about the school site • Financial inaccuracies • Capacity discrepancies: The consultation document asserts that Appletree Gardens can accommodate 432 pupils, yet official government data lists its capacity as 293. The council has not clarified this contradiction, nor provided evidence to show that all Langley pupils could be safely or appropriately accommodated on the Appletree site. Such inaccuracies not only undermine confidence in the council's decision-making but also risk leading to outcomes that are neither fair nor in the best interests of children. 2. Impact on Children and the Community Langley First School is not simply a building — it is a cornerstone of the local community. Parents consistently report choosing to move into the area because of Langley's nurturing ethos, high educational standards, and inclusive environment. The proposal to close the school disregards these strengths and fails to consider the social, emotional, and educational disruption it would cause. Langley's staff form a uniquely cohesive team of dedicated teachers and support staff who share a clear vision — to nurture every child as an individual and adapt teaching to meet diverse needs. The school's ethos prioritises wellbeing as the foundation of learning. Removing children from this environment would have a lasting impact on their confidence, sense of belonging, and progress. The consultation has already created unnecessary division between Langley and Appletree families. Both are excellent schools, and the suggestion that one must be "sacrificed" penalises Langley unfairly. A true merger, rather than the proposed closure, would allow the creation of a shared school that celebrates the strengths of both communities and ensures children and staff contribute to shaping its identity — name, ethos, and uniform included. Langley's Schools Out Northern childcare provision is a vital support for working families, offering flexible hours (7.30am–6pm), care from 9 months upwards, and holiday clubs. Appletree's Little Pips provision is not comparable in hours or capacity, with earlier closing times and limited holiday coverage. The majority of parents surveyed (60.5%) rely on Langley's provision, and many have said they would be forced to reduce hours or leave employment if it were lost. The assumption that children will walk to Appletree is unrealistic. Langley currently benefits from road closures at drop-off and pick-up times and a nearby free car park. Appletree, located on a bus route, cannot close its street and lacks suitable parking. 3. A Call for Fairness and Transparency Under Department

for Education guidance, there are two recognised ways to amalgamate schools: 1. Close one and transfer pupils to another; or 2. Close both and establish a new school through a formal merger process, approved by the Secretary of State and the Office of Schools Adjudicator. The council has chosen the former — a closure — claiming the second option is “too complex.” I disagree. A true merger is the fairer, more transparent, and more community-minded option. It allows proper scrutiny of decisions, ensures equal treatment for both schools, and enables the creation of a new, shared institution that honours the legacies of both Langley and Appletree. This process should be about doing the right thing, not the easy thing. Rushing through a closure risk lasting harm to children and families for the sake of administrative convenience. 4. Conclusion Langley First School is an exceptional place of learning, care, and community spirit. Its staff are highly skilled, its leadership forward-thinking, and its outcomes strong. It is a school at the forefront of teacher training, and a hub for inclusive education — not one that should be penalised for its proximity to Woodlawn or for maintaining prudent finances. I know a number of proposals have been put forward, I therefore urge the council to: • Withdraw the current closure proposal and commit to a full, evidence-based reassessment; or • Pursue a genuine merger, ensuring both school communities and children have a voice in shaping the future. This is an opportunity to show that North Tyneside Council listens to its residents, values integrity in its decision-making, and places the welfare of children above all else. [redacted]

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 10:04 PM

I am against the proposal as there is a need for children in west Monkseaton to attend Langley School and to prevent build up of traffic in and around apple tree gardens for those families who will no longer be able to walk to school. And also to prevent additional traffic and parking issues around the current Woodlawn site. Langley is the preferred choice for many families over apple tree gardens first school. I can not see a clear proposal how the apple tree gardens building will accommodate capacity of both schools. I do not see consideration of where all of the new children to area in developing Robinson Field estate will be accommodated.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 10:04 PM

The process so far has been inconsistent, unfair, and based on misleading information. The decision to remove Langley’s Reception intake for 2026 has already caused real disruption for families like mine — and closing the school altogether would make things unmanageable for many parents. 1. Practical and Emotional Impact on Families By removing next year’s Reception intake, families with more than one child at Langley are now forced to juggle two school runs, different start times, and separate events. This means one child

will inevitably be late or miss out. For working parents, this is not a realistic or sustainable situation. Langley has always been a family-centred school that works hard to accommodate the realities of modern parenting — from flexible wraparound care to understanding the pressures families face. There are not enough nursery wrap around services in the area to accommodate all the langley children especially at appletree. Also in your FAQ in regards to this you say it would be the same as in if you had ome child who npw attended secondary school. This is not the same at all my nursery and reception child cannot walk to school without me which they could of of secondry school age. 2. Quality and Reputation of Langley vs. Appletree Langley First School is a nurturing, inclusive, and high-performing environment that parents actively choose. Many families have moved into the area specifically for Langley. It is a larger site than Appletree Gardens, with more internal square footage and outdoor learning space — including its own field (which we dont have to cross a highway to access) , garden area, and dedicated sensory spaces. By contrast, Appletree Gardens has struggled with falling pupil numbers and lower community engagement for several years. It has higher surplus capacity and higher running costs, yet offers fewer facilities and less wraparound support. Parents are understandably questioning why a successful, oversubscribed school is being closed in favour of one with persistent capacity and reputation issues. Furthermore, the leadership at Appletree has failed to engage meaningfully with Langley parents throughout this consultation. [redacted] Look at the history of ofsted reports for both schools there is a huge reason i wouldnt send my children to that school. 3. Failings in the Consultation Process The council's own consultation papers contain factual inaccuracies — including claims about Langley's outdoor space, finances, and pupil projections. No proper community impact assessment has been conducted, and the governing body of Langley's wraparound provider, Schools Out, has never been contacted. Important provisions such as early years and before-and-after school care have been ignored, despite being vital for working parents. Langley is not in financial deficit. The school has maintained strong budgeting and works with an independent financial advisor. Meanwhile, Appletree receives additional "Falling Rolls" funding — essentially financial support for under-capacity — which Langley does not require. This alone should make the council reconsider which school is truly more sustainable. 4. Children with Additional Needs Langley's inclusive ethos and specialist facilities for children with SEND are second to none. The school provides sensory spaces,

quiet zones, flexible seating, and outdoor learning designed to support children's wellbeing and neurodiversity. Its proximity to Woodlawn Special School provides a strategic advantage, allowing shared support and dual registration opportunities. None of these assurances have been offered at Appletree. Closing Langley risks undoing years of inclusive progress. 5. A Fairer Alternative If the council insists that amalgamation is necessary, it must be through a true merger, not a forced closure. A genuine merger — with both schools closing and reopening as one — would ensure equality, shared input, and external oversight by the Office of the Schools Adjudicator. It would give families and children from both schools a fair voice in shaping the new environment rather than unfairly penalising one community. How can i make decisions of where to send my nursery child when no clear route is in front of us there are to many variables as well as parental choice being stripped from us. If Langley was to close then i would want my children to attend south wellfield however yes my nursery child could get in but my reception child would not as there are no places same with most schools in the burrow so my childs only option would be appletree which again is a school i would NEVER send my children too meaning looking into home schooling. 6.Birth Rates & Pupil Projections Birth rates are expected to stabilise and rise from 2026 (ONS data). The council's projections extend beyond 2030 without published methodology. Corrected data shows: Langley's 2030 surplus: 14% (within acceptable range) Appletree's: 34% (double the limit) Migration into coastal areas and new housing growth counteract the falling birth rate narrative. ADDITIONAL NOTES Increase in traffic - appletree is allready hourendous for parking with a crash in the area just last week. No ability for a safe street safe like Langley. Local businesses- the likes of local trades allards, sandwhich shops etc will massivley be affected by not having langley footfall. Future-what will the future look like if the clousure of langley goes ahead Class sizes? Loss of sen spaces? Loss of forrest school? Loss of parental choice? Will we be able tp choose elsewhere? According to the government's school spending comparison tool Appletree is a more expensive building to run. Appletree spends £29 per square metre on utilities, compared to Langley which spends £4 per square metre. No Community Impact Assessment has been carried out for Langley's closure. Early years and wraparound provision have not been considered. The council claims Appletree can hold 432 pupils, yet gov.uk lists capacity at 293. Appletree costs £29/m² to run, compared to £4/m² at Langley. Langley is significantly more popular: 73% of catchment pupils attend Langley vs 44% at Appletree. 88% of surveyed parents did not list Appletree as a preference. Only 11% said Appletree would be their first choice if Langley closed. Some parents would consider home-schooling if closure proceeds. Coquet Park: In structural financial deficit but protected until 2032 due to a PFI contract — what will happen come 2032? Where will all those children go if you close

there too - closing langley now does not sort the issues out in the long run. In Summary Langley First School is thriving, financially responsible, and community-led. It provides exceptional education, support for children with additional needs, and vital childcare provision for working families. The proposed closure is based on flawed data and a poor consultation process that fails to reflect the realities faced by parents. I urge the council to reconsider. Do not remove the Reception intake for 2026, and do not proceed with closing a school that continues to deliver outstanding value, inclusion, and care for our community. Our children deserve stability, fairness, and a say in their own future. We deserve to know a clear vision of what the future looks like. If any school should close it should be appletree where people choose not too send there children a school that is smaller, a school where the management run away and hide when faced with all of this, a school that financially is worse than langley.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 10:13 PM

This proposal would have a significant impact on my child and our family. My child is happy, settled, and thriving at Langley First School, where the caring environment and excellent staff have supported their confidence and learning. Moving them to a different school would be very disruptive and could affect their progress and wellbeing. Appletree Gardens is further away from our home, which would make the school run longer using a car and less convenient. We currently enjoy being able to walk to Langley, and losing that local connection would affect our daily routine and our sense of community. Langley is an inclusive, welcoming school that plays a vital role in our area. Closing it would take away something special that benefits both children and families.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 10:33 PM

Whilst in principal I agree, this is purely because there is a clear need to align admission numbers across the 3 tiers within the NEPA. Currently having higher admission numbers in first and middle schools places a number of children outside of NEPA at a disadvantage between year 6-9 where they may need to make an in year transfer to an already established year group, or as an outsider with no friends at yr 7. You have not shown in the data a sound reasoning, as figures provided are not provided for all the schools consistently. You have shown the outcome you wanted to show. The merger would mean the loss of a holiday club at Langley that my family use, and as a result presumably increase pressure on remaining holiday clubs. Please remember that not all families have the luxury of grandparents etc to help with childcare. As you are also looking at middle schools in NEPA, I would like to suggest that admissions criteria is changed for ALL first and middle schools within NEPA, to include an additional criteria above "as the crow flies

distance" of priority will be given to children within NEPA. This would further protect schools on the outskirts of the NEPA, by making them less reliant on admissions from outside of NEPA and even other LA's.

Screen Name Redacted
11/11/2025 11:44 PM

When choosing a home, we deliberately bought within the Langley First School catchment area because of its outstanding reputation and community values. In September 2023, our daughter began her Langley journey — a shy little girl with no prior nursery experience. From the very first day, the staff showed such warmth, care, and understanding that she quickly grew in confidence, made friends, and developed a genuine love for learning. Over the past two years, my experience as a parent at Langley has exceeded every hope and expectation I had from that very first visit. It is a school that not only educates but genuinely nurtures and inspires, placing each child's wellbeing and development at the centre of everything it does. Langley is much more than a place of learning — it is the heartbeat of our community. The unwavering commitment of its staff, the strength of its values, and the sense of unity it fosters among families make it truly one of a kind and impossible to replace. To close Langley would not only be a devastating loss for Monkseaton, but it would also diminish the quality and richness of education across North Tyneside. The effects would be felt not only by current pupils but by future generations — a loss that would echo far beyond the school gates. I've highlighted my core concerns below: 1. The Fear and Anxiety of Additional Transitions This proposal has already had a direct and distressing impact on my 5-year-old daughter. Explaining to such a young child that the school she adores may close has been one of the most difficult conversations I've ever had. She has cried repeatedly, asked if she will lose her friends, and communicated her fear and anxiety about starting somewhere new with teachers that are unfamiliar. If the merger goes ahead, my daughter will face an unnecessary additional transition during her early education — a stage where stability and familiarity are pivotal. She typically takes time to settle into new environments, and another move for such a short period could be detrimental not only to her learning but also to her confidence, emotional wellbeing, and mental health. Research consistently demonstrates that early education experiences lay the foundations for long-term academic success and emotional resilience. Disrupting these early years risks long-term negative consequences for children like my daughter. 2. Concerns Around Safety and Access The proposal also raises serious concerns about pupil safety. Moving children to Appletree would require many to cross Seatonville Road — an extremely busy and dangerous route, especially at drop-off and pick-up times. Parking and traffic conditions around Appletree are already hazardous; adding approximately 120 more pupils will only increase risk. The lack of clear planning and basic due diligence North Tyneside Council has shown around this matter is deeply

concerning. By contrast, Langley offers a Safe Street Initiative, where the road directly outside the school gates is closed to traffic at key times. This initiative keeps children safe from vehicles, allows them to walk and cycle confidently, and provides a calm, social space where they can chat and play with friends before the school day begins. It supports children's wellbeing, builds community spirit among parents, and sets a positive tone for learning. Closing Langley would not only remove this important safeguard but also force many young children into riskier travel routes and more stressful morning routines. Every child's safety — something we should all agree is non-negotiable — would be compromised. 3. Disruption to Friendships and Trusted Relationships At Langley, my daughter has built strong, secure friendships since nursery. Forcing children to leave these bonds at such a formative age is deeply unfair. This proposal imposes a level of emotional upheaval that is unnecessary and harmful. Langley's parent survey showed that only 11% of parents would choose Appletree if Langley were to close. This means that most children could be dispersed across multiple schools, fracturing established friendship groups and destroying the close-knit community these children have known since age three. To make matters worse, the proposal does not include the retention of Langley staff. The relationships children have with trusted teachers — those who know how they learn, what motivates them, and what support they need — would be completely lost. Expecting a 5-year-old to rebuild this trust while grieving the loss of friendship groups and school community is unacceptable. This is yet another example of North Tyneside Council failing to have the children's best interests at heart, and adds to the diminishing trust the community has for this council. 4. Risks to Educational Quality Despite assurances from councillors that educational quality will not suffer, the evidence fails to support this. My daughter's year group is one of the largest at Langley, and it appears this merger is being rushed through for financial reasons rather than educational ones. Forcing large class sizes into an already stretched school environment will inevitably reduce the quality of teaching and individual support. If genuine thought had been given to minimising disruption, this change would not be proposed until at least September 2029, allowing larger cohorts to naturally transition to middle school without detriment. 5. Lack of Transparency and Practical Planning Parents are being asked to make decisions about their children's future without transparency about what the merged school environment would actually look like. There have been mentions of "hopes" of introducing a new school identity and ethos by councillors, but the fact that this proposal is being masked as a "merger" is not only misleading, but indicates a clear disregard for clarity and transparency from North Tyneside Council. There are still unanswered questions about classroom capacity, dining arrangements, toilets, corridor safety, fire safety, and the potential loss of valuable facilities like music rooms, libraries, and sensory

spaces. These fundamental aspects of safety and educational wellbeing should be paramount to any proposal, and the lack of thought, consideration and evaluation of basic day-to-day essentials by North Tyneside Council is extremely alarming. It is also deeply concerning that councillors had not even visited both schools at the time of the proposal being issued. In addition to that, a misrepresentation of the use of Langley's school field (which is actually on site), multiple errors in data, and a lack of transparency of the pupil forecast model demonstrates how poorly thought through this proposal is from North Tyneside Council, and their ability to successfully maintain community trust. 6. Impact on Children's Wellbeing and SEND Support This proposal ignores the growing concern around social, emotional, and mental health (SEMH) needs in our local authority. Larger class sizes and reduced provision mean that the very spaces and interventions children may need to cope with this upheaval — such as calm areas, sensory rooms, and time-out spaces — are likely to be lost. While my daughter does not have SEND, several children in her class do, and the impact on them will ripple across the whole classroom. Langley currently provides excellent support; removing that stability will harm not only those children but also their peers, including my daughter. 7. Consequences for Our Family We bought our home specifically to be within the Langley catchment area because of its strong reputation, community feel, and educational quality. If the school closes, we will face a longer commute, childcare uncertainty, and potential financial challenges. The closure could also impact property values in a negative way and eliminate parental choice — something we exercised carefully when first applying for schools. We did not choose Appletree as one of our three options, and the council's own figures show why: only 44% of parents in Appletree's catchment actually choose it, compared with 73% choosing Langley. The council's decision to keep the less-favoured school undermines parental trust and choice. For our family, this proposal has caused immense stress — hours spent reading inconsistent data, researching alternatives, and worrying about our child's future. Balancing this with full-time jobs and supporting my daughter emotionally has been challenging and exhausting. 8. A Short-Term Fix with Long-Term Consequences This proposal feels like a short-term fix with long-term consequences. The council's own data shows that over 3,000 new homes are planned in the area — equating to a projected need for around 748 new primary school places and a new two-form-entry primary school. Why close a thriving, high-quality school like Langley, which sits within the catchment for these developments? It makes no sense to disrupt hundreds of children's education now, only to require additional capacity a few years later. Additionally, recent changes — such as South Wellfield and Wellfield Middle School proposing to federate — raise new questions about the broader educational landscape that this proposal and North Tyneside Council has failed to address. 9.

Concerns About Process and Fairness The merger proposal has been tied to the expansion of Woodlawn School, creating an unfair and misleading “either/or” scenario. By combining two unrelated proposals, the council has made it difficult for the community to express nuanced opinions. Parents were not clearly informed that to comment on Woodlawn’s expansion, they had to complete the Langley/Appletree consultation, which may have skewed the data in favour of the council’s preferred outcome. While SEND provision is vital, it should not come at the expense of hundreds of children’s mainstream education. Both matters deserve proper, independent consideration — something that North Tyneside Council are repeatedly failing to provide. 10. Failure to Prioritise Children’s Best Interests The council claims that this proposal prioritises children’s best interests and ensures high-quality education for all — yet every part of this process suggests otherwise. With factual inaccuracies, missing information, and a rushed, unacceptable six-week consultation period, parents have been left feeling unheard and unsupported. It is heartbreaking and infuriating to see such a strong, nurturing, and high-performing school being treated as expendable. Our children deserve better. Summary The closure of Langley First School would cause high emotional distress, educational disruption, and long-term harm to my daughter and countless other children. It lacks transparency, safety consideration, basic due diligence and educational logic. As a parent, I am deeply disappointed in the council’s approach — both in substance and in process. A six-week consultation for a decision of this magnitude is an insult to the families and children whose lives are directly affected. I urge North Tyneside Council to withdraw this proposal and work collaboratively with parents, staff, and the wider community to find a solution that genuinely supports our children’s futures rather than undermining them.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 12:24 AM

[redacted] this entire process is very unsettling for them and it's flies in the face of everything the Building a better North Tyneside outlines

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 08:15 AM

See above

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 08:28 AM

The proposal to merge Langley First School with Appletree Gardens First School would have a significant negative impact on my children and our family, both practically and emotionally. 1. Loss of a walkable, community-based school. We currently walk to Langley First School every day. This is an important part of our family routine - it saves us

	time and money, promotes healthy habits, and contributes to sustainability by reducing car use. If Langley were to close, all alternative schools, including Appletree, would require us to drive. This would increase our travel costs, take longer each day, and add further congestion and pollution to already busy local roads. The council's consultation materials assume most families would walk, but Friends of Langley's parent survey shows that over half of families would need to drive if they had to move to Appletree. This would directly undermine North Tyneside's environmental and active travel goals. 2. Loss of childcare that allows us to work. Both parents in our household work full-time in demanding jobs. We rely heavily on our local childminder, who has served Langley families for almost 30 years- for before- and after-school childcare because it is flexible, reliable, and located on site. It allows us to manage long working hours while ensuring our children are cared for safely within walking distance. Appletree's "Little Pips" childcare offers fewer hours, closes earlier, and does not provide care for the same age range. If Langley closes, we would likely lose this vital support, forcing us to cut working hours or even reconsider employment options. This would cause serious financial strain for our family and many others in the same position. 3. Emotional and educational impact on our children. Both of our children are thriving at Langley. The school has a warm, inclusive culture, strong leadership, and an excellent record for supporting children of all needs and backgrounds. The staff know our children personally; they feel happy, safe, and valued. Moving them- particularly our younger child in Nursery - would disrupt that security and their educational progress at a formative stage. Langley's approach to inclusion, pastoral support, and SEND provision is exceptional, and we have no reassurance that equivalent spaces, expertise, or nurture provision would be available at Appletree. 4. Community cohesion and wellbeing. Langley is at the heart of our local community. The school fosters strong relationships among parents, staff, and neighbours. Its potential closure has already caused anxiety and upset among families. Removing such a positive, connected hub would be a deep loss for our community and would erode the local identity that families like ours chose to be part of when we moved here. In summary: This proposal would mean: • Longer, more expensive, and less sustainable school journeys • Loss of accessible childcare that underpins our ability to work • Emotional disruption for two young children who are settled and happy • A significant blow to our local community and to the inclusive, high-quality education Langley provides For these reasons, I strongly oppose the proposed merger and urge the council to reconsider options that protect both families and the community we've built around Langley First School.
Screen Name Redacted	I strongly oppose the proposed closure of Langley First School, which

11/12/2025 09:00 AM

would have a profound and deeply personal impact on my family. We moved to West Monkseaton specifically because of Langley's outstanding reputation and its central role in the community. My son is currently in Year 2 and thriving—he has formed strong friendships, is developing beautifully, and is enjoying a happy, enriching childhood surrounded by peers from the local area. My daughter has just started in Reception, and we were excited for her to follow in her brother's footsteps at a school where he is flourishing. Our youngest child attends Langley's wraparound care, which all three of our children have been part of since they were nine months old. They have all attended Langley Nursery and either attend or will attend Langley First School. This continuity has been invaluable to their development and wellbeing. As a family, we walk to school together and regularly engage with other families in the community. We attend school-organised social events, which help foster a strong sense of belonging and connection. Langley provides the kind of education and environment every parent hopes for their children. If Langley First School were to close, the consequences for my family's daily life would be significant. While my son may be placed at Appletree Gardens, my daughter would not attend the same school, and our youngest would need to move to a different nursery altogether. This would mean our family, who currently walk together to one local school, would be forced to travel to three separate locations each day. This change would not only disrupt our children's routines and friendships, but also undermine the community connections we've built through shared school experiences. It would increase car journeys, reduce time spent together, and add unnecessary stress to our lives. Langley currently provides a cohesive, walkable, and community-focused environment that supports families like ours. Its closure would fragment that experience and diminish the quality of life for many local residents. I implore the council to reconsider its strategy. It is unjust to close a school that is almost at capacity, with an outstanding reputation and deep-rooted value to the area, while retaining a school with significantly lower numbers. The proposal to merge Langley and Woodlawn into a single, large special needs school is too vast and would be devastating to the community. Langley is not just a school—it is the heart of West Monkseaton. If Langley First School were to close, the impact on my family would be so significant that we would seriously consider; relocating, exploring home schooling, pursuing legal action against North Tyneside Council. The proposal disregards the needs of families who have built their lives around this outstanding school, and the lack of transparency and fairness in the process has left us feeling unheard and unsupported.

Screen Name Redacted

11/12/2025 09:13 AM

Opposition Statement to the Proposed Closure of Langley First School I am writing to formally oppose the proposed closure of

Langley First School. This proposal would have a severe and lasting impact on my family, my employment, and my children's wellbeing. When I chose Langley First, I did so because of its excellent reputation, strong ethos, and locality. As a single parent with no family or support network, the ability to walk to school and work is essential to maintaining our daily stability and quality of life. This proposal would dismantle that balance and create significant hardship for my family. Lack of Transparency and Accountability There are only two credible options for the council at this stage: 1. Close the consultation and keep Langley First School open. 2. Delay the consultation until accurate information, correct data, and proper analysis are available — following an internal investigation into how such an inaccurate and misleading proposal was produced. On this basis, I will not be submitting alternative proposals, as the current process lacks credibility and cannot form the basis of fair decision-making. Failure of Collaboration and Communication The handling of communication between schools has been extremely concerning. [redacted] If this is intended to be a "merger," the complete lack of dialogue, reassurance, or cooperation from the proposed partner school is unacceptable. As parents, we would expect transparency, collaboration, and mutual respect between both schools. The silence from Appletree has created deep mistrust and has already given parents a negative impression of the proposed merger. Impact on My Family Educational Disruption and Emotional Impact This proposal would result in my child, who will be entering Year 4 at the time, being forced to change schools for just one year before moving again to middle school. This would mean two school transitions in two years, which is entirely unnecessary and damaging. My son has already struggled to settle and form friendships and finds change particularly challenging. Such repeated disruption will have a detrimental effect on his emotional wellbeing and ability to learn. Stability at this stage of education is vital, and this proposal fails to protect that. Consultation Process and Timing The consultation process itself is inadequate and contrary to government consultation guidelines, which require adequate time and accessibility for meaningful public engagement. • The consultation period has run over a major school holiday, significantly limiting the ability of parents, staff, and governors to participate fully. • [redacted] Given that this proposal has been years in development, such a rushed and poorly timed consultation period gives the clear impression of a predetermined outcome rather than a genuine effort to seek and

consider public input. This approach undermines public confidence and falls short of the standards of transparency, fairness, and accountability expected of a local authority consultation process. Wraparound Care Provision The council has not adequately addressed the disparity in wraparound care between Langley First and Appletree Gardens, which is being suggested as an alternative. Langley First offers: • Term time: 7:30am – 6:00pm • Holidays: 8:00am – 5:30pm Appletree Gardens offers: • Term time: 7:45am – 5:30pm • Holidays: Monday–Thursday 8:00am – 5:00pm; Friday 8:00am – 3:30pm The reduced hours at Appletree Gardens would make it impossible for me to maintain my job, as I would be unable to collect my child on time. A 3:30pm finish every Friday in school holidays would mean taking annual leave weekly — something that is simply not feasible for any working parent. Employment and Financial Stability [redacted] If I were forced to change employment due to childcare or travel issues, I would face taking a low-paid, unskilled job at roughly half my current income. This would likely result in the forced sale of my home and financial instability for my family. Reducing my hours or altering my shift pattern is not an option, as we are already struggling to make ends meet. Lack of Viable Alternatives With Appletree Gardens ruled out, I would have to look at other schools that might offer suitable wraparound care. Research carried out by parents in this campaign has shown these provisions are already oversubscribed, with no guarantee of places. This means my parental choice would be removed entirely, leaving me to choose a school based only on childcare availability — not on what is best for my child's education or wellbeing. This is inequitable and discriminatory towards working families, particularly single parents. Transport and Logistical Challenges If Langley closes, I will be left managing two separate school drop-offs in opposite directions — one for my younger child and another for my eldest attending a middle school further away (especially following the proposed closure of Monkseaton Middle School). This will significantly increase travel time and make it near impossible to arrive at work on time. For shift-based roles like mine, even small delays can risk disciplinary action or job loss. General Issues with the Consultation and Supporting Information There are several factual inaccuracies and omissions within the council's documentation that undermine the reliability of this consultation: - Misrepresentation of school facilities: The report claims Langley has no direct access to playing fields and must escort pupils off-site for PE. - In reality, Langley has a playing field immediately adjacent to the school, an additional field across a minor road used only once a year for sports day, and several outdoor learning areas — including a forest school garden, potting garden, and outdoor classroom

supporting SEND pupils. - Incorrect financial information: It was stated that the school is in financial deficit. - This is false — the school has only predicted a potential shortfall for 2025/26, for the first time ever, and is working with an independent financial advisor to address it. - Inaccurate catchment and travel data: The documentation suggests most families can access Appletree Gardens “without crossing major roads.” - Many pupils would need to cross Seatonville Road and/or Cauldwell Lane, both busy and unsafe for unaccompanied children. - Limited engagement with school leaders: While meetings were held with headteachers, these were brief and excluded governors, limiting the opportunity to discuss realistic alternatives. - Errors in data and projections: Several inaccuracies exist in pupil number forecasts, deficit projections, and data for nearby schools, leading to unreliable conclusions about capacity and demand. - Lack of community impact assessment: No assessment has been completed for Langley First. The only cited report, from December 2024, relates to the Monkseaton High School proposal. - Failure to consider wraparound and early years care: The consultation completely omits analysis of childcare provision, despite this being essential for many working families. - No consultation with wraparound providers: Neither the governing body nor management of ‘School’s Out’ (Langley’s out-of-hours care provider) have been contacted as part of the process. Pupil Numbers and Popularity • Freedom of Information data shows that only 44% of pupils in the Appletree catchment attend Appletree Gardens; 52% choose other schools. In previous years, that figure was 39% (2024) and 48% (2023). This consistent pattern shows that Appletree is not a popular choice even within its own catchment area. • Appletree Gardens ranks 6th out of 7 local schools in terms of parental preference. This raises a serious question: if local families do not want to send their children there now, why would Langley families want to in future? • Langley parents have made their views clear. In a parent survey, 89% said they would choose other local schools if Langley closed. The council has made a huge assumption that Langley families will simply move to Appletree Gardens, but this is false. If the closure proceeds, Appletree Gardens’ pupil numbers are likely to continue to fall, pushing that school into financial deficit and potentially resulting in another closure proposal within a few years. Ofsted History and School Quality The difference in school quality is clear and well-documented: • Appletree Gardens: 9 years rated Satisfactory and 11 years rated Good. • Langley First: 19 years rated Outstanding and 2 years rated Good. Parents have repeatedly chosen Langley for its consistent excellence. Closing a long-established, high-performing school in favour of one with a weaker record is illogical and contrary to the council’s stated aim of raising educational standards. There is a reason families choose Langley and it is because of its reputation, there is a reason families don’t choose Appletree. Birth Rates and Local Demographics The council’s justification for this proposal relies

heavily on falling birth rates. However, this reasoning is flawed and short-sighted: • While birth rates have declined up to 2023, the ONS predicts they will level off by 2026 and begin rising again thereafter. • Schools in the North East Planning Area (NEPA) have remained resilient to the downward trend, staying within the council's acceptable surplus range since 2020. • Internal migration has not been considered. ONS data shows more young families are moving into North Tyneside than leaving, many specifically relocating to the coast for access to the three-tier school system. • In a survey by Friends of Langley, 58% of respondents moved to the area specifically for Langley First School, and a further 3% had plans to move here for the same reason. • The North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 itself contradicts the rationale for closure, stating that "net inward migration from neighbouring areas, primarily Newcastle, helps sustain the overall working-age population and limits the fall in the number of children." • Appletree Gardens has averaged a 23% surplus over the past five years, showing it is far more affected by declining rolls than Langley. Parental Choice and Demand The consultation assumes that Langley parents will move their children to Appletree Gardens. The evidence does not support this: • Appletree has consistently lower parental preference — only 44% of catchment pupils attend there, compared to 73% at Langley. • 88.2% of parents in the Friends of Langley survey said Appletree was not one of their original school preferences. • When asked which school they would choose if Langley closed: • 38.5% chose South Wellfield • 20.3% chose Southridge • 11.2% chose Marine Park • Only 11.2% chose Appletree Gardens • 43 parents said they would refuse a place at Appletree if offered, and 62 said they would consider home-schooling instead. Admissions data also shows that Langley attracts families from much further afield — the last place offered for Langley in 2025 was nearly 6 miles away, compared to 3.6 miles for Appletree, proving Langley's wider appeal and stronger reputation. This proposal would therefore remove true parental choice and close the more popular, demographically stable school. Current Year 2 Children For families with children currently in Year 2, the impact would be especially damaging: • All schools within NEPA are currently full for this year group, except Appletree Gardens (with only two available places). • A merger would create a Year 4 cohort of 118 pupils, with no clarity on class size arrangements. • There are serious concerns that class sizes will exceed 30 pupils, particularly as no guarantees have been given by the council or Appletree Gardens. • Implementing the merger in 2027 would disrupt the largest cohorts currently moving through the system. If a merger were ever to happen, it should be deferred until the smaller birth-rate cohorts are in place. Personal Impact on My Family As outlined earlier, this proposal would cause serious disruption to my family life, employment, and children's wellbeing — including: • Two school changes in two years for my son • The loss of viable wraparound care • [redacted]

[redacted] • Financial instability and potential homelessness This is not an educational reorganisation — it is a proposal that will destabilise families and working lives. Conclusion This proposal extends beyond education — it threatens to destabilise working families and remove the foundations that allow single parents like me to remain in employment. It will: • Disrupt children's education and emotional wellbeing • Eliminate access to reliable wraparound care • Jeopardise employment and financial security • Disproportionately impact single-parent and working families In my case, it could realistically result in loss of employment, financial hardship, and even homelessness. The council's proposal is based on incorrect information, flawed assumptions, and incomplete data. It ignores community evidence, parental choice, and the real-life consequences for working families. The only reasonable outcomes are: 1. To withdraw the proposal and keep Langley First School open, or 2. To delay the consultation until accurate information is available and the process can be redone transparently. For the wellbeing of our children, the integrity of local education, and the fairness owed to this community, I urge the Council to reject this closure proposal. I urge the Council to reconsider this proposal and recognise the full social, economic, and emotional implications of closing Langley First School. The school is not just a place of learning — it is a vital part of community life that provides stability, opportunity, and support for families. For these reasons, I strongly oppose the proposed closure of Langley First School

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 11:03 AM

I am writing to you as a parent and member of the Langley First School community, I would like to state that I am strongly against the proposal to close Langley First School to merge with Appletree Gardens. This plan is not in the best interests of our children or community and I have serious concerns about its impact. The news have recently published that North Tyneside Council (NTC) have no plans to increase the current consultation period which is absolutely unacceptable as we were advised during our consultation meeting at Whitley Bay High School (WBHS) that if enough people included the extension request in the 'Have your say' responses that it would be considered. The deadline for these responses is not until Thursday 13th November, so how can you confirm there will definitely be no extension when not all responses have yet been submitted. I hope this is not an indication that you are not interested in our responses. I hope that all responses will be acknowledged and taken seriously. NTC have had years to develop these proposals yet are expecting parents and staff to digest the details, ask questions that we get no answers to and come up with a realistic alternative in just six weeks. This is completely unreasonable, especially for working parents who are already stretched. We have been given the bare minimum amount of time deliberately so that we do not have the time to

compete against it. This is seeming like a tick box exercise and if NTC truly cared for our children within the community and their educations as they claim to, these proposals would not have been made without firstly fully inspecting the sites of the affected schools. This is extremely disappointing that no one has been to visit the schools prior to this to ensure that 'factual' details are correct as evidently following the meeting at WBHS, it was made clear that various 'facts' published are incorrect. These inaccuracies included that Langley has a field separated by a public highway meaning that children are escorted offsite for each PE/sporting activity and have no access to playing fields during lunch and breaks. This is untrue, the school in fact has a large field adjacent to the school building which is used on a daily basis. Langley also has great outdoor space in the reception garden which follows a forest school ethos and is also used for children with SEND as well as a potting garden and an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming. The field that NTC are referring to is a separate field belonging to Langley across a minor quiet road which is only used once a year for sports day. The consultation document advised that the majority of dwellings currently in the Langley catchment can access Appletree without crossing major roads, this is also incorrect. Many Langley children would need to cross the extremely busy main road Seatonville Road and/or Cauldwell Lane. If this proposal goes ahead the assumption from NTC appears to be that children will walk to school. However a recent parent survey carried out by Friends of Langley highlighted that only 18% currently drive to school at Langley yet this would increase to 55% if moved to Appletree. As a family it would hugely negatively impact us as we would no longer be able to walk to school or wrap around. The difference in distance would mean we would have to drive to school in order to get to work on time. This would impact our family significantly as we would need to buy a second car in order to do this. Adding huge financial stress to us. We may also need to look at reducing or changing our working hours in order to make it work which would also impact us financially and there is no guarantee that our workplace would be able to accommodate changes. If we are unable to adjust working hours we would need to look into increasing wrap around sessions which again will have additional cost implications and we are unsure on where this provision will even be as this has not been taken into account. There will be a huge increase in the number of families who will be driving to school if this proposal goes ahead, yet no evidence has been provided in the supporting documents in relation to traffic impact of these proposals. Langley currently closes the street outside school every morning to make it safer for the children. Appletree cannot close the street to cars in the mornings or at collection times due to it being on a bus route. Langley also has a free public car park very close by and Appletree does not have any access to a car park. It is situated within a residential estate and I imagine the local residents

would not be pleased with the increase of traffic and congestion either. The increase in the volume of traffic will have a huge impact on local residents as the area is already congested at school times without this added traffic taken into account, not to mention the impact this increase will have on the environment. There were also several other inaccuracies regarding pupil numbers and inaccurate pupil data which if had been researched correctly would have highlighted that Appletree is not actually big enough to accommodate all of the Langley children. NTC's figures show Langley has only around 10% surplus places (an acceptable level), while Appletree has 25% but this equates to only about 15 spare spaces per year group. This is not enough to accommodate all Langley pupils meaning children risk being sent further afield. The document states that Appletree can accommodate 432 pupils, enough to cover both school's children yet the information recorded on the government website disputes this and states a capacity of only 293. Also neither the nursery or wrap around provisions have been considered as a part of this consultation which is extremely worrying as there does not appear to be anywhere near enough capacity across other provisions to accommodate all of Langley's requirements. Further to this NTC have offered no assurance about how the Langley children could be accommodated onsite nor has it given us any assurance on class sizes. We know that in early year's provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. Appletree may have more classrooms than Langley yet only 2 out of those proposed 13 classrooms meet the government guidance of 62m2 for 30 reception children and 55m2 for KS1+, whereas 10 out of the 11 classrooms at Langley exceed the guidance. Without any guarantees from NTC or Appletree there is a concern amongst parents that our children will be placed in larger class sizes but in smaller rooms. As a parent I am extremely worried about this as this merge would mean there would be almost 120 pupils in a single year group which would inevitably increase the class sizes, reduce teacher-pupil ratios and have a negative impact on the wellbeing, attention and educational outcomes of all children involved. Not only would the classrooms be overcrowded, but corridors, dinner halls, toilet facilities etc will all be overcrowded and if Appletree is extended to accommodate the Langley children as suggested by NTC, this would also greatly reduce the outside space at Appletree which is so important to the children's wellbeing, not to mention the impact on our SEND children which I will come back to. This wouldn't just affect Langley and Appletree pupils, neighbouring schools would also become oversubscribed creating wider pressures across the area. Our priority must be the wellbeing and the education of our children. The merger of Langley and Appletree are not just administrative changes, Langley is more than a school building it is the heart of our community. Closing it will displace pupils, split up established friendship groups and weaken vital links between

families, staff and local services. This harms children's sense of belonging and the cohesion of our community. This closure would also greatly impact my child, he is so settled in Langley, he loves all the teachers and has a wonderful friendship group that help him learn and thrive. Langley has a unique culture and ethos which cannot simply be transferred to another setting. Closing the school would create such disruption to my child and would create anxieties and unnecessary worries. He is very uneasy amongst crowds and I fear that the numbers of children that would be forced into the one school if Langley where to close would be too much for him to deal with. This creates worry for us parents as we do not want our child to feel scared when at school amongst peers, especially when there will be no familiar teachers present either to offer comfort and support. We also do not want his education to suffer as a result. We do not want huge class numbers or temporary makeshift classrooms for our child to learn in. This is not what we chose for our child. We chose Langley because of its reputation and we moved to the area so that we were within catchment. So when the time came we knew Langley was the school that we wanted our children to attend. As a family we love Langley, the teachers are incredible and the support, love and attention they give every child really makes it a special place to be. This is the school I want my children to grow, learn and thrive in. I also have a second child currently in nursery who I have every intention of sending to Langley. These proposals if they go ahead, may mean that he would potentially have to go to a different school which would further add to our stress and disruption. How are we supposed to manage two different school drop offs and pickups, still work and navigate two different sets of school meetings, parents evenings etc. This is not feasible and again would have significant financial impact as it would mean two different school uniforms that we would have to purchase. I currently have uniform from my eldest waiting to be passed down to my youngest which if Langley closes, will be wasted. The Appletree colour is different to Langley so we are unable to use what we already have and would have to buy new uniforms to meet the Appletree uniform policy as well as potentially a second school for my second child. Langley also has 40 children out of 297 on the SEN register, equating to 13.5%. However there are an additional 24 children who are receiving additional support following early identification which takes this figure up to 24%. These children thrive on stability, routine and familiar staff who know them well, moving them into a larger, unfamiliar environment risks setting back their progress and widening the gap between SEND pupils and their peers. Langley currently offers amazing support for children with additional needs, the building is all on ground level with ramp access, there are accessible toilets and a specially adapted changing space with bed for a child with a catheter. The sensory room has no windows allowing a fully darkened experience if needed and has a padded wall and floor. The outdoor space in the reception garden as

previously mentioned follows a forest school ethos and is used for children with SEND through their time at Langley and there is a potting garden to offer gardening opportunities for small groups of children. The teachers offer a lunchtime club away from the dinner hall. There are three specially adapted spaces, The Nest in the Nursery, The Sensory Room (Hive) which offers an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming and a specifically adapted KS2 space. These spaces allow for breathing space as well as targeted intervention for children who struggle with the demands of the classroom and are well used. Every classroom has a ‘haven’ area which children can use to regulate and re-set and classroom adaptations are also regularly used throughout the school i.e. flexible seating arrangements, visual timetables, movement breaks and additional support/intervention for reading etc. The school also presents as ‘Neurodiversity Affirming’ with subtle adaptations to the environment such as soft lighting, clear visuals, adapted seating arrangements, strategies for regulating emotions throughout etc. No guarantees have been given about what, if any, adapted provision, SEN specific places or breakout spaces would be available at Appletree following the closure of Langley. By merging the schools the council admitted that this would mean using the classrooms which are currently used as sensory/breakout rooms, rooms which are pivotal to supporting children with SEND in mainstream. By removing these rooms we are failing our children with SEND and also negatively impacting the positive direction the council were trying to take regarding inclusivity in our mainstream settings. The inclusive culture and staff expertise have been developed over time at Langley. It is authentic and reliant on the staff team, their strong relationships, communication skills, connection and dedication to the children. Rather than being viewed as a candidate for closure simply because it is located next to a special school, Langley’s position represents a strategic opportunity. Its proximity to Woodlawn Special School allows for dual registration, enabling pupils to access targeted interventions and therapies as needed while continuing to participate in mainstream classes and interact with a diverse peer group. This approach supports the government’s key priority of inclusive education, keeping children with additional needs in mainstream settings wherever possible. It is evident from the consultation meeting and proposal that one of the driving factors for this to go ahead is the intention that Woodlawn will take over the Langley site and move the post-16 provision from Marden High School (32 children in total according to Ofsted) thereby displacing 300 children for the benefit of 32 children. This is effectively creating a false choice. Asking the community to accept a suboptimal and unstable mainstream solution in exchange for a desirable SEND solution. The long-term health of the mainstream school system should not be compromised to solve a logistical problem for SEND provision, however important that provision may be. Each school develops its own curriculum focus,

values and ways of working with children and this merger would result in the loss of exceptional teaching staff which is detrimental to our children. Merging into Appletree does not guarantee that the strengths and traditions of Langley will continue and I don't believe Langley is the right school to choose for closure. I simply cannot understand how a flourishing school delivering excellent outcomes and nurturing, confident, happy young people can be marked for closure. This proposal appears to represent a short term financial reaction rather than a sustainable education strategy and I urge NTC to reconsider and make decisions based on long-term value, not convenience. The documentation advised that the school is already in financial deficit which is also incorrect. The school has only predicted a deficit for the year 25/26 for the first time ever and is currently working with a financial advisor to see where the budget can be improved. Also according to the government's school spending comparison tool, Appletree is the more expensive building to run spending £29 per square metre on utilities compared to Langley which spends £4 per square metre. An analysis of birth rates mapped against six years' of reception offers data for each school also showed Appletree is ranked as the most sensitive school in the entire planning area to falling birth rates. Langley by contrast has a medium sensitivity, cushioned by its proven popularity and wider draw. NTC's proposal is therefore not just to close the more popular school, thereby ignoring parental choice, but also to close the more demographically stable and resilient one, leading to a longer-term risk. The consultation document also shows 44% of catchment children attend Appletree compared to 73% at Langley; 12% of Langley pupils attend from the Appletree Gardens catchment area. NTC's projection figures also appear to be inaccurate, it projects 59 pupils starting in 2025 in Reception in Langley which drops by six students to 53 in Y1. There is no explanation of this and no indication from parents in this year group of their intention to leave. In comparison, Appletree appears to gain 18 students between Reception to Y1, again with no explanation as to where these additional students have come from and not in line with the school's admission records. One of the main factors in NTC's decision-making is the concern that the capacity at WBHS is 390 pupils and the proposed first school and middle school changes are aimed at preventing the high school from going over capacity. However our research group has found that based on the council's methodology, from the current reception onwards, it is unlikely the numbers of pupils at WBHS will reach 390. Therefore NTC's focus on ensuring numbers don't exceed this figure are misguided. The issue NTC is trying to fix relates to children already in the system rather than future pupil projections, particularly the current Y2 and Y5 year groups. Closing Langley will not tackle this issue. In addition the Murton Gap development will see up to 3,000 new homes being built between now and 2032. NTC has consistently told us that new homes don't

automatically mean more children. However, the development proposal estimates a need for an additional 748 primary school places and proposes to build a new two-form entry primary school to provide an additional 420 primary school places for the development. NTC's own projections indicate that the new homes will generate approximately 72 additional students per year group and Langley First School will be perfectly positioned. Yet according to the council's school catchment checker, the development is covered by New York Primary School. However there is a considerable proportion of the development which would be considerably closer to both Langley and Appletree. The proposal as it stands undermines the three tier education system, a key factor that attracts families to the area. The guaranteed progression to WBHS is a significant draw and Langley is an integral part of this established pathway. To close it would weaken the very system NTC claims to be sustaining. The challenges of a future school place planning are a valid concern however closing existing well located schools in anticipation of building new ones is an inefficient and disruptive use of resources. A more sustainable approach would be to maintain and invest in Langley and recognise its vital role in the community and its capacity to absorb the forthcoming influx of students. The Government also announced earlier this week that they are revitalising the national curriculum to ensure children and young people leave school fully equipped to thrive in the modern world of work. This will include the publication of a new Oracy framework to ensure that young people are confident and effective speakers. Langley has had a huge head start on this having already been working with the Voice North of Tyne Project for 3years. Oracy is used across all areas from lessons, performances, lunchtime chats and school council meetings. I have no idea why would you would choose to close a school that's already ahead of the game when it comes to the national education agenda. For these reasons, I strongly urge you to reconsider these proposals and protect Langley First School's future. Our children deserve stability, belonging and the high-quality education they are already receiving in their own community school. Thank you for your time and for listening to our concerns. I hope you will reconsider the proposals and support keeping Langley First School open or at the very least extend the consultation period to give us more time to further develop counter proposals.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 11:12 AM

[redacted]

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 11:46 AM

How This Proposal Will Affect My Child and Family Langley First School is not just where my child learns—it is where they feel safe, supported, and part of a community. Closing Langley would have a

devastating impact on my child's education, wellbeing, and our family life. Loss of Stability and Quality of Education My child thrives because of the strong relationships with teachers who know them personally. Moving to a new school means losing that familiarity and trust. Larger class sizes at Appletree will reduce individual attention and increase pressure on teachers, risking a decline in quality. There is also a fear that children will be taught in inappropriate spaces—converted storage rooms or temporary portacabins—because the building cannot accommodate the numbers. This is not the environment I want for my child. Impact on Learning and Development Langley's approach to phonics is consistent and highly effective. A sudden change in teaching method could disrupt my child's progress in reading and writing at a critical stage. These early years set the foundation for lifelong learning—any setback now could have lasting consequences. Wraparound Care – A Critical Lifeline We rely on Langley's wraparound care to balance work and family life and have never had a problem accessing its service. It offers flexible hours from 7:30am to 6:00pm, which allows both my wife and I to work full-time. Appletree's provision is shorter and less flexible, and with more parents competing for limited spaces, there is no guarantee this would even be available. Losing this service would force us to reduce working hours or even change jobs, creating financial strain and career disruption. This is not a minor inconvenience—it is a fundamental change to how our family functions and could have wider economic consequences across the community. Specialist support Langley has dedicated spaces and staff for children with additional needs. My child benefits from these every day. There is no guarantee these will exist at Appletree, and no clear plan for how SEND provision will be maintained. Increased commute and disruption to work Our journey will go from a 5-minute walk to 15 minutes each way. That might sound small, but it triples the total commute—from 10 minutes to 30. Right now, I can drop her off and be home in time for a 9am work call. Under this proposal, that will no longer be possible, creating stress and impacting my job. For families without cars, this is even more challenging. Increased traffic will affect both areas—Appletree will see more cars from families traveling further, and the expanded Woodlawn site will bring more taxis, minibuses, and private vehicles for SEND pupils. This raises safety concerns and environmental impact. Loss of independence and safety We live so close to Langley that in the near future, I hoped my daughter could walk to school on her own. The route is safe, and the only road is closed to cars in the morning. With Appletree, this will never be possible. The distance and busy roads mean I will have to walk her every day until she leaves, removing an important step toward independence. Community Connections Torn Apart Langley is the heart of our community. Events like the summer fair and the parents' quiz night bring families together and create a sense of belonging. Closing the school destroys these connections and erodes the social

fabric that supports children and parents alike. Emotional Toll on Children Children need stability, routine, and familiar faces. Forcing them into a new environment with bigger classes, fewer resources, and unfamiliar staff will cause anxiety and stress. For some, this could lead to long-term issues with confidence and engagement in learning. Financial strain New uniforms, higher travel costs, and the hidden costs of managing childcare gaps. This proposal is not just about numbers—it is about real children and real families. It will disrupt education, damage wellbeing, and dismantle a thriving community. There are better, fairer alternatives that achieve the council's aims without harming the very people these schools exist to serve. As Well as personal impacts of the proposal, there are a number of further reasons why I strongly oppose the proposal to close Langley First School and merge it with Appletree Gardens First School. The current proposal is not fit for purpose, is based on incomplete and sometimes incorrect information, and fails to consider the full impact on children, families, and the wider community. I urge the council to pause, review, and work with the community to find a fairer, more sustainable solution that puts children first. Why I Do Not Support the Proposal A. The Proposal Is Not a True Merger • The process is, in effect, a closure of Langley First School, with Appletree Gardens retaining its identity, governing body, and DfE number. This is divisive and unfair, and does not allow for a genuine blending of school cultures, staff, or ethos. B. Flawed and Incomplete Evidence Base • Inaccurate and misleading information: The council's documentation contains factual errors about Langley's facilities, financial position, and accessibility. • Capacity figures are disputed: The council claims Appletree can accommodate 432 pupils, but government data lists its capacity as 293. • Financial projections are misleading: Langley is only forecasting a deficit for the first time in 2025/26 and is actively working to address it. • No community impact assessment: No specific assessment has been done for the closure of Langley First School. • No traffic or transport assessment: There is no evidence on the impact of increased car journeys, parking, or road safety at Appletree Gardens. • No detailed SEND transition plan: There is no clarity on how specialist provision, breakout spaces, or inclusive culture will be maintained or improved if Langley closes. C. Failure to Consider Key Issues • Parental choice is ignored: Langley is more popular and resilient than Appletree, with 73% of catchment children attending Langley versus 44% at Appletree. • Wraparound and early years provision overlooked: Langley's wraparound care is superior and more flexible than Appletree's. • Birth rates and migration not fully considered: ONS data shows birth rates are expected to rise after 2026, and inward migration and new housing developments (Murton Gap) could quickly reverse current trends. • SEND and inclusion not prioritised: Langley has a strong, neurodiversity-affirming culture and specialist spaces. D. Democratic and Procedural Gaps • MP Non-Engagement: Despite repeated

requests, our local MP has not engaged with my requests for engagement on the matter (and I am aware the same is true for other parents). This is a glaring gap in democratic accountability and undermines the legitimacy of the consultation process. • FOI Delays: Several Freedom of Information requests from parents remain unanswered or have been delayed, meaning key information will not be available before the consultation closes. This prevents parents from making fully informed submissions and is a serious procedural flaw. Conclusion The current proposal is not robust, is based on incomplete and sometimes incorrect information, and fails to consider the full impact on children, families, and the community. The lack of engagement from our MP and delays in FOI responses further undermine the legitimacy of the process. There are better, fairer, and more innovative alternatives available. I urge the council to pause, review, and work with the community to find a solution that puts children first and protects the unique strengths of Langley First School.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 11:48 AM

I object to the closure of Langley First School and the sending of all those children to Appletree Gardens First School. I am deeply concerned about the profound impact this change will have on my child's emotional well-being and educational experience. Younger children, particularly those who are as shy as mine, experience transitions like this with great intensity. Moving to a new school is not simply a logistical adjustment—it can cause overwhelming anxiety. It is the loss of everything she knows and loves about going to school. Having just settled into the school environment she is starting to find her own personality and confidence. She will have to start all over again meeting unfamiliar teachers, and navigating an entirely new environment which will be overcrowded beyond its intended use. Beyond this, she may lose the close friendships she has made which helps her to be happy in her learning environment. She has bonded with teachers she trusts which will be taken away and the loss of that familiar rountine and environment will strip away the sense of security she has built. The stress of such a significant change can massively disrupt her learning. These challenges are not minor; they directly affect my child's ability to thrive both emotionally and academically. What makes this proposal even more concerning is that it removes any parental choice in determining the best educational environment for our children. Families should have the right to make decisions that prioritise their child's needs, yet this closure takes that choice away. Furthermore, the proposal has already caused divisions within the community, creating tension between the two schools. Sending all Langley children to Appletree Gardens under these circumstances risks deepening those divides and making the transition even harder for the children involved. In addition to these emotional and academic concerns, the practical implications of this merger raise serious safety

issues. The location of Appletree Gardens already presents problems with traffic congestion, cars parking on pavements, double parking, and even road rage incidents. Adding approximately 300 more children will only worsen these issues and compromise the safety of children walking to school. There are also unanswered questions about how the site will accommodate such a large increase in students. No clear provisions have been outlined for children with special educational needs or those who require safe spaces, which are currently widely available at Langley. Furthermore, there has been no explanation of how the Appletree site will manage the additional numbers without resorting to oversized classes or temporary buildings. My child's education should not become substandard when she currently attends a thriving, successful, and nurturing school. I strongly urge decision-makers to prioritize the emotional and developmental needs of our children over financial convenience. Stability and well-being must come first. Our children deserve an education that supports their happiness, confidence, and growth—not one compromised by cost-cutting measures. Thank you for considering this objection. I hope you will take these concerns seriously and act in the best interests of the children and families affected.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 12:32 PM

[redacted]. The wellbeing of my children is my priority. It is deeply concerning that North Tyneside Council appears willing to jeopardise that wellbeing for the sake of a flawed and rushed plan. During the public meeting at Whitley Bay High School, representatives from the Council all but admitted that our children will be 'collateral damage' in their attempt to future-proof education in the borough with a strategy that isn't standing up under scrutiny, even in the short time we've had to review it. The information used to justify this consultation contains multiple inaccuracies and omissions: • It incorrectly claims Langley has no adjacent playing field, when in fact the school has extensive and well-used outdoor spaces. • It misrepresents the school's financial position. Langley is not currently in deficit and has only forecast a potential deficit for 2025–26, the first in its history, which it is proactively addressing with independent financial advice. • It asserts most families in Langley's catchment can access Appletree Gardens without crossing major roads, when in reality many would have to cross both Seatonville Road and Cauldwell Lane. • The council has also failed to conduct a proper community impact assessment and has not consulted with providers of early years or wraparound care, services that are vital to working families like mine. The current plan is, in effect, a closure of Langley rather than a merger. A fair and transparent process would involve closing both schools and creating a new school, requiring scrutiny by the

Secretary of State and the Office of the Schools Adjudicator. This would allow a genuine blending of ethos, staff, and community, rather than one school being absorbed into another. At present the proposal looks to punish outstanding, innovative and successful teachers and staff at a high performing, beloved school. The plan also looks to close a school nursery at the very time the Governments Education Secretary is visiting the region, opening school nurseries in a government effort to boost access to childcare – it just doesn't add up. The impact this action would have on families is significant. If the proposal proceeds with no new reception intake from 2026, my two children would be forced to attend different schools for at least a year. Managing two school runs, differing start times, uniforms, inset days, and childcare arrangements would be practically impossible. Like many parents, I work full time and rely on a combination of grandparents and a long-standing childminder, one who does not work with Appletree. While my children don't currently use Langley's wraparound care, 'School's Out Northern' is an essential service for many working families, used regularly by over 60% of parents. There are no assurances that Appletree could offer equivalent provision, hours, or flexibility, leaving many without viable childcare options - including my family if we can no longer work with our childminder. Beyond logistics, the emotional consequences of this decision are far more profound. Research in child development and education consistently shows that a sense of belonging, built through stable relationships, familiarity, and trust, is fundamental to children's learning, confidence, and wellbeing. The Department for Education's own "Mental Health and Wellbeing in Schools" guidance (2023) highlights that belonging is one of the strongest protective factors against anxiety, low attainment, and disengagement. Disrupting that sense of belonging by uprooting children from their community, teachers, and friends risks lasting harm. We hear repeatedly that children are resilient but that completely undermines the very real, lasting emotional impact this process has – I speak from experience having been moved to Appletree Gardens myself for just one year after Monkseaton Village First School was closed in 1994. To hear that history is about to repeat itself for my own children is distressing. Furthermore, I have deep concerns about capacity, safety, and infrastructure. The council claims Appletree Gardens can accommodate 432 pupils, yet official Department for Education data lists its capacity as 293. No clear plan has been presented for how the additional children will be safely accommodated without overcrowding. Langley has safe, accessible outdoor space and a nearby public car park; Appletree does not. The council has not provided any evidence of traffic impact assessments or how the additional cars will be managed. Of particular concern, given the impact the change proposed would have on the local community is the council's own projections contain errors, including unexplained changes in pupil numbers between year groups, and rely on forecasts

extending beyond 2030, which are not supported by national methodology. When corrected, Langley's surplus by 2030 would be just 14%, well within the council's acceptable range, while Appletree's surplus would be far higher. Closing a financially stable, well-performing, and popular school while retaining one with greater surplus capacity contradicts the stated goal of efficiency. If we can't trust the information presented to us in this proposal as carefully collated, robust data, it undermines trust between residents and the Council. Looking at the bigger picture, we can see that birth rates are forecast to rise again after 2026, and internal migration continues to bring young families into North Tyneside, particularly to the coast. The Murton Gap development will add up to 3,000 new homes nearby, with hundreds of new primary-age children expected. Closing Langley now would be short-sighted and could leave the area without sufficient school places just as numbers begin to grow again. In summary, this proposal is neither careful nor robust. It is based on flawed data, overlooks key community and employment impacts, and disregards the wellbeing of children who are flourishing within an inclusive and highly regarded school. The closure of Langley First would be a serious mistake, educationally, socially, and economically. I urge the Council to withdraw the current proposal and reconsider its approach in genuine consultation with the community it serves.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 12:51 PM

The proposal to close Langley First School and merge it with Appletree Gardens raises serious concerns for our family and the wider community. We believe the council has failed to adequately assess the full impact of this decision, and we urge reconsideration based on the following points: Lack of Community Impact Assessment No community impact assessment has been conducted specifically for Langley First School. The only assessment referenced was for Monkseaton High School in December 2024, which is not relevant to this proposal. This omission undermines the council's understanding of how the closure would affect families, children, and the local community. Safety and Class Size Concerns The council has not provided any assurance regarding how Langley children would be safely accommodated at the Appletree site. There is also no clarity on future class sizes. While early years provision is legally capped at 30 pupils per class, there is no such protection for children aged seven and older. Without guarantees, we fear our children may be placed in overcrowded classrooms, negatively impacting their education and wellbeing. Financial and Operational Inefficiencies According to the government's school spending comparison tool, Appletree is significantly more expensive to run, spending £29 per square metre on utilities compared to Langley's £4. Additionally, Appletree receives Falling Rolls funding due to its surplus places, whereas Langley does not—its surplus is within the council's acceptable range. This raises questions about the financial logic behind the merger. Lack of

Engagement with Langley Leadership The council has not met—or offered to meet—with Langley's leadership or governing body to discuss its forecasted deficit. This lack of dialogue is deeply concerning and suggests a top-down approach that disregards the expertise and insight of those closest to the school. Questionable Demographic Justifications The consultation relies heavily on falling birth rates as justification. However, the Office for National Statistics projects that birth rates will begin to rise again from 2026. Furthermore, the North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 contradicts the rationale for closure, stating that net inward migration—particularly from Newcastle—helps sustain the child population in the borough. A recent parenting survey conducted by Friends of Langley revealed that 58% of respondents moved to the area specifically to send their children to Langley, with another 3% planning to do so. This demonstrates the school's strong draw and importance to local families. Flawed Pupil Projections The council's pupil projections lack transparency and appear inaccurate. No link to the cited methodology is provided, and the figures extend beyond 2030—despite the National Pupil Projection Model only publishing data up to that year. Discrepancies in projected numbers between Reception and Year 1 at both Langley and Appletree raise further doubts. When corrected, Langley's projected surplus in 2030 is just 14%—only 4% above the council's acceptable threshold—while Appletree's surplus is nearly double at 34%. Impact of New Housing Developments The Murton Gap development will introduce up to 3,000 new homes by 2032. While the council claims new homes don't necessarily mean more children, the development proposal itself estimates a need for 748 additional primary school places and includes plans for a new two-form entry primary school. According to the council's own catchment checker, parts of this development fall closer to Langley and Appletree than to New York Primary School, suggesting Langley could play a vital role in meeting future demand. We believe these points demonstrate that the proposal to close Langley First School is premature, inadequately justified, and potentially harmful to our children, our families, and our community. We respectfully urge the council to reconsider and engage meaningfully with stakeholders to explore alternative solutions.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 01:00 PM

Please note - although I have not included an alternative proposal in this survey (I don't think it's fitting for parents to have to come up with such a thing in just 6 weeks) I fully support the proposals being officially put forward by Langley First School. I strongly object to the 'merger' of Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School for the following reasons: - The documentation is riddled with inaccuracies - how can I trust this process and feel it is in the best interests of my child when some of the simplest details are incorrect - claims that Langley children need to cross a main road to access

their only playing field (Not True), claims that we wouldn't have to cross a main road to access Appletree Gardens (Not True - Cauldwell Road in our case) are just two examples. - Removal of parental choice - My husband and I specifically chose Langley First School, which is outside our catchment area, as it offered an educational experience and culture not available at another First School. PAN indicates that there are no available places at other First Schools when my daughter would be due to move, meaning we'd be forced to choose Appletree Gardens despite it not being our first or second choice for our daughter. This isn't acceptable. - Wrap around provision has not been considered or included in the consultation – as a working parent with no close family in the region I rely heavily on the excellent wrap around care at Langley First School. However, this vital service has not been included in the consultation so far. Appletree Gardens offer reduced hours of wrap around, meaning I'd be forced to reduce my working hours. Plus, Langley offers 3 full days at nursery rather than the norm of five half days; again brilliant for working parents. - Environmental considerations are severely lacking – there seems to be little evidence of the increased traffic implications. I have to drive my daughter to school on my way to work- Langley has a free carpark to use and closes the street to traffic at key times. Appletree cannot close the street as it's on a bus route and only has on street parking. Plus, more parents will need to drive to Appletree with it being further away from their homes. -Little confidence in the proposed solution – the documentation details Appletree can accommodate 432 pupils – but the official capacity is published at 293. There are no details of how the merger would work in practical terms. No assurance has been given on how big the classes would be. This leaves me with little confidence that my daughter would continue to enjoy the positive educational experience that she as to date. - Unfair process – the council has already admitted that this is a closure rather than a proper merger – but why is this? Langley is an excellent school with so many strengths, why wouldn't we want to keep as much of this in our community as possible. That would be the right thing to do. As a parent, I want the very best for my child. I believe Langley offers that. If change is needed, let's do it right with fairness, transparency and a plan that puts children first.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 01:33 PM

Firstly I would like to begin by saying that this decision would detrimentally affect such a large number of children, teachers and families, and all for the sake of finances. There is no way to deny that this is about money. Because it's certainly not for the welfare of our children. A council should be there to preserve communities and should consider education and schooling as a sacred part of that, one which should be protected at all costs. Reasons I am against this proposal below. - Would be distressing for my child to be unsettled

into a new school with new teachers and pupils. - not all the children can fit into Appletree school grounds- so where do you expect them to go? - class sizes at Appletree would be above the recommended 30 per class, why should our children have a sub par education because of the councils decisions? - would not want my child learning in a temporary portable classroom environment if that is what will be added to expand appletree capacity. This would be detrimental to their learning as environment is critical. - there was a mention of using 'empty' classrooms at Appletree to fit the additional children. We have since learned these are not 'empty' classrooms but vital rooms needed for SEND children as breakout spaces. This impacts all children negatively. - - Woodlawn school expanding onto Langleys grounds show the council prioritising the needs a small group of children over the needs and welfare of the entirety of the pupils and staff at langley. - - none of the Langley teachers will be able to teach at Appletree - 'how is this a merger'? If there is no continuity for the Langley children?? And no jobs for the staff? - we chose Langley School for a specific reason- above Appletree and other closer to our home. We should have a choice as parents where our children is educated. - 3000 houses being built just across the road- but the council seem to 'know' that this will only bring a small number of children…? I think they said around 100…. - How on earth can that be predicted? Who knows who will sell up / move in over the next few years- who will have babies etc. figures build on absolute guesswork. There were also plans discovered to build another primary school for this new housing?! One minute away from Langley?! Absurd. - Untrue statements made in the councils proposal. There is no 'highway' for the children to cross - they have large fields and playgrounds they play in on the the school premises and they have an additional field across a residential road that is used once a year for field day. Untrue statements made in the councils proposal.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 01:39 PM

I love my school and my friends and my teachers. I get nervous around new people and new environments. I feel safe and calm and happy at Langley. It is not fair to take that away from me and my friends. Our teachers are the best and do not deserve this. Save our school.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 01:42 PM

I am opposed to the closure of Langley First School and outline here the reasons why and my alternative suggestions. When you have the privilege of working in an area with good schools, I believe as a council you should be looking at ways to capitalise on this and maximise their potential, rather than close them because you are in financial difficulties. This should be your purpose. If the aim is to provide a good and sustainable education for the children of North Tyneside you need to look at other ways you can save money as

these proposals present a direct way of damaging children's education. I oppose the plans on the following grounds: Impact on education of children in North Tyneside • The number of children will not reduce just because you close some schools. They will still not all fit into WBHS. Where will they go? Will they have to go out of the area? Other areas do not have middle schools. My children will not be in a catchment area for any middle or high schools. • You have schools where children with SEND are well supported. The government's aim is to integrate more children with SEND into mainstream schools. This proposal is the direct opposite of this. • How many children will be in a class at KS3? You are not able to provide an answer on this. This is very concerning. A merger with Appletree would mean 118 children in year 4. • No guarantees have been given about what, if any, adapted provision, SEN specific places or breakout spaces would be available at Appletree following the closure of Langley. You will potentially use the excellent SEN provision at 2 schools (3 including MMS). Why would you think this is a good solution? • You say you want to maintain the 3 tier system. Does the 3 tier system actually work with the numbers of children? If not, you need to look at ways of modifying this . • Children with SEND are thriving in these schools. If you close them and send them to ill equipped schools with lack of resources, space and larger class sizes, not only will this affect their wellbeing, education and future life prospects, they may end up needing to go to a specialist provision. Impact on community on North Tyneside • Unemployment of excellent teachers. • Unemployment of staff at wraparound provision • Parents unable to work as they have to now look after their children before after school (Appletree Gardens wraparound does not offer extended hours that Langley's does) or drop children off at different schools. More unemployment/ reduction in working hours/ taxes. • Impact on traffic/ congestion/ parking around Appletree Gardens. No survey has been done by NTC. Inadequacies in the decision making process/ lack of robust evidence base. • Overall there is a lack of or use of incorrect data. There are several examples of this. • You have not visited or done any sort of survey on any of the schools you propose to close/ merge. Expand (Woodlan, Appletree, Langley). As a result you have no idea how much this will actually cost. • Your predictions of future birth rates and population of children of school age in the area appears to have no sound basis. What methodologies have you used? What research have you carried out? Why are you using pandemic data which represents 'outlier' figures? In fact, the Office for National Statistics predicts that birth rates will level off from 2026 and then begin to increase again. Internal migration has not been considered. The numbers you used regarding the number of children living in the new houses on Rake Lane appear arbitrary. Where do you get these figures? • The Murton Gap development will see up to 3,000 new homes being built between now and 2032. The council has consistently told us that new homes don't automatically mean

more children. However, the development proposal estimates a need for an additional 748 primary school places, and proposes to build a new two-form entry primary school to provide an additional 420 primary school places for the development. Many of these children could go to Langley and Appletree. • The North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 contradicts the rationale for closing Langley due to falling birth rates as it states: “Net inward migration from neighbouring areas, primarily Newcastle, helps to sustain the overall working age population and limits the fall in the number of children in the borough”. • Your projections do not appear to be based on any statistical research or findings. You project 59 pupils starting in 2025 in Reception in Langley, which drops by six students to 53 in Year 1. There is no explanation of this and no indication from parents in this year group of their intention to leave • You have errors in your data – for example, you state there is no outside space at Langley – this is incorrect. I find the fact that you have not even visited the site and have no understanding of the environment very concerning. • The school is in financial deficit (This is incorrect. The school has only predicted a deficit for the year 25/26, for the first time ever. They should be given the opportunity to address this. You have offered no support to do this. • You said there was space at Appletree to accommodate all the children. This is incorrect. You then conceded (in the meeting at WBHS) that this was the case and that you would need to modify the site, but you have not costed this. • There has been no consideration of parental choice. Langley has a higher proportion of parental choice than other schools. • There has been no community impact assessment carried out. You have to carry one out. This is stated on your website. • Neither early years provision nor wraparound provision have been considered as part of this consultation. No governing body or senior manager of ‘School’s Out’ (out of hours provision) at Langley has been contacted as part of external communication. This is of great concern and highlights the lack of care and thought given to this proposal and the lack of engagement with key stakeholders. This is bad practice. • The council, by its own admission, has not taken either early years nor wraparound provision into consideration as part of the consultation. • According to the government’s school spending comparison tool Appletree is a more expensive building to run. Appletree spends £29 per square metre on utilities, compared to Langley which spends £4 per square metre. Future implications • Children with SEND are thriving in these schools. If you close them and send them to ill equipped schools with lack of resources, space and larger class sizes, not only will this affect their wellbeing, education and future life prospects, they may end up needing to go to a specialist provision, which will cost you significantly more money. • Many children will not be in the catchment area for any school. • The education provision (and reputation) in North Tyneside will be adversely affected because of your closures. This is not in the best interest of the people and the

community which is what elected councils are supposed to stand for, therefore the reputation of the area will suffer as will any support for NTC councillors. • This would potentially result in empty buildings that are currently being used effectively. You have already closed MMS. The future of that building is unknown. This is a poor legacy to be creating. • You do not need a 300 capacity school to house approximately 30 Woodlawn pupils. • Based on the council's methodology, from the current reception onwards, it is unlikely the numbers of pupils at WBHS will reach 390. Therefore the council's focus on ensuring numbers don't exceed this figure are misguided. • This issue the council is trying to fix relates to children already in the system, rather than future pupil projections, particularly the current year 2 and year 5 year groups. Closing Langley will not tackle this issue. Alternative solutions • Use Langley to integrate more children with SEND into mainstream school. Use the resources, expertise and staff to facilitate this, rather than lose them in North Tyneside. The same goes for MMS. Possibly open an ARP at Langley. This would align with government priorities and address sociodemographic trends. • Allow Langley to address any deficit and enrol more children. This is achievable. It would look better for NTC to be advocating and supporting with this, rather than just closing a perfectly good school. • Address the whole picture at the same time and avoid the stress on parents not knowing if their child will have a place at any school anywhere near them in NT. Do you need to increase capacity at WBHS? Can you come up with solutions to do that? Potentially involving VGMS and the soon-to-be disused site of MHS? • Increase MMS to post-16. The Woodlawn post-16 provision could use that rather than Langley. If this is the reason? I am unsure as the council have given so many contradictory reasons. • Implementing this merger in 2027 would mean disrupting the largest cohorts of pupils currently moving through the system. If this merger is to go ahead, a far more logical approach is to wait until the smaller birth-rate cohorts are in the schools. • If it is all about cost (which was one of the reasons given by you at the meeting at WBHS) – NTC should find alternative ways to save money, rather than massively affect the education of the children you are supposed to be supporting. As parents, we genuinely care about the future of our children and the quality of their education. While we have pointed out numerous inadequacies in the proposal and the consultation process, it's crucial for the council to step up and provide a viable alternative given their oversight. It is your responsibility to explore all options thoroughly and present a plan that considers the needs of both schools and their communities, which your current proposals have not done.

Screen Name Redacted

11/12/2025 01:46 PM

[redacted]

[redacted] The school's proximity to our home was a deliberate choice when we moved to this area, and walkability was a key factor in our decision. Impact on My Year 2 Child The immediate and severe impact: - Educational disruption at a critical age: My child would be 8-9 years old (Year 4) when forcibly moved to an unfamiliar school environment, at a developmentally sensitive time when stability and consistency are crucial for both academic progress and emotional wellbeing. - Overcrowding concerns: With 118 children in Year 4 alone and no guarantees about class sizes, my child faces the very real prospect of being placed in an oversized class. This would inevitably mean less individual attention from teachers, reduced support for learning, and a more chaotic classroom environment that could significantly impact their educational outcomes. - Loss of relationships: My child has built strong relationships with teachers and support staff who know them well, understand their learning style, and have nurtured their development. These relationships would be severed, requiring my child to start again with unfamiliar adults at a vulnerable time. - Building suitability unknown: The council has provided no assurance that Appletree can safely and appropriately accommodate 403 pupils. There is conflicting information about capacity (432 vs 293), no details about how classrooms would be organised, and no guarantees about access to specialist spaces, outdoor learning areas, or adapted facilities. - No alternative options: All other NEPA first schools are full for my child's year group, with only 2 spaces available at Appletree across the entire planning area. We effectively have no choice but to accept whatever the council decides, regardless of suitability for our child. Daily Practical Impact - Journey to school: We live very close to Langley and my child currently walks to school safely. Moving to Appletree would require driving to school on most mornings, - Traffic and safety: Langley closes the street every morning for child safety and has a free public car park nearby. Appletree cannot close its street (bus route) and has no nearby parking. This means increased traffic congestion, reduced safety, and added stress to daily routines. - Wraparound care crisis: Schools Out at Langley, operates from 7:30am-6pm with flexible booking. Appletree's Little Pips runs 7:45am-5:30pm - a significant reduction in hours that would directly impact our ability to maintain our current work commitments. The council has admitted it has not considered wraparound provision in this consultation and can only say it would 'look to work with providers' - offering no concrete assurance. Loss of What Makes Langley Special Having experienced Langley with my older child and currently with my Year 2 child, I can speak from direct experience about what this proposal would destroy: - Inclusive ethos: Langley has developed an authentic, neurodiversity-affirming culture over years. With 24% of pupils receiving SEND

support, the school has extensive adapted facilities including a sensory room, outdoor classrooms, 'haven' areas in every classroom, forest school provision, and specially trained mental health ambassadors and thrive specialists. This isn't just about facilities - it's about staff expertise, relationships, and a whole-school approach that cannot simply be transferred to another site. - Community feel: Langley is a genuinely community-focused school where families feel welcomed, valued, and heard. The school leadership knows families personally and has consistently shown commitment to every child's wellbeing. This culture has been built over 70+ years and is embedded in the fabric of the school. - Educational excellence: My older child thrived at Langley and moved to middle school well-prepared, confident, and with a genuine love of learning - she achieved Greater Depth in all her SATS results last year. The school's success is evident in its persistent absence rate of just 5.9% (compared to Appletree's 15% and the North Tyneside average of 13.7%) - a clear indicator of pupil engagement and school effectiveness, particularly important given Ofsted's recent inclusion of attendance in grading criteria. - Proven popularity: We chose this area specifically for Langley, as did 58% of surveyed families. The school's catchment uptake of 73% versus Appletree's 44% speaks volumes about parental confidence. The last place offered at Langley in 2025 admissions was nearly 6 miles away, compared to 3.6 miles for Appletree, demonstrating Langley's exceptional ability to attract families from a wide area. Emotional and Psychological Impact Beyond the practical concerns, this proposal has created significant stress and anxiety for our family: - My child is aware that their school might close and this uncertainty is affecting them emotionally. Children at this age are acutely sensitive to change and loss, and the prospect of losing their school, teachers, and the learning environment where they feel safe and supported is genuinely distressing. - As parents, we feel powerless. We made informed, careful choices about where to live and where to send our children to school. We have invested in this community and our children have flourished at Langley. To have that taken away through a flawed process based on inaccurate data and questionable projections feels profoundly unjust. - The lack of genuine consultation is evident. The council characterises this as a 'merger' when it is clearly a closure. There has been no meaningful engagement with Langley's leadership or governing body about financial solutions. No community impact assessment. No consideration of wraparound care. Multiple factual errors that undermine trust in the entire process. - The realisation that our children - particularly those in the Year 2 bulge cohort - are being sacrificed for a decision that prioritises short-term cost savings over educational quality and community wellbeing is deeply troubling. Broader Community Impact This proposal affects not just my family but our entire community: - The school has 23 children on the waiting list for nursery in 2026, 9 for 2027, and one already registered for

2028. These families have planned their lives around Langley's availability and will now face uncertainty. - Local house prices and community desirability are directly linked to school quality and accessibility. Closing the more popular school will negatively impact property values and community cohesion. - The divisiveness created by this process has damaged relationships between school communities. A true amalgamation could have brought communities together; instead, the current approach has created an 'us versus them' mentality that will persist regardless of the outcome. - Many families have stated they would consider home-schooling (33% in the survey) or moving to alternative schools rather than accept placement at Appletree. This could lead to unpredictable enrolment patterns that undermine the council's financial assumptions. Financial Concerns The council justifies this proposal on financial grounds, but the analysis appears flawed: - Langley has only projected (not actual) deficit for 2025/26 and has never been in deficit before. The council has not met with Langley's leadership to explore solutions, despite the school working with an independent financial advisor. - Appletree receives additional Falling Rolls funding; Langley does not, as its surplus is within acceptable range. This makes direct comparison misleading. - Appletree is more expensive to run: £29 per square metre on utilities versus Langley's £4 per square metre according to the government's school spending comparison tool. - Closing the more popular school creates long-term financial risk. If families choose other schools (as survey data suggests), the merged school could face worse financial problems than either current school. -The council is effectively repurposing one school site (Langley) to benefit 32 children (Woodlawn post-16), while displacing 300 children from a thriving, popular, educationally successful school. This appears to prioritise property assets over educational quality. Questions the Council Must Answer Before any decision is made, the council must provide clear answers to: - What is Appletree's actual capacity? Is it 432 or 293? How will 403 pupils be safely accommodated? - What will class sizes be for the Year 4 cohort of 118 children? - What specific SEND provision will be available at the merged school? What happens to Langley's sensory room, outdoor classrooms, adapted spaces, and specialist staff expertise? - What wraparound care will be available? Can working parents be guaranteed equivalent hours and flexibility? - Why has no community impact assessment been conducted? - Why were there multiple factual errors in the cabinet documentation and consultation materials? - Why has the council chosen to close the more popular, more resilient school with higher parental satisfaction? - What contingency plans exist if significant numbers of families choose alternative schools or home-schooling? - Has the council considered the impact of the Murton Gap development on future pupil numbers? - Why is the council rushing to implement this in 2027 when waiting until 2029 would allow the bulge cohorts to move through and result in a more manageable transition?

Misalignment with Labour Party Policy It is particularly concerning that this proposal comes from a Labour-led North Tyneside Council operating under a Labour government, yet fundamentally contradicts core Labour Party education policy and values. Contradiction with National Labour Education Policy The Labour government has made clear commitments to education that this proposal directly undermines: - Opposition to school closures without community support: Labour's education policy emphasises the importance of community schools and local decision-making with genuine community engagement. This consultation has been characterised by inaccurate data, lack of community impact assessment, and a predetermined outcome dressed up as consultation. The overwhelming opposition from Langley families - evidenced by the 88% who did not choose Appletree as any preference - demonstrates the absence of community support. - Commitment to inclusion and SEND provision: Labour has pledged to improve support for children with special educational needs and disabilities, promoting inclusive education in mainstream settings. Langley's exemplary SEND provision - supporting 24% of pupils with extensive adapted facilities, specialist staff, and neurodiversity-affirming practices - represents exactly the kind of inclusive mainstream education Labour champions. Closing this provision without guaranteed equivalent support at Appletree directly contradicts this commitment. - Focus on educational outcomes over cost-cutting: Labour's education policy prioritises raising standards and improving outcomes for all children. This proposal prioritises short-term financial considerations over educational quality, closing a high-performing school (5.9% persistent absence vs 15% at Appletree) in favour of one that demonstrates lower parental satisfaction and engagement. Labour's emphasis on 'opportunity for all' is undermined when families are forced into schools they actively did not choose. - Supporting working families: Labour has consistently championed affordable, accessible childcare and wraparound provision to support working parents. The complete failure to consider wraparound care in this consultation - with Schools Out at Langley providing 7:30am-6pm care compared to Little Pips' 7:45am-5:30pm - directly impacts working families' ability to maintain employment. Of surveyed parents, 35.6% said they would need to cut work hours if Schools Out was unavailable. How does forcing families to reduce working hours align with Labour's commitment to supporting working people? - Levelling up and reducing inequality: Labour's mission includes reducing regional inequality and ensuring every child has access to excellent education regardless of background. Closing a school that serves a wide catchment area (last place offered at 6 miles) and has proven ability to attract families from diverse areas, in favour of one with lower uptake and narrower appeal, risks creating educational inequality by limiting genuine parental choice and potentially concentrating disadvantage. Labour Values and Community Cohesion Beyond specific policies, this

proposal contradicts fundamental Labour values: - Community and solidarity: Labour's roots are in community organisation and collective action. This proposal has divided communities, creating an adversarial 'us versus them' dynamic between Langley and Appletree families. A true amalgamation - creating a genuinely new school with a fresh identity - would embody Labour values of bringing communities together. Instead, the current approach erases one community entirely. - Democratic accountability and transparency: Labour champions transparent, accountable governance. This process has been marked by factual errors in official documentation, unexplained pupil projection methodologies extending beyond published models, conflicting capacity figures (432 vs 293), and failure to engage with Langley's leadership about financial alternatives. When citizens cannot trust the accuracy of information provided by their council, democratic accountability breaks down. - Protecting local services: Labour has historically fought to protect local services from cuts that harm communities. Langley First School is exactly this - a valued local service that has served the community with distinction for over 70 years. The school is not in crisis; it has only a projected (not actual) deficit for 2025/26 and has never been in deficit before. Rather than working with the school to address projected challenges, the council has moved directly to closure. - Long-term thinking over short-term expediency: Labour's approach to governance emphasises sustainable, long-term solutions. This proposal appears designed for quick cost savings without adequate consideration of long-term consequences. Closing the more popular, more resilient school creates greater risk of future enrollment problems, financial instability, and community dissatisfaction - problems that will fall to future councils to resolve. The Political Question As a Labour council operating under a Labour government, North Tyneside has a responsibility to demonstrate how Labour values translate into local governance. This proposal fails that test: - It prioritises property assets (repurposing Langley site for 32 post-16 pupils) over educational quality for 300 children - It ignores parental choice and community wishes, forcing families into schools they actively rejected - It threatens exemplary SEND provision without guaranteed replacement - It impacts working families through inadequate wraparound care - It proceeds on flawed data and inadequate consultation - It divides rather than unites communities How can the council justify pursuing a policy that contradicts the national Labour government's education priorities? How does this decision reflect Labour's stated commitment to 'breaking down barriers to opportunity'? What message does it send to working families, to parents of children with SEND, to communities who believe in the power of local schools, when a Labour council closes a successful, popular school against community wishes? Political choices have consequences. Families who have supported Labour based on its education policies will remember when their children's

school was closed despite Labour's national commitments to inclusive education, community engagement, and supporting working families. The disconnect between Labour's national education rhetoric and this local council's actions is stark and troubling. I urge North Tyneside Labour councillors to recognise this misalignment and demonstrate that Labour values - of community, inclusion, educational excellence, and democratic accountability - actually mean something in practice, not just in manifestos. My Request to the Council I urge the council to: - Reject the current proposal to close Langley First School - If reorganisation is deemed necessary, pursue a true amalgamation that creates a genuinely new school preserving the best of both communities - At minimum, delay implementation until 2029 to allow bulge cohorts to transition naturally and enable proper planning - Conduct a proper community impact assessment - Correct all factual errors in the consultation materials and provide accurate, verified data - Engage meaningfully with Langley's leadership about financial solutions before defaulting to closure - Consider the long-term sustainability of closing a popular, well-performing school in favour of one that is statistically more vulnerable to falling birth rates - Prioritise educational quality and community wellbeing over short-term property and financial considerations My child's education and wellbeing should not be sacrificed to a flawed process based on questionable data and inadequate planning. Langley First School has served our community with distinction for over 70 years. It deserves better than to be erased through a proposal dressed up as a merger but which is, in reality, a closure that ignores parental choice, community impact, and educational quality. I strongly urge the council to reconsider this decision and work with the community to find a genuinely fair and sustainable solution.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 01:46 PM

Again this is not a merger. You will be closing down the school we picked for my daughter and make her go into another school which will be over crowded. Nothing has been proposed of how this would work. Class sizes, toilets, hallways, dinner halls will all be over crowded. [redacted] She has just started her education and is comfortable where she is as are the rest of the pupils and staff. You have gave no answers of how this would work which considering the timescales is an absolute joke. Closing Langley would also make the streets around Appletree a lot busier, traffic is already bad and adding further pupils there will make this worse. [redacted] you are making my area unsafe for my child and family. Have you looked into the traffic management of this proposal or do you not care as you decision makers don't live in this area?

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 01:54 PM

I am writing to formally respond to the consultation regarding the proposed closure of Langley First School. I strongly oppose this proposal and request that the council reconsider the decision, taking into account the points outlined below. 1. Inaccuracies and omissions in the consultation process The initial documentation contained errors, including claims that Langley has limited playing fields, is in financial deficit, and that most local dwellings can access Appletree without crossing major roads. These claims are incorrect. Briefings with headteachers were limited and did not involve Governors, restricting input from school leadership. Consultation documents also contained inaccuracies regarding pupil projections, deficit forecasting, and other schools' data. No community impact assessment has been conducted specific to Langley's closure. Early years and wraparound provision have also been ignored. 2. Merger vs Closure A true merger of Langley and Appletree would be a fairer approach, ensuring both school communities have input into the ethos, name, uniform, and staff retention. The current proposal favors a simpler closure route, bypassing additional scrutiny from the Secretary of State and the Office of Schools Adjudicator. A more careful, considered approach should be taken in the best interest of children and staff. 3. Building space and capacity concerns The council's claimed capacity for Appletree (432 pupils) is inconsistent with gov.uk figures (293 pupils). No assurances have been given regarding class sizes, early years provision, or SEN-specific spaces, raising concerns about children's wellbeing and education quality. Appletree is more expensive to operate than Langley, which challenges claims of financial efficiency. 4. Traffic and accessibility issues Langley has safe street closure arrangements in place; Appletree does not, and the school lacks a nearby public car park. Surveys indicate a significant increase in parents who would need to drive if Langley were closed, potentially worsening traffic and safety. 5. Financial considerations Langley is projecting a small deficit for 2025/26 but is actively working with advisors to manage this. Appletree receives additional funding (Falling Rolls) which Langley does not, yet this has not been reflected accurately in financial comparisons. 6. Support for children with Special Educational Needs (SEN) Langley offers extensive SEN provision, including sensory rooms, outdoor classrooms, and neurodiversity-affirming adaptations. Staff expertise and inclusive culture are well established and would be disrupted by closure. No guarantees have been given about equivalent SEN provision at Appletree. 7. Birth rates and pupil projections While birth rates in North Tyneside have been declining, they are expected to stabilise from 2026. Langley remains a popular and resilient school, drawing children from a wide geographic area. Appletree has historically had surplus spaces, demonstrating it is not the preferred choice for many families. 8. Parental choice Surveys show the majority of families would not choose Appletree if Langley closed. Some parents may even consider home-schooling due to lack of

suitable alternatives. Closing Langley undermines parental choice and forces children into less preferred placements. 9. Early years and wraparound provision Langley provides extensive, flexible wraparound care and holiday provision, which Appletree cannot match in hours or age range. The potential disruption to working parents is significant, with many relying on Schools Out Northern. 10. Wider impact on other schools The proposal affects the wider North East Planning Area and could destabilise other schools, particularly Woodlawn and Coquet Park. The council's focus on logistical issues for SEND provision should not compromise the quality and stability of mainstream schooling. Conclusion Langley First School is a valued, inclusive, and well-resourced school with strong community support. The proposed closure is not justified based on financial, capacity, or demographic arguments, and it fails to account for the impact on children, families, and staff. I urge the council to reconsider this proposal and explore alternatives

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 01:58 PM

I will be saddened as you close another school without a transparent and fair consultation. I will be saddened as you damage another part of the Monkseaton community (seeking to close 3 schools in quick succession). I know this isn't material to you but I have lost all faith in democratic fair process in North Tyneside and the education review team should take some responsibility for that.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 02:02 PM

[redacted] and long-term resident of North Tyneside to express my strong opposition to the proposed closure of Langley First School. [redacted] From experience, I know how critical schools are in providing the structure, consistency, and sense of community that so many children depend on. Closing a school like Langley risks undermining those protective factors that keep children safe, engaged, and connected to positive role models. The Council's proposal contains serious inaccuracies and oversights that cast doubt on the validity of the entire process. For instance, it wrongly states that Langley lacks its own playing field, that the school is already in financial deficit, and that most families could safely walk to Appletree Gardens without crossing major roads such as Seatonville Road and Cauldwell Lane an assumption that anyone familiar with the area knows is simply untrue. These are not minor errors; they reflect a lack of understanding of the community and its daily realities. Langley is not just a school, it is a community anchor. It offers children stability, belonging, and inclusion. I have friends and neighbours whose children attend Langley, and I have witnessed first-hand how they have flourished under its nurturing, forward-thinking approach.

The school's commitment to inclusion and wellbeing — particularly its outstanding support for children with additional needs — represents the best of what North Tyneside's education system can offer. It is a place where every child is seen, heard, and valued. The proposed closure would also result in job losses, [redacted] I know how vital trusted adult relationships are in shaping positive outcomes. Losing those relationships not only affects the school but weakens the wider network of community support that so many families rely upon. Beyond education, there are broader social consequences to consider. Schools like Langley help to prevent isolation, reduce anti-social behaviour, and promote community cohesion. When schools close, these community ties are disrupted. For children who already face challenges at home, the removal of a safe, familiar, and inclusive environment can lead to increased anxiety, behavioural issues, and disengagement — problems that inevitably ripple out into the wider community. I am also concerned that this proposal follows closely after the decision to close Monkseaton High School, due in August 2026. Families across the area are still dealing with the uncertainty and disruption that decision caused. To now propose the closure of Langley, based on similar reasoning and flawed data, risks repeating those mistakes and further undermining trust between residents and the Council. Langley First is a thriving, oversubscribed, and inclusive school that clearly meets the needs of its pupils and community. Closing it in favour of a less popular alternative would be an illogical and short-sighted decision. I urge the Council to withdraw this proposal, correct the factual inaccuracies in its documentation, and engage meaningfully with staff, families, and residents to find sustainable solutions that protect local education, employment, and community wellbeing. [redacted]

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 02:16 PM

It will not affect my family but it will affect numerous other families

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 02:29 PM

Myself and my husband moved to Monkseaton before we had children, with a very large factor in our move being the excellent three tier system of schools in the area as we looked to start a family. Although we live in the Appletree Gardens catchment area, when it came time to choose a school for our son we strongly preferred Langley First School and were delighted when he was granted a place. [redacted] He has thrived in the warmth and community of Langley First School. Every single member of the staff at Langley First School are incredibly passionate and dedicated to providing an environment where all of the children

thrive. He has grown into a confident boy who loves going to school each day, recognised and greeted by name by whichever member of staff is at the gates each morning, supported and nurtured, and is doing incredibly well academically. This is due to Langley's amazing ethos and I know his experience is shared by every single one of his peers. He is currently in Year One, which means if he was forced to move to Appletree Gardens at the end of next year he would be thrust into an unfamiliar environment with absolutely zero guarantee of a cap on class sizing for two years, which will be incredibly disruptive to his learning journey and his childhood as a whole. He is devastated at the thought of Langley closing, and it's incredibly hard to console him when I can't promise he would have even a remotely similar experience in an overcrowded Appletree School. There has been no assurances from the council what this move would look like, no explanation on how the Appletree building would suddenly be able to accommodate all of the Langley children. I am sure that Appletree First is a lovely school in its own right and I'm not trying to imply it isn't, but thrusting my child from his beloved school with all of his friends and support system into an unfamiliar environment with overcrowded classrooms and unfamiliar staff, is something I am incredibly concerned by. Part of the proposal talks about children crossing main roads being a factor, and it's true that we have to cross Seatonville Road to get to Langley each morning and afternoon, but Seatonville Road has several sets of traffic lights for safe crossing. When we get closer to the school the road closure allows him to scoot safely. As it is now, the roads around Appletree Gardens may not be main roads, but the traffic around there is extremely congested each drop off and pick up time and the junction from Appletree Gardens and Bromley Avenue field creates a blind corner which is a big worry for kids scooting or cycling or walking. The addition of the Langley pupils to this would only exacerbate the problem and create downright dangerous traffic at drop off and pick up times. I understand the need for SEN provision in the region to expand but strongly object to mainstream school children being made to sacrifice their school for this. They should not be played off against each other, and indeed the SEN provision at Langley is excellent with brilliant facilities in use by it's SEN and non-SEN pupils alike. My boy makes regular use of his classroom's quiet corner, and again, there are zero assurances from the council how this would be replicated in an overcrowded Appletree Gardens. I am extremely worried about my son's educational experience being sacrificed on the altar of budget based on projection over the next couple of years. Indeed the ONS projects birth rates falling short term but then levelling off and rising again in the medium term. It seems incredibly short sighted to close a thriving and financially successful school which is also very close to an enormous housing development which will definitely see an influx of school age children to the area. The council dispute this, but the proposals for the development anticipate plenty of school age children moving in to

it, and it's incredibly likely that a large amount of the families without children moving into those houses will be like myself and my husband when we moved to the area - childless but moving to the area in order to start a family. If the 'merge' must go ahead it MUST be a true merger in all aspects - a new name, a new DofE number, a new ethos, staff from both schools retained - and must surely centre the children in every single decision made. The 'merge' proposed currently is just a closure of Langley, which is so unjust it's unbelievable. Why should Appletree Gardens retain every aspect of itself and all of its staff while the amazing staff of Langley face job losses through absolutely no fault of their own. Additionally, if any school should be closed we all know there is a school in the area currently only in single form entry and in horrible deficit. Coquet Gardens is protected by red tape but why the council is closing a thriving and excellent school with that particular elephant in the room is unconscionable. It seems to all of us that the council is taking the easiest and quickest route and hoping that we will take it meekly and without question, rather than taking the longer but better route. Every parent in Langley is devastated and outraged that the wonderful school we chose for our children is proposed to be closed. The staff and the children deserve orders of magnitude better. I implore the council to explore alternatives proposed by Friends of Langley and to centre the children of Langley in the decision making instead of simply brushing them aside as admission figures and statistics. They're little people who are all very worried and upset at the thought of losing their stability and community, they are not numbers on a page.

Screen Name Redacted

11/12/2025 02:31 PM

[redacted] From the moment I stepped through the doors, I felt welcomed, valued and supported. The warmth of the staff and the ethos of the school left such as lasting impression on me that I remember thinking, ‘if I ever have children this is where I would want them to go’. A few years later we bought a house within the Langley First School catchment. In September 2023, our daughter began her Langley journey as a shy little girl with no nursery experience, but the staff welcomed her with such care and understanding that she blossomed in confidence and her love for learning began. Over the past two years my experience of Langley as a parent has been everything I hoped it would be: a school that nurtures, inspires and truly puts children at the heart of everything it does. Langley is not just a school, it is the beating heart of our community. The dedication of its staff, the strength of its ethos and the way it brings families together make it utterly irreplaceable. To close Langley would not only be a devastating loss for Monkseaton but it would also diminish the richness of the education in North Tyneside. It would be a disservice to the children of today

and for generations to come with an impact far beyond the children who attend Langley. Emotional impact on my child Trying to explain to a five-year-old that her school, the place she feels safe, happy, and loved might close has been one of the hardest things I have ever had to do. My daughter has cried at the thought of losing her friends and having to start again in a new school, with teachers she doesn't know. She has said she is scared, as a parent there are no words that can justify this fear or make it easier for her to understand. The uncertainty this proposal has created has already had a direct emotional impact on her wellbeing and this is before any decision has even been made. Transitions If this proposal goes ahead, my child will face additional transitions in her early education journey. She takes a long time to settle in new environments and moving her again for a short period before middle school could be detrimental to her learning, mental health, confidence, and sense of security. Research shows that 'disruption during early education years can have lasting effects on future learning outcomes' (DfE Early Years Research, 2020). A stable and nurturing early education environment is crucial for a child's long-term academic and emotional development, something this proposal directly undermines and has not given full consideration. Safety Concerns To reach Appletree, we have to cross Seatonville Road, an extremely busy main road especially during school drop-off and pick-up times (something that this proposal has failed to acknowledge). The traffic and parking situation around Appletree is already hazardous, and adding around 120 more children has clearly not been thought through. The parent survey carried out by Langley indicates that 78% (150) families currently walk to school however this would decrease to 37% if this proposal were to go ahead. The additional use of cars will cause higher vehicle emissions in a densely populated residential area and increased air pollution exposure for children walking to and from school (something the council itself has acknowledged as a growing public health concern) Friendships and Relationships My daughter has formed secure, treasured and meaningful friendships since nursery. This proposal would force her, and many others to lose those relationships at a critical developmental stage. The parental survey data shows that only 11% of Langley parents would choose Appletree if Langley closed. This means the majority of children will be scattered across different schools, resulting in widespread loss of friendship groups and stability and the impact this will have on children's learning is significant. Additionally, as the closure would not retain Langley staff, all existing relationships with trusted adults would also be lost. Expecting 4-9 year olds to adapt to a completely new environment, form new friendships, and trust new adults while grieving the loss of their beloved school community and still being expected to learn is unrealistic and deeply unfair. Quality of Education We have been told that the quality of education will be maintained yet the available data suggests otherwise. With no upper limit on class sizes for children in

KS2 this proposal raises serious concerns. Implementing this merge by September 2027 will almost certainly result in overcrowded classrooms, reduced individual attention, and overstretched resources. These conditions would have a significant and detrimental impact on learning for both Langley and Appletree children. Maintaining high-quality education in such circumstances would be extremely challenging, if not impossible. If the council had truly prioritised educational quality, a more thoughtful timeline such as implementing changes from September 2029 would have been proposed. In addition to this, changes in phonics approaches and numeracy programmes, unfamiliar teaching staff, and being “the new child” in an already established cohort will make it harder for children like mine to thrive academically and emotionally. Building Space and Facilities Parents are being asked to make life-changing decisions about their children’s education without any clear understanding of what life at Appletree would actually look like. There has been no transparency around how the additional children could possibly fit within the existing building and facilities. The inevitable increase in pupil numbers raises serious questions about fire safety, overcrowding, and the general wellbeing of children. Lunchtimes, which should be a positive social part of the school day, risk becoming rushed due to lack of space and time in the dining hall. Overcrowded corridors would not only compromise safety in the event of an emergency but would also create daily congestion, noise, and anxiety for young children simply trying to move around school. The lack of councillor visits to Langley and errors in the proposal raises serious doubts about the level of research and due diligence behind this proposal and has caused a complete loss of faith in North Tyneside Council. School Ethos Langley is a nurturing, connected, and inclusive school where every child is known and valued, one of the main reasons we chose Langley for our child. One of the most distressing aspects of this proposal is the clear message from Appletree’s leadership that they are unwilling to engage in any discussions with Langley’s Headteacher about the future of our children. This speaks volumes about the school’s approach to collaboration, empathy, and openness. As parents, this leaves us deeply worried. If Appletree’s leadership are unwilling to even begin a conversation at this stage, how can we possibly trust that they will welcome and prioritise Langley’s children should this merger go ahead? Transitioning such young children requires compassion, communication, and a shared commitment to their emotional wellbeing, yet the refusal to engage already suggests that our children’s needs will not be at the heart of this process. This lack of partnership undermines any confidence we might have had in the proposed move. It reinforces the view that the nurturing, child-centred ethos we value so highly at Langley would not be replicated at Appletree, and that our children’s happiness, safety, and sense of belonging would not be treated as a genuine priority. It’s no surprise

that 73% of families in Langley's catchment choose Langley, compared to only 44% choosing Appletree within their own catchment. This proposal completely disregards the clear voice of the local community and the trust that parents have built with Langley's staff and leadership. SEND and SEMH I am deeply concerned about the impact this merger will have on children's SEMH, an area recognised as a growing concern within our LA. The transition alone will be incredibly stressful for many children, and yet this proposal risks removing exactly the kinds of support that help them cope. Whilst my daughter does not have identified SEN, several of her peers do. At Langley they are supported with care, expertise and understanding, creating an inclusive classroom where every child benefits from a calm and nurturing environment. I have no doubt that Appletree also works hard to support its pupils, but the increased class sizes and loss of specialist spaces would make it impossible to sustain that same quality of care. Ultimately, this will have a ripple effect not only on children with SEN but on all pupils. The additional stress, reduced support, and inevitable classroom disruption will impact everyone's learning experience. This merger risks undoing years of dedicated work by both schools to provide environments where all children can feel safe, supported, and ready to learn. Housing This proposal feels like a short-term financial fix, not a sustainable educational plan. The Murton Gap development will see 3,000 new homes being built by 2032. Despite the council repeatedly telling us that new homes don't mean more children, the developmental proposal estimates a need for an additional 748 primary places (standard yield of 0.25 primary pupils per dwelling) and proposes to build a new primary school. A large proportion of the development would be within walking distance to Langley first school. It makes no sense to close a thriving school that could help meet this need and in a few years time have to build a new school within a few hundred metres of one the council has just closed. The council should publish updated pupil-place forecasts that explicitly model Murton Gap build-out before proceeding with any closure. It is deeply concerning that the council appears to be making hasty, premature decisions that will have a lasting negative impact on current and future generations of children. Impact on Our Family We specifically bought our home in the Langley catchment area because we wanted to give our children the best possible start in education by attending Langley. The proposed closure of Langley completely undermines that decision and would have a profound impact on our family life. When we first applied for a school place, we did not list Appletree as one of our preferences, for very clear reasons. Even the council's own data shows that Appletree is the less preferred option among local parents, which surely cannot be ignored. By choosing to close the more popular school and retain the less favoured one, the council is removing genuine parental choice. This proposal would effectively force many families, including ours, to consider alternatives such as

relocating or home schooling, life-changing decisions that no parent should be forced to make because of the council's poor planning and insufficient research. Adding to our concern is the fact that Appletree has been identified as one of the schools most sensitive to falling birth rates. Asking parents to move their children to a setting that could once again become vulnerable if numbers continue to decline makes no sense when there are other, more sustainable options available. This process is causing immense stress and anxiety for our family and the lack of clarity from the council has compounded this anxiety. We have spent countless hours trying to understand the proposal, researching inaccurate and incomplete council data and desperately seeking reassurance in a situation that feels rushed and poorly considered. All of this while juggling full-time jobs, parenting and supporting a five-year-old who is already deeply worried about losing the school she loves. The financial implications are also significant. We would face increased costs for wraparound care or have to reduce our work hours. The closure of Langley, a school that is both highly sought after and central to our community would not only affect families like ours today but also reduce educational choice and opportunity for future generations. Finally, since this proposal was published, further changes have been announced within the NEPA, the proposed federation of South Wellfield and Wellfield Middle School. These are new and important developments that have not been taken into account but raise further concern about the long-term educational journey of our child and others in our community. For all of these reasons, we strongly object to the closure of Langley First School. The proposal feels premature, inconsistent, and damaging. Educational Bias and Policy Contradictions This proposal shows a clear educational bias that undermines both national guidance and the principles of inclusion. The Government's current SEND and Alternative Provision Improvement Plan (2023) explicitly emphasises increasing high-quality mainstream provision for children with SEND and reducing over-reliance on specialist placements and EHCP's. Bridget Phillipson (Education Secretary) recently discussed that "we are thinking very carefully about how we can expand SEND provision in schools – more specialist provision in mainstream schools and considering how we can make good use of the school estate including spare space that has come about because of capacity to put that to good use as well" It is clear that North Tyneside are not carefully thinking about this, the opportunities to utilise the strategic position of Langley, next door to a special school have been overlooked and their proposal directly contradicts government agenda by displacing approximately 300 well-supported children in a thriving mainstream setting to relocate just 32 special school places (Ofsted data for Woodlawn's post-16 provision at Marden). While improving SEND provision is important, it should not come at the expense of the stability, wellbeing and education of hundreds of mainstream pupils. The long-term health of the mainstream school system must not be

compromised to solve what is, ultimately, a logistical challenge in specialist provision planning. True inclusion means expanding opportunities for all children, not removing them from those who are already flourishing in their current environment. By combining the proposed Woodlawn expansion with the Langley and Appletree merger, the council has created a false and unfair choice for the community. Parents are being asked to accept a deeply flawed and unstable mainstream solution as the price to pay for supporting an important but unrelated SEND proposal. This approach pits two groups of children against each other, those in mainstream education and those requiring specialist support when it is the council's duty under the Equality Act 2010 and the Children and Families Act 2014 is to promote inclusivity and fairness for all learners. Furthermore, the consultation process itself appears misleading and biased. Many members of the local community have not been made aware that to express a view on the Woodlawn expansion, they must complete the Langley/Appletree consultation survey. By failing to make this clear, the council may have unintentionally (or perhaps conveniently) created a bias in favour of their preferred outcome, reducing transparency and limiting informed participation. We believe the proposal to expand Woodlawn deserves its own independent consultation, properly considered on its own merits and separate from any reorganisation of mainstream education. Only then can parents, educators, and the wider community make balanced, evidence-based contributions that respect the needs and rights of all children. This lack of transparency and disregard for national inclusion policy further undermines our trust in North Tyneside Council's decision-making process and reinforces the belief that this proposal is not being driven by what is best for children, families, or education in our community. Finally, this proposal has not only affected our child, our family, and our community, it has also destroyed the trust and confidence that parents once had in North Tyneside Council to make fair, transparent, and child-focused decisions. The council has repeatedly stated that the best interests of our children are its top priority and that it is committed to delivering a high-quality education for every child in North Tyneside. However, this proposal gives us serious doubts that these commitments are being upheld. The number of factual inaccuracies, inconsistencies, and missing information within both the proposal and the supporting documents make it extremely difficult for parents to have confidence in the council's decision-making process. The inaccuracies and omissions that we have identified although fear may not be limited to include: -The original letter provided [redacted] to parents informing them of this proposal had the incorrect school name - 'Langley Park First School' - The initial documentation stated that Langley's school field is separated by a public highway and children have no access to a field for break times. Obviously this is incorrect and Langley has a well used large field with play equipment and an outdoor learning space.

This is basic information that would not have been overlooked if the proposers had actually visited the school site. -The school is not in financial deficit, it has a predicted deficit for 25/26 for the first time and is working with an independent financial advisor to see where the budget can be improved. -Inaccuracies published regarding projected pupil numbers, deficit forecasting, inaccuracies in pupil data at other schools. -There has been no community impact assessment done in relation to the closure of Langley First School. -Neither early years provision nor wraparound provision have been considered as part of this consultation. -No governing body or senior manager of 'schools out' (out of hours provision) at Langley has been contacted as part of external communication. -The consultation document says Appletree can accommodate 432 pupils however, the gov.uk website states that the capacity of Appletree is 293 pupils. -No evidence has been provided in the supporting documents in relation to traffic impact as a result of these proposals including one for Woodlawn. -Misleading financial figures as Appletree is in receipt of Falling Rolls Funding which Langley is not therefore these financial figures are not comparable. -The 'pupil projection methodology' is cited in the supporting documents but a link to this methodology is not provided. To conclude, the closure of Langley First School would not only take away an outstanding educational environment, it would tear at the heart of a thriving, close-knit community. It would cause unnecessary distress to hundreds of children, disrupt their education, and risk long-term harm to their confidence, wellbeing, and development. Langley is far more than just a school; it is a safe, nurturing space where children feel known, valued, and inspired to learn. This proposal is not in the best interests of our children or our community and it has eroded the trust we once had in North Tyneside Council to make fair, robust, child-centred decisions. We therefore urge the council to reconsider this proposal in full, to listen to the voices of parents, children, staff and the 6000 people that signed our petition and keep Langley First School open. Follow the lead of the Cheviot Learning Trust who have listened to their community and closed the consultation to merge two of their schools. We ask North Tyneside council to do the same and acknowledge the strength of feeling within the community; and to prioritise the stability, safety, and happiness of our youngest learners. Our children deserve better and our community deserves to be heard – Save Langley!

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 02:32 PM

I am aware that Woodlawn is in desperate need of expansion and feel this has played a huge part in the decision to merge Langley and Appletree! I live on the same street as the school and feel this will also result In a huge increase in minibuses in an already busy street! Unless alternative entry point la to the school can be arranged this will cause major impact.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 03:00 PM

Overcrowded classrooms in small sized classrooms at Appletree. Not enough capacity at Appletree. Very happy with class sizes at the moment.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 03:33 PM

There's not many safe crossing areas on cauldwell lane which is a busy main road which would put kids and adults at risk whilst crossing the roads during busy times. Along with this, their is a road closure in front of the school to ensure the safety of the children during drop off and pick up which Appletree does not offer. With this, more pupils are able to walk to Langley which is a great way for the kids to stay active whereas if it merges with Appletree, more pupils have suggested that they will drive to school which is worse for the environment, adds to what is already a congested area at that time of the morning and there is limited parking areas which will cause a build up in the area which affects the residents for the surrounding area. 78% say they currently walk and if the merger goes ahead it would drop to 37.6% Our daughter falls within the SEN category and Langley have went leaps and bounds to ensure that she is getting the best start to her educational start. They had quickly ensured that the correct level of help was sought after and on a daily basis they make sure that they are doing everything they can to support her. It also allows her to integrate with other children within a normal school setting whilst having access to targeted interventions and therapies with being situated next to woodlawn. With the school closure it would mean that I would have to take my daughter out of a comfortable environment as my other child is due to start nursery meaning that drop off would not be possible if both children had to go to different schools and would potentially mean delaying nursery admission for my child in January which is having an impact on their early year development. If the two schools merge then there will be too many pupils in the school and not enough support for the pupils, a lack of SEN support, infrastructure and other facilities to ensure the best development for the students. With this, it states that Appletree spends more on utilities- £29 per square metre whereas Langley uses £4 per square metre.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 03:51 PM

My children are in the 3 tier system and I think anything to prevent increasing Whitley Bay High places, and to reduce it being oversubscribed us good. I also think we need more special school places in North Tyneside and better support for children who have EHCP in mainstream.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 03:52 PM

My child previously attended Langley. It is an amazing school. I don't know know much about Appletree. This will affect the local community. It is a small nurturing school and merging it may make

financial sense to the council but there is no consideration for the local community what so ever.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 03:57 PM

I take my grandson to/from Langley and the distance from my home to Langley is a nice walk. However, should my grandson have to go to. Appletree gardens, the extra distance would severely have an impact on me physically as I suffer badly if I have to walk a considerable distance and appletree gardens would be.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 04:02 PM

[redacted] Like many families in this area, we tripled our mortgage - despite financial concerns - so she could benefit from the three-tier system, and Langley, with its reputation, welcoming atmosphere, and emphasis on play - together with the attitude of the staff - ticked all the boxes. We have never once regretted our decision. I've already moved away from an area where this council is failing local schoolchildren with poor education standards; now you're coming after this area too. [redacted] Every classroom has a haven for children who need to regulate, and she has been a regular user of this since reception. The school also uses soft lighting in the hallways and there are ways for children who find loud situations difficult to come away from them without any issue. [redacted] is fully accepted for who she is, and the adjustments she needs are quietly made for her without issue. [redacted]

[redacted] shouldn't need an EHCP, they were never meant to be for neurodiversity. But the inability of schools to cater for the needs of these children is driving an unsustainable reliance on them. We're not the only family who haven't felt the need to go down the EHCP route. There are many children in school who would easily qualify for one but their needs are met well by their teachers. This is often done at the expense of the school but they do it because it's the right thing to do. Rather than punishing Langley by closing it, you should be celebrating it. As well as being better for the children by meeting their needs in the first place, their commitment to the children in their care is reducing the burden on EHCP requests and the ongoing cost they incur, which is saving you - and ultimately the tax payer - money. These proposals will take my daughter away from a nurturing environment where she is happy and thriving, and place her into a school for one year where she is likely to be in a large class with teachers who don't know her. We have not been given any assurance about what, if any, adapted spaces would be available at Appletree. Given the classrooms are smaller (see below), I worry there won't be any, which will cause dysregulation for children like Lily who rely on them. And pupils like Lily who don't have an EHCP in place will have no protection. My knee-jerk response is to try and get one in place for her, placing additional unnecessary burden on you as a council. Given the adverse impacts on SEND children, I also worry - from both a moral perspective and as a tax payer - about the potential increase in home-schooling as a result of these proposals. I'm already aware of people who have taken their children out of Appletree due to the school's inability to support their SEND needs and the attitude of the head teacher. Why would you close a school that is catering for these children well in favour of a school which is not? I am extremely worried about the adverse impact these proposals will have on her, not just for her education but for her mental health, another concern given how terrible the support is for mental health in our region. [redacted] I worry [redacted] is already slipping through your cracks and this will only continue to get worse with the choices you are leaving me with as part of those proposals. I am also concerned that I have not seen any evidence that you have considered the impact on working families, something your government has been so keen to stress as a priority for them. We both work full time [redacted] - so we rely heavily on wraparound

and holiday provision. Again Langley was a perfect fit for us - the Schools Out provision offers care from 7.30am-6pm as well as much-needed holiday provision almost every day of the year. The staff work extremely well with the school and the care of our children is seamless. When I asked about wraparound provision at the consultation evening at Whitley Bay High School, the council officer I spoke to accepted that wraparound provision hadn't been considered at all during the preparation for this consultation. I was meant to have confidence in the words "we would look to work with the providers". Surely if you are going to close a school, you need to ensure there is like-for-like provision at the alternative schools? The hours at Appletree's wraparound are not as long as Schools Out, which will impact our working arrangements. I may have to cut my hours at work, which will cause significant strain on our household at a time of increasing costs due to inflation. Something else seriously lacking in this consultation exercise has been the transition proposals [redacted] will be in year 4 when these proposals begin. Her year is full in the whole of our region, meaning we have no parental choice; we have no alternative but to send her to Appletree. Whilst I understand the issue around surplus places, her year is not in this situation and so I am really struggling to understand why you are starting with her year. I have seen no evidence that our children's needs have been considered as part of these proposals - you have not provided any evidence of how you expect to fit 297 additional children - with 118 children in year 4 alone - into Appletree. This isn't just about Langley's children, it's about Appletree's too - I would be extremely concerned if I was an Appletree parent. How do you expect PE would work with 118 children? How will lunchtimes work? You've provided no assurance about class sizes, hoping that they would continue to be 30 for KS1 children but failing to answer the question for KS2 children. Middle school and long term NEPA sustainability concerns I had already started to worry about what a move to middle school might hold for her and was looking at either Monkseaton Middle School as our catchment school or Wellfield Middle as a back up as both of those schools have a reputation for taking a more holistic view of a child with nurturing and mental health as their key priorities for the children in their care. Your proposals to close Monkseaton Middle, and the federation proposals which have come about at Wellfield first and middle in direct response to your proposals, take both of these options away for my daughter. We will go from having four schools available to us to choose from to just two - Valley Gardens or Marden Bridge. I appreciate both are excellent schools, but that doesn't make them right for my child. Without the support of an expensive EHCP, she's in danger of being branded naughty at a rules-based school like Valley Gardens, and Marden is more than a 45-minute walk away. I understand and appreciate the challenges facing you as a council, particularly in terms of finances. Working in the public sector myself, I know what a difficult balance it is to juggle the books with the needs

of the population you serve and to ensure you're getting the best value for money for the taxpayer. However these proposals don't give me any confidence in the long-term sustainability of our education system. Nor do they solve the issues you're trying to fix. It's all very well asking all the middle schools to lower their PAN to meet the magic 390. But, looking at your data, years 5-8 all have more than 390 living within catchment.Conversely, looking at reception to year 4, you can see the catchment children will never go above 390. Knowing this, why did you not delay the closure of Monkseaton High School? You have closed it knowing there are not enough places at Whitley Bay High School to meet the needs of the children within NEPA. Where are these catchment children supposed to go? Have you actually checked there are spaces available outside the NEPA area? Or are you simply, once again, 'hoping for the best'? Not only that, but if the birth rate is falling the way you predict - you're actually in danger of risking the future of Whitley Bay High School long-term, especially if you're closing schools that encourage people to move into the area like Langley. You're so worried about the 390 short-term, you've failed to consider that you actually need to make the first and middle schools stronger to attract parents to the area. Keeping Appletree over Langley will work against you in this vein. Taking all the above into account, I have zero confidence in your ability to plan for my daughter's education or the education of the generations that come after her.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 04:34 PM

This merger doesn't directly affect our family. However, as a resident [redacted] I am concerned that NTC does not understand the strength of feeling in the local community about this. I am also concerned that NTC have placed the wellbeing of children and their education secondary to concerns about falling birth rate and money. The FAQ section about this merger (which I have read today) is not good enough. The answers NTC gives to important questions (eg those regarding potential class sizes) are vague and don't actually answer the question with anything specific - is it any wonder why people are concerned?! Vague terms and an inability to be specific about what children's education will look like following a merger is completely unacceptable. It is also completely inappropriate to state that Langley First School buildings will become part of Woodlawn School - NTCs inability to provide enough special school places is not the fault of first school children! I also have concerns about children with SEND who attend both Langley and Appletree. You cram two schools onto one site and use every single room for classrooms, leaving no room for quiet spaces etc then you end up with an overcrowded and overwhelming space. It is not a calm and nurturing environment for any pupil. Both schools, separately, are lovely schools, they meet the needs of the children who attend there. This will not be the case if you cram everyone onto one site. Again,

like the consultation for Monkseaton High school, and most likely Monkseaton Middle School, this is a box ticking exercise. It will happen regardless of what anyone says, with money the driving factor behind this, and not the wellbeing or the education of children. Shame on you NTC!

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 04:39 PM

[redacted] We had heard such wonderful things about the school from friends and local families, and we were so excited for our son to eventually become part of its community. Our son attended Schools Out Northern Langley playgroup followed by Langley Nursery. Like many children, he initially found it difficult to settle into new environments. I still remember his first day at Nursery. He cried when I left, and I walked away in tears myself, unsure if I was doing the right thing. His teacher reassured me that he was in safe hands, and looking back now, I realise just how true that was. Although our son has found each year's transition a challenge, he has absolutely thrived at Langley. The school's nurturing environment, strong sense of community, and inclusive ethos have made such a positive difference to his confidence and development. If Langley and Appletree were to merge, it would create significant practical difficulties for our family. I recently started a new job, and one of the key reasons I was able to accept the position was because of our proximity to Langley which is just a 5–10 minute walk away. This allows me to drop my son off at school and return home in time to begin work. Travelling to Appletree, however, would require driving due to the longer distance. With heavy traffic in that area during drop-off and pick-up times, this would add considerable time to our mornings and make our current work arrangements unmanageable. Beyond the logistical challenges, the proposed closure of Langley represents a loss of choice for parents. Every family at Langley chose the school because of its outstanding reputation, welcoming environment, and proven track record. Many of us were drawn to the area specifically because of Langley's excellence. Langley First School is an integral part of the West Monkseaton community. It is not just a school, but a cornerstone of local life. Its closure would be a significant loss to the area, to families, and most importantly, to the children who continue to flourish there.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 04:45 PM

[redacted] A successful response with appropriate plans to counteract the uncertainty of closure and transition is essential. Currently Langley's SEND provision is exemplary, my child's paediatrician recommended the school to us because of this. The reasons for their success are the relationships they build and the

nurturing, genuine community they provide that makes children feel safe. [redacted] Reputations like this don't happen easily. During lockdown the community came together at Langley and picking up the takeaway school lunch, [redacted] was the permitted activity for our family. It gave us a purpose and link to the school community that was severed by COVID closures. I implore you to reconsider as this school is essential to our community, our children's education and well being and the reason why Monkseaton and North Tyneside are a desirable place to live. Overall, there are inaccuracies about Langley's facilities and financial status that paint a skewed picture that doesn't reflect the reality of the current school environment. Moreover, the consultation process lacks transparency and does not consider the real impact on the community and the children involved. It's crucial to address these discrepancies and advocate for a more accurate representation of the school's strengths and needs. We deserve a fair decision that truly reflects our community's values and priorities and will ensure that a correct decision is made to support children who will be affected by these proposals. The methodology on birth rates underlying the argument is one-dimensional, failing to consider other relevant factors, and is therefore fundamentally flawed. It's imperative that those in charge engage with our community to gather the necessary insights before proceeding. Our children and educators deserve thoughtful consideration of their unique circumstances, and we must advocate for that before any final decisions are made. General issues with the process The initial documentation given to the council's cabinet, which the decision to move to consultation was based upon, contained several inaccuracies, including: • Langley has a field separated by a public highway, meaning groups of children are escorted 'off site' for each PE/sporting activity and have no access to playing fields for lunch and dinner breaks - (This isn't true. The school does in fact have a well-used playing field immediately adjacent to the building. Langley also has an outdoor space in the reception garden, which follows a forest school ethos and is also used for children with SEND as well as a potting garden and an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming) • The school is in financial deficit (This is incorrect. The school has only predicted a deficit for the year 25/26, for the first time ever and is working with an independent financial advisor to see where the budget can be improved) The majority of dwellings [currently in Langley catchment] can access [Appletree] without crossing major roads (This is incorrect. Many of our children would need to cross Seatonville Road and/or Cauldwell Lane) – my child would have to cross Bromley to access Appletree school. • There were briefings and reports with headteachers (Whilst there have been meetings, this has been very brief and Headteachers could not include Governors which

meant there was little options for them to act or come up with solutions) There were also several inaccuracies published in the consultation documents, including (but not limited to): ● Projected pupil numbers ● Deficit forecasting ● Inaccuracies in pupil data at other schools ● There has been no community impact assessment done in relation to the closure of Langley First School. A community impact assessment was done in December 2024 but this was in relation to the Monkseaton High School closure. Neither early years provision nor wraparound provision have been considered as part of this consultation No governing body or senior manager of 'School's Out' (out of hours provision) at Langley has been contacted as part of external communication I would consider this bad practice. Merger vs closure • The campaign's position is that we don't believe Langley is the right school to choose for closure. • However, if we cannot persuade the council on this, we would like it to be a true merger. It isn't currently and use of that terminology is false and misleading. • This should be about doing the right thing, not the easier thing. Surely if we want to get this right for our children, we shouldn't be rushing the process. Given Langley isn't yet in deficit, why does it matter that it will take longer? Building space at Appletree • The council's consultation document says Appletree "can accommodate 432 pupils, which is more than the amount of both schools combined when future birth rates and admission numbers are adjusted". However, when we checked on the gov.uk website for the capacity of Appletree, the capacity is stated as being 293. The campaign has asked for clarification on this • As yet, the council has offered no assurance about how the Langley children could be safely accommodated on the site, and we are concerned that some children will not have access to a close school which will impact development and education. • The Council has not given us any assurance on class sizes. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. • Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, there is a concern amongst us that our children will be placed in larger class sizes, which will have an adverse affect on their education and wellbeing. • According to the government's school spending comparison tool Appletree is a more expensive building to run. Appletree spends £29 per square metre on utilities, compared to Langley which spends £4 per square metre. Traffic No evidence has been provided in the supporting documents in relation to traffic impact as a result of these proposals: • Langley currently closes the street outside school every morning to make it safer for the children. Appletree cannot close the street to cars in the mornings or at collection times due to it being on a bus route. • Langley also has a free public car park very close by, which Appletree Gardens does not have. The assumption appears to be that children will walk to school. The parent survey carried out by Friends of Langley asked parents how they currently travel to school: ● 78% (150) said they walk ●

18.3% (35) said they drive When asked how they they would travel is their children attended Appletree: ● 55% (104) said they would drive ● 37.6% (71) said they would walk This is an increase in driving to school – how can this be accommodated? Also, these answers reflect that many parents will not be able to continue to walk their children to school if they were in Appletree – affecting traffic, health of children and emissions. Impacting on the carbon emissions. Finance Within its consultation documentation, the council states: • “While currently both schools are in surplus (they receive more funding than they spend), Langley First is predicting a deficit (spending more than they receive) in 2026 which is projected to grow to £0.751m by 2028. Children with special educational needs (SEN) There are 40 children out of 297 on the SEN register at Langley, equating to 13.5%. However, there are an additional 24 children who are receiving additional support following early identification, which takes this figure up to 24%. ● Langley offers the following support for children with additional needs: • The building is all on ground level with ramp access, accessible toilets and a specially adapted changing space with bed for a child with a catheter. • The sensory room has no windows allowing a fully darkened experience if needed, and has a padded wall and floor • The outdoor space in the reception garden follows a forest school ethos, used for children with SEND through their time at Langley, and there is a potting garden to offer gardening opportunities for small groups of children. • The teachers offer a lunchtime club away from the dinner hall. • There are three specially adapted spaces - The Nest in Nursery, The Sensory Room (Hive), which offers an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming, and a specifically adapted KS2 space. These spaces allow for breathing space as well as targeted intervention for children who struggle with the demands of the classroom and are well used. • Every classroom has a ‘haven’ area which children can use to regulate and re-set. • The following classroom adaptations are regularly used throughout the school; flexible seating arrangements, visual timetables (both universal and bespoke)use of ‘Now and Next’, incorporating special interests, movement breaks, ‘soft landings’ and additional support/intervention for reading. ● It is also unclear how all children will be accommodated into classrooms before even considering the need for SEN specific spaces. Appletree was in the process of applying for the development of an Additionally Resourced Provision (ARP) to accommodate SEN but we understand this plan has been put on hold due to this consultation. ● The Inclusive culture and staff expertise have been developed over time at Langley. This culture is authentic and reliant on the staff team – their strong relationships, communication skills, connection and dedication to the children. ● Rather than being viewed as a candidate for closure simply because it is located next to a special school, Langley’s position represents a opportunity to share this best practice. Indeed, its proximity to Woodlawn Special School allows for enabling pupils to access

targeted interventions and therapies as needed while continuing to participate in mainstream classes and interact with a diverse peer group. This approach supports the government's key priority, keeping children with additional needs in mainstream settings wherever possible. Birth rates This consultation relies heavily on the argument that birth rates are falling. Whilst there is no denying the downward trend in birthrates throughout North Tyneside up to 2023, the Office for National Statistics predicts that birth rates will level off from 2026 and then begin to increase again. ● Birth rates within the NEPA have been declining since 2008. However, despite this, the numbers within NEPA schools have been resilient to this downward trend, with the majority of schools* being within the council's 10% acceptable surplus range on average since 2020. ● The parenting survey conducted by the Friends of Langley showed 58% of respondents (out of 185 responses) moved to this area specifically to send their children to Langley First School, with a further 3% who had been planning to move to the area to send their children to Langley. ● The North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 also contradicts the rationale for closing Langley due to falling birth rates as it states: "Net inward migration from neighbouring areas, primarily Newcastle, helps to sustain the overall working age population and limits the fall in the number of children in the borough" *Appletree Gardens has had a 23% surplus level on average over the last five years. Pupil projections The 'pupil projection methodology' was cited in the supporting documents provided in the Council proposals but there is no link to this methodology provided. Looking online we assume they must have used the National Pupil Projection Model since this is the only published methodology. However, the National Pupil Projection methodology only publishes projections up to 2030. Somehow, the council has forecast pupil numbers well beyond 2030. The council's projection figures also appear to be inaccurate: • It projects 59 pupils starting in 2025 in Reception in Langley, which drops by six students to 53 in Year 1. There is no explanation of this and no indication from parents in this year group of their intention to leave • In comparison, Appletree appears to gain 18 students between Reception to Year 1, again with no explanation as to where these additional students have come from and not in line with the school's admission records • When these figures are corrected, we see that in 2030 (the acceptable time frame for pupil projections) Langley surplus is projected to be 14% surplus - only 4% away from the council's acceptable level - whereas Appletree's surplus is projected to be almost double at 34%. • One of the main factors in the council's decision-making is the concern that the capacity at Whitley Bay High School (WBHS) is 390 pupils, and the proposed first school and middle school changes are aimed at preventing the high school from going over capacity. However, our research group has found: • Based on the council's methodology, from the current reception onwards, it is unlikely the numbers of pupils at WBHS will reach 390. Therefore the council's focus on

ensuring numbers don’t exceed this figure are misguided This issue the council is trying to fix relates to children already in the system, rather than future pupil projections, particularly the current year 2 and year 5 year groups. Closing Langley will not tackle this issue. Parental choice This consultation assumes parents will choose to send their children to Appletree Gardens if Langley First School is closed. This would certainly be true for the current year 2 group, where there are no spaces across the whole of Whitley Bay to house these children other than at Appletree (where we understand there are currently two spaces). However, with a surplus at many of the other schools in the area, it cannot be assumed that Appletree would be the school of choice. The council’s consultation document shows 44% of catchment children attend Appletree compared to 73% at Langley; interestingly 12% of Langley pupils attend from the Appletree Gardens catchment area. In the most recent 2 previous years of higher birth rates, 2020 reception and 2023 reception intakes, Appletree was the only NEPA first school with surplus spaces in admissions, 14 and 6 respectively. For the 2 lowest birth rate years, 2024 and 2025 intake, Appletree had the largest portion of surplus places in admissions against PAN, 32% and 45% respectively. When looking at the 2025 admissions data, the distance of the last place offered at Langley was nearly 6 miles, compared to 3.6 miles for Appletree, demonstrating a far wider geographic draw and a greater ability to attract families from further afield. Of the 187 parents who responded to the survey carried out by Friends of Langley, 88.2% said Appletree Gardens was not one of their school preferences when they applied for their school places. That same survey also asked which school would be their first choice of school for their children if Langley were to close. Of the 187 responses to this question: ● 38.5% chose South Wellfield (72 parents) ● 20.3% chose Southridge (38 parents) ● 11.2% chose Marine Park (21 parents) ● 11.2% chose Appletree (21 parents) ● 3.2% chose Whitley Lodge (6 parents) • 3.2% chose Coquet Park (6 parents) • When asked if they would take a place at Appletree Gardens if offered, 43 parents said no. • A further 62 parents said they would potentially consider home-schooling their children if Langley closed. An analysis of birth rates mapped against six years’ of reception offers data for each school showed Appletree Gardens is ranked as the most sensitive school in the entire planning area to falling birth rates. Langley, by contrast, has a medium sensitivity, cushioned by its proven popularity and wider draw. ● The council's proposal is therefore not just to close the more popular school, thereby ignoring parental choice, but also to close the more demographically stable and resilient one, leading to a longer-term risk. New homes The Murton Gap development will see up to 3,000 new homes being built between now and 2032. The council has consistently told us that new homes don’t automatically mean more children. However, the development proposal estimates a need for an additional 748 primary school places,and proposes to build a

new two-form entry primary school to provide an additional 420 primary school places for the development. According to the council's school catchment checker, the development is covered by New York Primary School. However, there is a considerable proportion of the development which would be considerably closer to both Langley and Appletree. This section is specifically for parents with a parent in year 2, who would be in year 4 at the point that these proposals go ahead as they currently stand. ● All schools within the North East Planning Area (NEPA) are currently full for this year group, apart from Appletree Gardens, which we understand currently has two spaces ● A merger with Appletree would mean 118 children in year 4. ● As yet, the council has not provided any information as to what the class sizes would be in the 'merged' school. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. Implementing this merger in 2027 would mean disrupting the largest cohorts of pupils currently moving through the system. If this merger is to go ahead, a far more logical approach is to wait until the smaller birth-rate cohorts are in the schools. Early years and wraparound provision The council has accepted that it has not taken either early years nor wraparound provision into consideration as part of the consultation. The parent survey conducted by Friends of Langley found: ● Of the 190 parents who answered the question about using wraparound provision, 60.5% (115 parents) said they regularly used Schools Out, with a further 4.2% (8 parents) said they use it for last-minute emergencies ● When asked what they would do if Schools Out wasn't available: ● 52.8% of parents didn't have an answer ● 35.6% of parents said they would be forced to cut their hours at work ● 19% of parents said they would look for a childminder ● 14.7% of parents said they would need to rely more heavily on family ● There were several other comments from parents concerned about having to quit their job altogether, whether there would be enough childminders to support the area, and needing to change schools to one which could provide wraparound cover There are already 23 children on the waiting list for nursery at Langley for 2026, with a further nine on the list for 2027 and one already on the list for 2028. Other schools relevant to this consultation . 1. Woodlawn ● The consultation outlines the intention for the council to repurpose the Langley site and move the post-16 provision from Marden High School (32 children in total according to Ofsted), thereby displacing 300 children for the benefit of 32 children ● By bundling the two issues - the alleged need to close a school with the need to expand Woodlawn - the council is effectively creating a false choice: asking the community to accept a suboptimal and unstable mainstream solution in exchange for a desirable SEND solution. ● The long-term health of the mainstream school system should not be compromised to solve a logistical problem for SEND provision, however important that provision may be. 2. Coquet Park First School ● Within the consultation documents, the council makes

reference to considering the closure of Coquet Park but that this was not deemed financially viable. This is due to a private finance initiative (PFI) school, which the council is contractually obligated to until 2032.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 05:22 PM

My nieces and nephews would be impacted and it would mean a change in the type of phonics they will learn and have a huge impact on their learning. It will also lead to changing schools twice in 18 months.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 05:24 PM

Like many parents I was very shocked and saddened to hear of the proposed Closure of Langley first school. Having moved to Whitley bay from London for its green spaces and great number of reputable schools, I have come to learn that not only is much of that valuable green space being used for 3000 new houses but that not just Langley but multiple schools are being forced to close or ‘merge’. [redacted] Starting at Nursery he has forged great relationships and made an incredible group of friends . [redacted] This was such a blessing as moving home is already a big change.. Moving from rectopion to 1st year was already a challenge and he spent the first week afraid to play outside, in part because of the new playground and surroundings . [redacted] Taking this continuity away and asking him to make a huge change at such a young age is worrying. We chose Langley over all the other schools including South Wellfield, which is closer to us, however none of the other schools had the same warmth of feel. I think the focus on each child’s individual needs as well as mental well-being and development is so incredible . Our son and the school are thriving ! The more the friends of Langley, with legal assistance, have dug into this proposal, the less transparent and frankly more confusing the proposals seem. Not only do I refuse to accept the claims that north council are positive there won’t be enough children to fill Langley , when 3000 families will be moving into the area , I’ve also been shocked to see that part of the housing development is to include a brand new primary school where Langley already stands - albeit a few hundred meters away. Not only am I concerned about how this will affect [redacted] learning (as well as the poor staff who face losing their jobs) but I also strongly agree with concerned parents with SEND children attending both Langley and apple tree. There is no guarantee that their children will have the adequate extra breakout classrooms and spaces required for their special needs which also seems a total oversight. Logistically, for school runs and drops offs, Appletree doesn’t have the infrastructure to take on double the traffic and footfall as it can’t shut the road due

to local Bus routes. Far more dangerous therefore than the false labeling of Langleys “highway “- which the children have to cross (once a year) for sports day. It’s not a highway as the council well knows . It’s a quiet residential street. I would hate to see a beloved institution that has been a pillar of the community for over 70 years be shut for the wrong reasons. I don’t want to put Langley’s welfare ahead of other schools but as this comes down to money, shouldn’t we be looking other schools that are running at a higher loss and deficit whilst actually having less children to account for ?! I take some hope from Northumberland councils recent about turn on their proposed school closures and hope north Tyneside can consider this too .

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 05:27 PM

It is just a very sad prospect that will affect so many children and their families.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 05:46 PM

The traffic footfall along seatonville road is hirrendeous and you are going to put more childrens lives at risk having to cross. The traffic footfall through the estate near appletree is going to be also horrendeous. I dont think anyone has really thought of the impact you are going to have on childrens lives that are currently settled within the schools.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 05:48 PM

It would disrupt my grandson’s educational experience and potentially put him in classes with higher pupil ratios which would be detrimental to his education. Langley has superior pre school facilities and out of school facilities unlike Applebee’s and also excellent support for SEN children. I cannot see why the Council has come to this decision.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 06:19 PM

[redacted] This became an asset to the school as more and more parents needed chidcare out of school hours and during holidays. We then offered wraparound care for the nursery and with qualified staff were able to offer high quality Ofsted registered care. We continued to be an extension of the school after parents were offered 30hours early years funding. The wraparound currently provides childcare to babies as well now. This is what the government has wanted. School's Out currently has over 150 children on their books. Afterschool can have between 40 and 70 children per night. A major question for those parents/carers is who would provide childcare as Appletree only has 30 places and they are full. I hope this helps stop the closure of Langley as I just wanted to show you

another side to Langley

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 06:27 PM

I am a parent of a child in Reception at Langley and am strongly opposed to the closure of Langley First School for several reasons. My opinion is that the council's proposal is a short-term, easy financial fix that does not put the education and interests of Langley's pupil's first, nor does it have the backing of the local community. Langley is not a valid choice for closure, rather it has drawn the short straw simply because 1) other less-well performing schools are PFI, and 2) the opportunity to expand Woodlawn offers further cost-savings to the council. These are NOT acceptable reasons to close an excellent school like Langley and is not in the best interest's of the children's education or the wider community 1. This is not a merger. The ethos of Langley, it's governing body and it's excellent teaching staff will be lost to us. This is grossly unfair to the Langley pupils and families. Penalizing Langley in this way would make a transition harder for it's pupils. 2. I am deeply concerned by the council's inadequate and vague plan to accommodate Langley pupils on the Appletree site. Nor has the council given any assurance on class sizes or what impact the "merger" would have on the ability of Appletree to provide SEN support and extra-curricular clubs. The council have made no guarantee that our children won't miss out because of this squeeze on resources. 3. My main objection is the lack of parental choice. Appletree is NOT my school of choice and I would need to consider alternative schools should Langley be forced to close. I am also extremely concerned by the refusal of Appletree leadership to engage with Langley. This has only created negative feelings and would make a transition harder 4. The wraparound provider, School's Out at Langley, provide vital childcare to many families. There is no assurance, in deed it is unlikely, that Little Pips will be able to fill this need. School's Out management should have been consulted with. 5. Increased traffic and lack of parking will be an issue at Appletree. Langley has a free car park and closes it's entrance street to traffic which Appletree can not do. 6.. The Friend's of Langley campaign (FoLC) have compiled data on projected pupil numbers, deficit forecasting, building space/capacity at Appletree, as well as council finances relevant to this proposal which calls in to question the council's position on this proposal. The FoLC has also highlighted several inaccuracies/issues with the council's process, and a lack of transparency in the methodologies and datasets used by the council to arrive at this proposal. As all of this information will be presented by the FoLC to council I will not repeat it here, but, in short, these data require unbiased review and scrutiny. The FoLC has shown that there is a huge strength of feeling and support both within our school and in the wider community to save Langley. The council should not ignore this and must work to find an alternative proposal.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 06:38 PM

I feel strongly that a ‘merger’ (I use the term loosely) is the wrong decision for Langley First School. As we all know it is not a true ‘merger’. The outcome of closing our school is unfair on our children and staff. We are a ‘good’ rated school by OFSTED. [redacted] There have been several inaccuracies in the information given. It is alleged that the children have to cross a public highway to access our field. This is untrue. We have what we call a field onsite. Although we have been informed it is just a ‘green space’. Our children use it daily several times. We also have a forest school outdoor space that our early years children use twice a day. Our nursery has a large garden that is also used daily several times per day. We have a potting shed in an area where we grow our own vegetables and flowers. We also have an ‘outdoor’ classroom for children who find outside play overwhelming. We are very much an inclusive school who pride ourselves on welcoming children with additional needs and working with their families and outside agencies to ensure they progress in their time with us. We have a very nurturing school environment and work hard to build good relationships with our parents and carers. I am worried that our children will be placed in larger class sizes and our children with SEN will struggle even more with that. In addition to moving to a new school with unfamiliar staff. I think Langley could work well with Woodlawn. Some children could have dual registration. Two schools working together. This supports the governments idea of ‘inclusive education’ surely? I am concerned that there has been no community impact assessment regarding the closure of our school. There has been no communication with our Wraparound provision ’Schools Out’ and this will also affect their business. We have worked well alongside them for years. I am proud to work at Langley and feel humbled by the amazing reaction from our families past and present and our community to the reaction of our school possibly closing. We are stronger together.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 06:44 PM

I have concerns about how this will affect a child in my family who is a current pupil of Langley First. The child has SEN and is currently supported through the available resources at Langley. From reading the consultation document, it is clear that the needs of pupils with SEN will not be properly accommodated in the merger. It is clear that resources at Appletree would not meet his needs, and no clear provision is given in the proposal to rectifying this. I believe it will cause significant disruption to my nephew’s education and wellbeing (as well as those of children with similar needs) if the merger goes ahead.

Screen Name Redacted

As a parent of a child currently attending Langley, I am deeply

11/12/2025 06:55 PM

concerned about the negative impact this decision would have on my child's education, wellbeing, and our family's daily life. 1. Disruption to Wraparound and Early Years Provision Langley's "Schools Out" childcare service is vital to our family, offering flexible hours from 7:30am to 6pm, holiday cover, and care for children from 9 months to 9 years. Appletree's "Little Pips" offers shorter hours and limited holiday provision, which would significantly reduce our childcare options and may force us to alter our working arrangements. 2. Increased Traffic and Safety Risks Langley benefits from a nearby public car park and a street closure during drop-off for child safety. Appletree is located on a bus route and lacks similar safety measures and parking. Parent survey data shows a sharp increase in families needing to drive if moved to Appletree, worsening congestion and safety risks. 3. Larger Class Sizes and Overcrowding There are no assurances about class sizes at Appletree, especially for older children where no legal limits exist. Langley's current Year 2 cohort would become 118 children in Year 4 post-merger, raising concerns about overcrowding and reduced individual attention. 4. Impact on Employment The proposed changes to wraparound care and nursery provision would make it harder to manage childcare, forcing further relying on family, or even reducing hours employed. In conclusion, this proposal prioritizes short-term logistics over long-term educational stability and community wellbeing. I urge the council to reconsider this decision and explore a fairer, more inclusive solution that protects the interests of all children and families in our community.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 06:55 PM

Living under a labor council who does not conduct themselves appropriately is embarrassing, the campaign has shown a number of flaws in the councils plans which if anything, make them look incompetent or disingenuous. Even if I continue to vote labor I'm sure this will alter others opinions and I would prefer disgruntled North Tyneside council residents do not turn to reform.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 06:59 PM

The community of Whitley Bay relies on the great schools and opportunities our children have. Merging the schools will take that spirit away. Covid was bad enough, removing valuable local schools will destroy our community.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 06:59 PM

Affect on me/ my child The number of children will not reduce just because you close some schools. They will still not all fit into WBHS. Where will my child go? They may not be in the catchment area for any schools. The stress of not knowing where my child is going to go to school. They will have their education at Langley disrupted in their final year of first school, have to go to another school further away (not 600m) potentially in a very large class with new pupils/ teachers/

potential lack of space and resources for one year, then have to move again to another school. But I am not sure if there will be a place for them at any school in the area if you have to reduce capacity to fit into WBHS. How many children will be in a class at KS2? You are not able to provide an answer on this. This is very concerning. A merger with Appletree would mean 118 children in year 4. Impact on my child's emotional well-being due to the disruption of having to move schools in final year. Detriment to education due to loss of good teachers and potentially larger class sizes. New teachers will not know anything about the pupils - for those on their final year of first school this will be disadvantageous to their education. Loss of work and earnings due to having to take children to different schools and unable to use wraparound service as does not meet times needed. Having to cross main road to get to school. Impact on local community and networks - you have not considered this and have not carried out any impact assessment. I find this very concerning. The inadequacies in the decision making process/ lack of robust evidence base concerns me and my trust in this council. It is not in the best interests of the children and their education. Overall there is a lack of or use of incorrect data - including (but not limited to): your description of the school sites (which you have not even visited); your predictions on future birth rates and population of children of school age in the area; your projections on number of children joining Langley; your lack of knowledge of the actual space available at Appletree; the financial state of the school and any measures to address this. This issue the council is trying to fix relates to children already in the system, rather than future pupil projections, particularly the current year 2 and year 5 year groups. Closing Langley will not tackle this issue.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 07:18 PM

[redacted]. As a parent, I know how devastated I'd be if my children's school closed and I have friends with children at Langley. The stress and anxiety this has caused them is awful and this will impact all the children's education and mental health. I went to Langley nursery myself and it will be horrendous for the community if this goes ahead.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 07:19 PM

[redacted] He is extremely settled, well supported and happy. [redacted] The progress he has made with his self regulation and resilience has been incredible. As a family, we are very worried that this proposal would involve two huge transitions for him within a year. We cannot see how the level of support would be replicated through this merger and

our Grandson would be at risk of regression, overwhelm and ultimately, disengagement. He struggles with transitions and relies on trusted adults. [redacted] We oppose this consultation as it would be detrimental for our Grandson and would place considerable stress and strain on our family, my daughter is extremely worried about how her son will manage and us even talking about giving up her career and home educating him. We hope you will reconsider this proposal and avoid closing a hugely valued and successful school which is a vital part of this community.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 07:28 PM

[redacted] This proposal will mean my youngest child will not be given a place in reception 2026 despite being part of the school community and wearing the uniform for well over a year. To explain to a four-year-old why he must move schools away from his sibling is unrealistic. This would mean two different school drop offs and collections at the same time for one parent is again unrealistic when both children are so young. I would not or ever would consider Appletree gardens as a school for my child even after attending the open evening. By forcing my youngest child into a different school you separate two siblings, they will no longer be able to see each other in the school yard or in the dinner hall, they will no longer be able to walk to school or back together talking about their day. The logistics of this are ridiculous and unachievable for a single parent. My eldest son has been severely unsettled due to this proposal, with breakdowns and emotional meltdowns the stress put on him due to this proposal is unacceptable. The data provided by the council is inadequate and false. This proposal forces my children to be homeschooled and removed parental choice from me and their farther which is again unacceptable.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 07:28 PM

I am worried about the impact on local schools in the area. This feels like a short sighted plan given the amount of houses planned for Murton gap. The roads outside Appletree are already terrible around school times. Parents relocated from Langley will no doubt need to drive to school as they are further away from home and may not have

time to work with work commitments etc Wrap around care will be an issue

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 07:39 PM

[redacted] I have seen children take their first confident steps into education here, grow in character, learn to read, to question, to care for one another, and to believe in themselves. To think that this could all be brought to an end on the basis of flawed information and an incomplete consultation process is heartbreaking and deeply concerning. 1. Issues with the Consultation Process The decision to move to consultation was based on documentation that contained multiple factual inaccuracies. These inaccuracies have shaped public perception and decision-making, and they must be formally acknowledged and corrected before any decision can be made. Outdoor space: The claim that Langley lacks accessible playing fields is untrue. The school has a well-used playing field directly adjacent to the building. The separate field across the road is used just once a year for Sports Day. In addition, we have a Reception garden following a forest school ethos, an outdoor classroom, and a potting garden all used daily for learning, well-being, and SEND provision. Financial position: The consultation document states that Langley is in deficit. This is false. The school has never operated in deficit; only a predicted shortfall for 2025–26 exists, and we are working with an independent financial advisor to address it. Accessibility and safety: It is also misleading to claim that most dwellings in Langley's catchment can reach Appletree without crossing major roads. Many of our children would have to cross Seatonville Road and/or Cauldwell Lane, both busy, high-traffic areas. Engagement with headteachers and governors: Headteacher briefings were minimal, and governors were excluded. This restricted schools' ability to respond constructively or propose alternative solutions. Beyond these issues, the consultation documents themselves contain errors in projected pupil numbers, deficit forecasts, and pupil data for other schools. No community impact assessment has been carried out for Langley, despite this being standard practice for such significant decisions. The December 2024 assessment cited by the Council relates to Monkseaton High School, not Langley. Moreover, there has been no consideration of early years or wraparound provision, nor any contact with 'School's Out' our highly valued out-of-hours care provider. These are vital services for families and form part of what makes Langley such an integral part of our community. 2. Merger vs Closure If change must happen, it must be fair. The current proposal is not a merger it is a closure of Langley disguised as one. Department for Education guidance clearly outlines that a true merger requires both schools to close and a new one to be formed. This process allows for equal representation,

community ownership, and oversight by the Office of the Schools Adjudicator. The Council has rejected this path because it is more complex and time-consuming. But the easier route is not the right one, not when children's education, well-being, and community identity are at stake. A true merger would: Reduce division between two excellent schools, allowing both communities to shape a shared future. Ensure fair consideration of both sites, staff, and pupils. Provide stronger scrutiny and transparency in decision-making. Give children a voice in creating a new ethos, name, and culture. Something they can take pride in. Langley is not yet in deficit, and our children deserve time for this to be done properly. We must prioritise getting it right, not getting it done quickly. 3. Building and Capacity Concerns The Council's documentation states Appletree can accommodate 432 pupils yet the official capacity listed on the government website is 293. No explanation has been given for this discrepancy. There are no clear plans for how all Langley pupils could be safely accommodated on the Appletree site, nor for how class sizes will be managed. In Key Stage 2, where no statutory class size limits exist, there is real concern that classes will become overcrowded, compromising both education and well-being. Additionally, data shows Appletree is a significantly more expensive site to run (£29/m² vs Langley's £4/m² in utilities). These figures cast serious doubt on whether the proposed "savings" justify the disruption and loss this closure would bring. 4. Traffic and Safety The proposal includes no traffic impact assessment. This is alarming. Langley currently operates a successful road closure scheme at drop-off and pick-up times to ensure pupil safety. Appletree cannot, as it sits on a bus route. Langley also benefits from a nearby free public car park; Appletree does not. According to the Friends of Langley parent survey, 78% of families currently walk to school. If moved to Appletree, 55% say they would need to drive. This would dramatically increase local traffic, pollution, and parking issues, particularly around an already congested site. 5. Financial Context While both schools are technically in surplus, the presentation of Langley's forecasted deficit is misleading. Appletree currently receives Falling Rolls funding, which compensates for under-enrolment. Langley does not, as its surplus capacity is within acceptable limits. The Council has never met with Langley's leadership or governors to discuss its financial forecasts or offer support. Instead of closing a financially stable, well-run school, why not work collaboratively to ensure long-term sustainability? 6. Provision for Children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Langley has worked tirelessly to create an inclusive, nurturing environment for all children. Currently, 24% of our pupils receive additional support. Our entire school design — single-storey, ramp access, sensory and breakout spaces, adapted classrooms, outdoor education provision reflects our belief that every child belongs. Our SEN provision is not just physical; it is cultural. Staff across the school are trained as mental health ambassadors,

Thrive practitioners, and neurodiversity-affirming educators. Every classroom has a “haven” space, and our flexible, child-led approach ensures every child is supported to succeed. The Council has provided no guarantees that equivalent provision or expertise would exist at Appletree, particularly since their plans for an Additionally Resourced Provision (ARP) have been paused due to this consultation. To dismantle this level of SEND expertise would be a grave step backwards in inclusive education. Langley’s proximity to Woodlawn Special School is not a reason to close us, it is a strategic advantage. Our partnership enables dual registration, joint provision, and shared expertise, exactly the kind of inclusive collaboration the government advocates. 7. Birth Rates and Future Demand The justification for closure leans heavily on falling birth rates. While this has been true up to 2023, the Office for National Statistics predicts birth rates will stabilise from 2026 and then increase. Furthermore, internal migration patterns show more families with young children moving into North Tyneside than out. The Friends of Langley survey found that 58% of families moved to the area specifically for Langley First School, with another 3% planning to. The North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 itself acknowledges that net inward migration helps sustain the local child population. Langley’s popularity, strong results, and community reputation show that demand for high-quality first-tier education in this area remains strong. Langley First School is more than just a building. It is a living, breathing part of our community. It represents inclusion, care, academic excellence, and above all, joy in learning. To close it based on flawed data, incomplete consultation, and procedural convenience would be a disservice not only to our children, but to the values our education system is meant to uphold. We ask the Council to: Correct the inaccuracies in the consultation documentation. Conduct a full, fair, and transparent community impact assessment. Reconsider the proposed closure in favour of a genuine merger process. Recognise Langley’s outstanding contribution to inclusive, high-quality education. Our children deserve the best start in life. Langley gives them that every single day. Please don’t take it away.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 07:55 PM

I am writing as a Langley parent to say I am completely opposed to the proposal to close Langley First School. I believe this plan would have a serious and long-term impact on my children, my family and our community. It feels rushed, unfair and based on information that doesn’t reflect the true picture of Langley or our local area. 1. [redacted] Both are happy, confident and settled at Langley. The thought that my son might have to move to a new school as early as next September is heartbreaking. At four years old, he is proud to wear his Langley uniform, knows his teachers and routines, and feels part of the school. Having to leave while his sister

stays would be confusing and upsetting for him, and I worry it would give him a negative start to his education that could last for years. Managing two children at different schools would also be extremely difficult for us. Even if start times were staggered, it would mean longer mornings, time off work, and more childcare to cover the gaps. We'd also be juggling two sets of inset days, parents' evenings and school events. It just isn't realistic for working families like mine. 2. Parental Choice When I applied for schools, Langley was my clear first choice. I chose it because of its ethos, the warmth of the teachers and the nurturing environment that helps every child feel seen and supported. Appletree Gardens was not one of my preferences then, and it wouldn't be now. The Friends of Langley parent survey found that nearly 90% of parents didn't list Appletree as one of their school choices, and many said they would look for places elsewhere or even consider home-schooling if Langley closed. That reflects exactly how I feel and we will not be choosing Appletree for our son when he starts in reception next year. Parents don't want to be told where to send their children - we want to be trusted to choose the right environment for them. Langley is a popular and successful school with strong leadership and a dedicated staff team. Closing the more popular, stable school while keeping open the one that struggles more to fill its places feels completely wrong and goes against what families in the area clearly want. 3. Quality of Education and Ethos At the public consultation meeting, the council has said this proposal isn't about school quality, but as a parent, that's what matters most to me. Langley is a brilliant school with exceptional teachers. The school's inclusive and caring ethos makes it somewhere children want to be and being at Langley has helped my daughter to flourish and grow in confidence despite her shy nature. Langley's facilities are fantastic for young learners. The sensory rooms and spaces like The Nest and The Hive where children can take time out if they need to have been brilliant for my daughter. She often talks about how kind her teachers are and how everyone helps each other. That sense of belonging can't just be picked up and moved somewhere else. Moving her will set her education back and her confidence which could impact her entire school journey, not least because she would then have to move again only two years later. Closing a school that already provides such high-quality education makes no sense. It would take away a learning environment that so many of us actively chose and value deeply. 4. Support for Children with Additional Needs Langley provides excellent support for children with additional needs. Around a quarter of pupils receive extra help or are on the SEND register, and the staff have specialist training in mental health approaches. Even though my children don't have identified additional needs, the inclusive environment has really benefitted them both. Langley has a patient, thoughtful approach that has built their confidence and self-esteem. Being next to Woodlawn School should be seen as an advantage, not a reason for closure. It allows for

collaboration and shared expertise between mainstream and special school settings, which is exactly the kind of inclusive education the government says it wants to see more of. 5. Problems with the Consultation It's hard to have confidence in this consultation because there are so many inaccuracies in the council's documents. They claim Langley doesn't have its own playing field when it clearly does – within the school grounds. They say the school is already in deficit when it isn't - it's only forecasting a small shortfall for 2025/26 and is already working with an independent adviser to address it. They suggest children could walk to Appletree without crossing major roads, but many families, including ours, would have to cross Seatonville Road or Cauldwell Lane, both of which are busy and unsafe for young children. The council has also not carried out a proper community impact assessment. Given how central Langley is to our local community - not just for families but for wraparound care, after-school activities and local jobs - this seems like a serious oversight. [redacted] This is something I would like the Council to address. 6. Space, Safety and Site Concerns The council says Appletree can accommodate both schools' pupils, but the Department for Education lists its capacity as 293, not 432. There's been no clear explanation for that difference or any reassurance about class sizes or how all children could be safely accommodated. Langley's building is well-designed and efficient, with plenty of space for outdoor learning and play. My children love the garden areas and the field next to the school. Appletree, on the other hand, is on a bus route that can't be closed to traffic and has no nearby public car park. I can't imagine how safe drop-off and pick-up could be managed for that many extra families. 7. Financials Both schools are currently in surplus. Langley's forecast deficit is small and manageable, and the council hasn't even met with the school's leadership or governors to talk about options before proposing closure. It also costs far less to run Langley than Appletree. According to government data, Langley spends around £4 per square metre on utilities compared to £29 at Appletree. Closing a school that's more efficient, more popular and not currently in debt doesn't seem logical or fair. 8. Birth Rates and Future Pupil Numbers The council keeps saying falling birth rates are the reason for closing Langley, but the data doesn't back that up. The Office for National Statistics predicts that birth rates will level off by 2026 and start to rise again. The council's own Local Plan says that families moving into North Tyneside from surrounding areas help to keep pupil numbers stable. Langley continues to attract families from across the area, while Appletree has consistently had the highest number of surplus places. When the projections are corrected, Langley's future surplus

is within the council's acceptable range, while Appletree's is far higher. If anything, Langley is the more sustainable school long term. 9. Wraparound and Early Years Provision The council has admitted that it hasn't taken wraparound or early years provision into account. For working parents like me, this makes a big difference. I regularly use Langley's Schools Out childcare, which runs from 7.30am to 6pm and covers almost every school holiday. It's reliable and flexible, and it's one of the reasons I'm able to work full-time. Appletree's Little Pips service has shorter hours and closes early on Fridays. If Langley's wraparound closed, I would have to reduce my working hours and I honestly don't know how we'd manage childcare. The council hasn't acknowledged or planned for this at all, even though it affects so many families. 10. Traffic and Local Safety I live on Langley Avenue opposite the school, so I see the traffic situation first-hand. There are already minibuses and taxis using the street for Woodlawn School, and it gets very busy. If Woodlawn were to expand across the whole Langley site, the amount of traffic would increase even more. The road is narrow, and vehicles often travel too fast. I'm worried about the safety of my children and many others who live on the street if that happens. 11. A Fairer Approach Langley First School is a thriving, inclusive and much-loved school that parents actively choose. The council's proposal is based on flawed information and ignores the real impact on families, children and the wider community. I'm asking the council to stop this process and review the evidence properly. Please take into account the educational quality, the wraparound care that families rely on, and the wellbeing of the children who are already settled and happy here. Our children deserve stability, a nurturing education and a school that values them. Langley First School already provides that, and it should remain open. If the council insists on making changes, then the process should at least be fair. A genuine merger - where both schools close and a new one is created - would mean both communities have equal input and proper oversight. What's being proposed now is not a merger at all. It's simply closing Langley and calling it something else, and that's not right for our children, our teachers or our community. I also ask that there should be a reception intake in 2026 at Langley so that younger siblings, like my son, can start school where their older brothers or sisters already attend. This would allow families like us to manage one transition instead of two and would make the process far less disruptive for everyone and more manageable for working parents. I also ask that parents be given a choice of where else they send children to school in this circumstance, rather than Appletree being presented as the only option.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 07:57 PM

I wish to object to the proposal to merge Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School for the following reasons: 1. The capacity of the target school is not sufficient. The proposal and

meetings with the Council have informed parents and the public that there is sufficient space in Appletree Gardens to accommodate all pupils from Langley First School. This statement is only correct in terms of pure numbers that the premises can hold and has absolutely no provision set aside for the CORRECT use of the premises for actual schooling. The proposal states a building occupancy of 432 pupils, which is more than the total current number at Langley and Appletree, but the gov.uk website for building occupancy shows a figure of 293, which is not sufficient. Attempting to force the total number of children into this premises will degrade the ability of the school to properly educate the children by removing key specialist areas such as computing labs, library and reading spaces, and sensory provision. Such a move would also dramatically increase the class sizes in each year, resulting in a poorer education for all children. All of this is on top of the effect on children that would be forced to move schools as a part of the proposal. This change would drastically affect the entire education of our children, as is unacceptable. 2. The tier 3 numbers for Whitley Bay High School used as evidence as to why the school closures will help align tier 1 and tier 2 numbers to allow the correct entry into WBHS are misleading at best and intentionally misrepresented at worst. The current reception numbers over schools across the affected intake does not total the projected t3 number, so the intention of the Council to mitigate against this as a cause to close schools down is misguided and incorrect. The number of pupils that will merge up to t3 without the school closures will still not exceed the projected intended number. This means that the proposal doesn't seek to fix any future projections and solely focuses on children already in the system, which are already accounted for with the current school availability. 3. There has been no evidence provided to demonstrate the traffic impact of this proposal. Currently, Langley First School has agreement to close the street outside the school every morning to make it easier and safer for children walking to school. This is important, as a survey carried out by the Friends of Langley showed that currently 78% of parents walk to the school. If forced to move to Appletree Gardens, that number would, by necessity, drop to 55%. Appletree Gardens has no capability to ensure the same level of safety for our children, as the street outside the school is a bus route. Crucially, there is also no good parking option for parents that are then forced to use cars to get their children to school, as there is at Langley. All of this culminates in a far less safe and secure environment for children to make their way to and from school. 4. Being attached to Woodlawn, Langley First School prides itself on accommodating SEN children. There are a number of SEN pupils currently at Langley, with another group that are receiving additional support following early identification of SEN, which means that 24% of pupils have some amount of SEN support. Langley provides a lot of support in this area. We chose Langley in part because I came

from a SEN background and understand the importance that having support provides for children and their education. As far as can be seen in the current proposal, there is no provision set aside for this at Appletree Gardens, and in fact with the need to move hundreds of new pupils into Appletree should the proposed ‘merger’ take place, then there will functionally be no SEN support at Appletree. This is negligent and will severely affect a sizable portion of the children who are supposed to feel safe and secure at the school. 5. The figures presented to showcase the financial deficit held by Langley in the proposal are misleading, and do not paint the full picture, especially when the incomplete data has been used as a decision point for a change as large as this. The figures act as a comparison between Langley and Appletree to attempt to show that Langly is in a worse financial position but completely fails to mention additional funding that is apportioned to Appletree specifically to cover the surplus of places at that school. Langley is not in surplus and thus has no access to this funding. The overall comparison MUST take the proposed financial figures without the additional funding. Furthermore, there has been no effort made by the council to meet with the leadership or governing body of Langley First School to address the proposed deficit in funding.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 08:00 PM

Reduces parental choice fewer local school places less flexibility for families overcrowding at Appletree larger class sizes and reducing induvual support for children. Traffic issues around Appletree. Shutting thriving schools is not good for the community and also damages the sense of community

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 08:02 PM

The schools are not being ‘merged’. Langley children are proposed to merge into Appletree with its existing pupils. Langley staff will be redundant and the building repurposed for Woodlawn. This will affect me personally because I will potentially be out of work after decades of service. The affect on the children will be huge, especially children with SEND who will potentially have to contend with multiple massive changes all at once, with no familiar adults or support to assist with this. Children who have EHCPs and/ or one to one support will really struggle with this lack of care and consideration. Please consider the considerable impact this decision could have on our most vulnerable members of society.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 08:05 PM

I have two children who I wish to go to Langley It would be impossible to get both children to two different schools for the start of school day and the same problem at the end of the school day I want both children to be at the same school not different schools

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 08:11 PM

Reduces parental choice less places mean less flexibility for families

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 08:14 PM

Appletree is an amazing wholesome school with wonderful caring staff. [redacted] Teachers and support staff go above and beyond for the children and families. [redacted] We have a site for our EYFS children which is long, narrow and has the most amazing nooks for exploring. Our big site, allows our ks1/2 children to explore wildly with room to learn and grow. The children at Appletree are able to access a full curriculum alongside biking, sports and Forest school. During Forest school sessions (weekly for EYFS and twice a term ks1/2) the children also cook over the firepit, use tools and build relationships and resilience. With this extra outdoor space, I really do believe Langley children would thrive and cherish their experiences at Appletree. It's something we are very proud of. We feel sad that this merger has been presented however, we at Appletree know we can take great care of the new families and deliver an amazingly rich varied curriculum that supports all children. I am therefore in favour of the merge.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 08:36 PM

I went to Langley first school and Monkseaton middle school and they were such a big part of my childhood and I'd love for my daughter to go to those schools.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 08:37 PM

We were absolutely devastated to hear the news of the merger the day after looking around Langley First School at their open evening. We had heard so many great things about the school. [redacted] The very next morning I emailed Langley to ask if my daughter could start nursery at Langley in January 2026, as she has a September birthday and has just turned 3. Unfortunately, they emailed later that day that they had just had the very upsetting news of a potential merger/ closure. We have since applied and hope that, if able to, our daughter will be able to go to the nursery in January or September 2026. As a teacher, I strongly oppose the merging of the two schools. It is unfair on both school communities, who each have their own strong identities. Appletree is a small school and they should not have to give up their facilities such as library, computer suite, intervention spaces etc to accommodate another school. Langley is almost full and I would be very concerned sending my daughter to a merged school where there is not appropriate space or facilities for an education she and all children deserve. I know a number of parents on my estate [redacted] had been talking about

sending their children to Langley First School. Lots of houses are being built around the schools. If the schools merge, I have huge concerns about whether my daughter would get a place as the spaces will surely be extremely limited. The community in and around Langley First School is strong, and it has been inspirational to see the efforts that the school have made to oppose this plan. I sincerely hope you will change these plans.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 08:41 PM

The merger would ensure the future of Appletree by increasing pupil numbers.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:03 PM

I speak as a North Tyneside resident, I have no children at Langley.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:04 PM

I am a resident of west Monkseaton and have 3 children. I moved to the area when my eldest daughter was 3 so that she could attend Langley nursery and the first school. All my 3 children attended Langley first school and the school has provided them with a welcoming, safe and nurturing environment and also a fantastic education. All 3 children have been happy and supported during their time at Langley. [redacted], we have huge concerns about the impact the closure will have on my son in particular. At present he is on a class of 30 which in my opinion is the maximum number of children there should be in a class in order for successful learning to take place and also for a child to feel safe and supported. The consultation on the merger states that Appletree can accommodate ‘more than the amount of both schools combined when future birth rates rise and admission numbers are adjusted’ however the capacity of Appletree is stated as 293. These conflicting figures need to be clarified. In addition to those very worrying figures, we know that all schools in this area are currently full for his year group. (Apart from Appletree which has 2 spaces). We have been provided with no information about how this would work in a merger. Are the children going to be in significantly larger class sizes? If this is the case this will have a huge adverse affect on the education and well being. I am also aware (from my own experience with my older children) that the transition to middle school is a really challenging time for pupils. It’s a huge thing for children so young to leave the safe community of a first school and start a new school with new friends and teachers and routines. I really feel that for my son to have to move schools twice within the space of a year will be extremely traumatic for him. I firmly believe that this merger is not in the best interests of our children. A far better option it to pause the consultation until the larger cohorts of children have gone through the system. My child also uses the wrap around facilities at Langley. [redacted]

[redacted] As yet we have had no assurance that there would be any wrap around facilities at Appletree which would leave us in an impossible situation. We are hugely concerned about the plans to merge. We feel that the documentation used as a basis for the decision has many inaccuracies which shows that this has not been a well thought out decisions. Langley is not the best for school for closure.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:04 PM

Consultation Response: Opposition to Langley Closure This consultation asks the public to identify solutions the council should implement something the council hasn't done to the best of its ability yet. I strongly oppose the closure of Langley for numerous reasons. I moved to Monkseaton before starting my family specifically because of the school choices available. Langley was always my first choice—the staff ethos and nurturing environment were key reasons I enrolled my eldest daughter there, and she thrived. My youngest daughter, now in Year 2, spent her early years in lockdown. Since joining Langley, she too has flourished. Forcing her to move would further disrupt her childhood in ways beyond her control and it would be wholly unfair. The closure will affect my family in multiple ways—not only my children's wellbeing but also house prices, increased traffic from taxis for Woodlawn, and my work commitments. I may need to reduce my hours or seek wraparound care, which will not be available if Langley closes. I have tried attending council surgeries and speaking to members, but every event I attended lacked engagement—staff simply directed me to the website. This is unacceptable. Please look at Northumberland's recent decision based on parent feedback and decide not to close schools based on birth rate and instead agree it's a larger issue. Key Objections Timelines Children in Year 4 typically spend a full year preparing for transition, building resilience and skills for the move into middle school, it takes a whole year to prepare for this transition. You propose this change at the end of Year 3 (for my daughter) without sharing details on class sizes, placement, or how integration will work. Teachers have not been prepared to support this transition. My daughter would then face another school change after just one year to go to middle school. For a generation already impacted by lockdown, this lack of continuity is unfair. Parental Choice I moved here for Langley and the areas schools, as did my neighbour. Closing Langley removes parental choice. Appletree was not even in my top three preferences, and I will not send my daughter there. The closure of Monkseaton Middle also reduces middle school options. Each middle school offers a unique environment, and choice is essential. Reducing numbers across all middle schools and closing Monkseaton leaves parents with minimal options. This consultation assumes parents will choose to send their children to Appletree Gardens if Langley First School is closed. This would certainly be true for the current year 2 group, where there are

no spaces across the whole of Whitley Bay to house these children other than at Appletree (where we understand there are currently two spaces). However, with a surplus at many of the other schools in the area, it cannot be assumed that Appletree would be the school of choice. The council's consultation document shows 44% of catchment children attend Appletree compared to 73% at Langley; 12% of Langley pupils attend from the Appletree Gardens catchment area In the most recent 2 previous years of higher birth rates, 2020 reception and 2023 reception intakes, Appletree was the only NEPA first school with surplus spaces in admissions, 14 and 6 respectively. For the 2 lowest birth rate years, 2024 and 2025 intake, Appletree had the largest portion of surplus places in admissions against PAN, 32% and 45% respectively When looking at the 2025 admissions data, the distance of the last place offered at Langley was nearly 6 miles, compared to 3.6 miles for Appletree, demonstrating a far wider geographic draw and a greater ability to attract families from further afield. Of the 187 parents who responded to the survey carried out by Friends of Langley, 88.2% said Appletree Gardens was not one of their school preferences when they applied for their school places. That same survey also asked which school would be their first choice of school for their children if Langley were to close. Of the 187 responses to this question: • 38.5% chose South Wellfield (72 parents) • 20.3% chose Southridge (38 parents) • 11.2% chose Marine Park (21 parents) • 11.2% chose Appletree (21 parents) • 3.2% chose Whitley Lodge (6 parents) • 3.2% chose Coquet Park (6 parents) When asked if they would take a place at Appletree Gardens if offered, • 43 parents said no. • A further 62 parents said they would potentially consider home-schooling their children if Langley closed. An analysis of birth rates mapped against six years' of reception offers data for each school showed Appletree Gardens is ranked as the most sensitive school in the entire planning area to falling birth rates. Langley, by contrast, has a medium sensitivity, cushioned by its proven popularity and wider draw. The council's proposal is therefore not just to close the more popular school, thereby ignoring parental choice, but also to close the more demographically stable and resilient one, leading to a longer-term risk Flawed Data and Lack of Foresight This proposal should be withdrawn, and a full review of North Tyneside education undertaken. At consultation stage, accurate and complete data should be available. Parents deserve clarity on their child's full educational journey. When Monkseaton High closed, the council should have outlined future pathways for all children. Data has not been properly analysed and these plans not thought past a number a figure and lack detail. A full review should be engaged, and there should be engagement with schools and governors. SEN provision, proposed class sizes, and other critical factors must be addressed thoroughly. You haven't shared all the data you have and we haven't had all the data for the full 6 weeks in order to have a fair chance at considering options and working on feedback. The online

information has constantly been changed and updated which is makes forming an argument difficult, we haven't had the same opportunity to look at the data the council has. There is also data you don't have which I feel is important for example, if its local people moving into the new housing development, who is moving into those houses, in the rings you have drawn around schools how many children live in those streets impacted and many more. Inaccuracies in Council Documentation The cabinet papers used to justify consultation contained several errors: • Playing Fields: It was claimed Langley lacks adjacent playing fields and escorts children off-site for PE. This is false. Langley has a well-used playing field next to the building and a separate field across a minor road used only for sports day. Additional outdoor spaces include a reception garden (forest school ethos), a potting garden, and an outdoor classroom for children with SEND or those overwhelmed by the playground. • Financial Deficit: Incorrect. Langley has only predicted a deficit for 2025/26—the first time ever—and is working with an independent financial advisor to improve the budget. • Safe Access: The claim that most dwellings in Langley's catchment can access Appletree without crossing major roads is wrong. Many children would need to cross Seatonville Road and/or Cauldwell Lane. • Headteacher Briefings: Meetings were brief, and governors were excluded, limiting opportunities for solutions. • Consultation Document Errors: These include projected pupil numbers, deficit forecasts, and inaccuracies in pupil data at other schools. • Community Impact Assessment: None has been done for Langley's closure. The only assessment was for Monkseaton High in December 2024. • Wraparound and Early Years Provision: Not considered. • External Communication: No contact with Langley's 'School's Out' governing body or senior managers. This is just some of the inaccuracies I'm sure there are more had I and others had more time we may have been able to look further. Not a Merger If closure proceeds, at least make it a genuine merger—close both schools and create a new one, combining the best teachers and practices. This approach has not been considered because it requires effort, but decisions should prioritise children, not convenience. A true merger would: • Prevent community division and allow both schools—and their pupils—to contribute to a new school's name, ethos, and uniform. • Retain the best aspects of both schools, including staff, and ease the transition for children. • Increase scrutiny by requiring approval from the Secretary of State and the Office of Schools Adjudicator. • Ensure decisions are made carefully, not rushed. Langley is not yet in deficit, so why the urgency? Wraparound Provision The council admits wraparound and early years provision were not considered. At Whitley Bay High, an officer said they would "work with providers" but offered no assurance. Availability at Little Pips remains unclear. What we know: • Schools Out Northern (Langley): Childcare 7:30am–6pm, flexible booking, day care from 9 months to 9 years, holiday provision (Mon–Fri, 8am–5:30pm). • Little

Pips (Appletree): Childcare 7:45am–5:30pm (4:30pm for nursery), day care from age 2, holiday provision Mon–Thu 8am–5pm, Fri 8am–3:30pm. • Parent Survey: Of 190 respondents, 60.5% regularly use Schools Out; 4.2% use it for emergencies. If unavailable: o 52.8% had no alternative. o 35.6% would cut work hours. o 19% would seek childminders. o 14.7% would rely on family. o Others feared quitting jobs or insufficient childminder availability. • Waiting Lists: 23 children for Langley nursery in 2026, nine for 2027, one for 2028. Impact on Other Schools The proposal affects all NEPA schools and has long-term implications not addressed in council documents. Woodlawn The Langley field is earmarked for development—why not build a purpose-built school for the 32 children who need it? This would be cheaper than closing and redeveloping Langley and Appletree. Current plans displace 300 children for the benefit of 32, creating a false choice between mainstream stability and SEND provision. The consultation outlines the intention for the council to repurpose the Langley site and move the post-16 provision from Marden High School (32 children in total according to Ofsted), thereby displacing 300 children for the benefit of 32 children By bundling the two issues - the alleged need to close a school with the need to expand Woodlawn - the council is effectively creating a false choice: asking the community to accept a suboptimal and unstable mainstream solution in exchange for a desirable SEND solution. The long-term health of the mainstream school system should not be compromised to solve a logistical problem for SEND provision, however important that provision may be. Coquet Park First School The council considered closing Coquet Park but deemed it unviable due to a PFI contract until 2032. The school ended 2024/25 with a £0.325m deficit and cannot balance its budget within three years. Classified as in structural deficit, it faces long-term financial issues. With one-form entry and high PFI costs, its future viability is questionable. Without proposed solutions, closure after 2032 seems inevitable. Close this school and pay the fees again cheaper than current proposals. Building space Capacity and Accommodation Concerns The council's consultation document states that Appletree "can accommodate 432 pupils, which is more than the combined total of both schools when future birth rates and admission numbers are adjusted." However, government data lists Appletree's capacity as 293. This discrepancy requires clarification. To date, the council has provided no assurance regarding how pupils from Langley will be safely accommodated on the Appletree site, nor any confirmation of projected class sizes. Class Size and Educational Impact While early years provision is legally limited to a maximum of 30 pupils per class, there is no statutory limit for children aged seven and older. Without clear guarantees, there is significant concern that pupils may be placed in larger classes, potentially compromising educational quality and wellbeing. The actual size of classrooms is also an issue, Langley's classrooms are up to government guidelines, Appletree's are not and

are in fact smaller. Again another issue that shows the timelines and work on this has not been fully thought hrough. Financial Considerations According to the government's school spending comparison tool, Appletree incurs utility costs of £29 per square metre, compared to Langley's £4 per square metre. This raises questions about the long-term financial sustainability of the proposed arrangement. Birth Rates This consultation relies heavily on the argument that birth rates are falling. While there is no denying the downward trend in birth rates throughout North Tyneside up to 2023, the Office for National Statistics predicts that birth rates will level off from 2026 and then begin to increase again. Birth rates within the NEPA have been declining since 2008. However, despite this, the numbers within NEPA schools have remained resilient to this downward trend, with the majority of schools* being within the council's 10% acceptable surplus range on average since 2020. Internal migration has also not been taken into account for this consultation. Aside from a decline in 2022, the Office for National Statistics shows more young children move into North Tyneside than out of it. Although these statistics don't go down to NEPA level, we do know many families move specifically to the coast take advantage of the three-tier system. The parenting survey conducted by the Friends of Langley showed 58% of respondents (out of 185 responses) moved to this area specifically to send their children to Langley First School, with a further 3% planning to move to the area for the same reason. The North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 also contradicts the rationale for closing Langley due to falling birth rates, as it states: "Net inward migration from neighbouring areas, primarily Newcastle, helps to sustain the overall working-age population and limits the fall in the number of children in the borough." *Appletree Gardens has had a 23% surplus level on average over the last five years. Traffic No evidence has been provided in the supporting documents in relation to traffic impact as a result of these proposals • Langley currently closes the street outside school every morning to make it safer for the children. Appletree cannot close the street to cars in the mornings or at collection times due to it being on a bus route. • Langley also has a free public car park very close by, which Appletree Gardens does not have. • The assumption appears to be that children will walk to school. • The parent survey carried out by Friends of Langley asked parents how they currently travel to school: o 78% (150) said they walk o 18.3% (35) said they drive o When asked how they they would travel is their children attended Appletree: o 55% (104) said they would drive o 37.6% (71) said they would walk Finance Within its consultation documentation, the council states: While currently both schools are in surplus (they receive more funding than they spend), Langley First is predicting a deficit (spending more than they receive) in 2026 which is projected to grow to £0.751m by 2028. At the same time Appletree Gardens is predicting it will enter deficit by 2028. School leaders have made changes and worked hard with the

	Council to make the financial situation better, but because low pupil numbers mean less funding, the situation is not improving. If left unchanged, the risk is that the two schools would continue to grow in deficit, and this in turn would limit their ability to sustain high quality education. Whilst these figures are not inaccurate, they are somewhat misleading. Appletree Gardens is in receipt of additional funding, known as Falling Rolls funding, to help it make up for its surplus places Langley is not in receipt of this funding, as its surplus figure is within the council's acceptable range. The council has not met - nor offered to meet - with the leadership or governing team at Langley to address its forecasted deficit Current year 2 children All schools within the North East Planning Area (NEPA) are currently full for this year group, apart from Appletree Gardens, which we understand currently has two spaces • A merger with Appletree would mean 118 children in year 4 • As yet, the council has not provided any information as to what the class sizes would be in the 'merged' school. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, there is a concern amongst us that our children will be placed in larger class sizes, which could have an adverse affect on their education and wellbeing. Implementing this merger in 2027 would mean disrupting the largest cohorts of pupils currently moving through the system. If this merger is to go ahead, a far more logical approach is to wait until the smaller birth-rate cohorts are in the schools.
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 09:07 PM	Busy traffic, over crowded school, disruption to young children's education.
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 09:13 PM	Our child is currently within a local primary and o am aware of friends children that work or attend these schools effected. I have grave concerns on the effect to staff and children within the school. SEN especially. I feel this is poorly thought out and will have a detrimental ripple effect across all of NT schools
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 09:21 PM	I would no longer work at an inclusive, nurturing and popular school.
Screen Name Redacted 11/12/2025 09:26 PM	I have two children in the school one is 7 years old and is in nursery which he started in January 2024 my eldest child is in year 2 currently. This proposal will mean my youngest child will not be given a place in reception 2026 despite being part of the school community and wearing the uniform for well over a year. To explain to a four-year-old why he must move schools away from his sibling and great friendships he has made is unrealistic. This would mean two different

school drop offs and collections at the same time for one parent is again unrealistic when both children are so young. I would not or ever would consider Appletree gardens as a school for my child even after attending the open evening. By forcing my youngest child into a different school you separate two siblings, they will no longer be able to see each other in the school yard or in the dinner hall, they will no longer be able to walk to school or back together talking about their day. I truly believe this will have a incredibly negative effect on my childrens mental health. My eldest son has been severely unsettled due to this proposal, with breakdowns and emotional meltdowns the stress put on him due to this proposal is unacceptable. I believe the proposal risks disrupting the quality of learning. Larger class sizes and stretched resources often mean less individual support for students who need it most. Teachers would be under increased pressure to manage bigger groups, reducing the time they can dedicate to personalised learning and pastoral care. I don't see how school trips or even school discos could happen with a year group size of 120 as in the case of my 7yr old these are vital to learning and enjoyment of school and build strong core memories for children. The logistics of this are ridiculous and unachievable for a single parent. My eldest son has been severely unsettled due to this proposal, with breakdowns and emotional meltdowns the stress put on him due to this proposal is unacceptable. The data provided by the council is inadequate and false. This proposal forces my children to be homeschooled and removed parental choice from me and their mother which is again unacceptable.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:28 PM

Statement to Council on the Proposed Closure of Langley First School Firstly, thank you for taking the time to consider the detail in this information from me and so many of those involved (parents/teachers etc) in Langley First School. You'll see there is a lot to unpack, assess and consider with this process. I hope that the right care and attention is given to those who, like me, will be providing much detail for you to make a correct and fairer decision for the children in our area. As a parent with children at Langley First School, I am strongly against the proposal to close it. This decision would have lasting consequences for the whole community and my family. It does not accurately reflect the reality of our local area and the decision feels rushed and unfair and based on data and information that is incorrect. Critical decisions such as this need to be made on honest and trustworthy data. Impact on Families: My son has just started Nursery and my daughter is in year One. Both are thriving at Langley; they are happy and settled in their routines and adore going to the school here. The idea that my son could be forced to move schools as early as next September is deeply upsetting. At only four years old, he already feels proud to wear his Langley uniform and has built strong connections with his teachers and the wider staff

supporting him there. Him leaving while his sister remains would be confusing and damaging, potentially affecting his confidence and education for years to come. We know how much these early years of education are so important to children and fear his development will be hindered if this process continues. For working parents like us, managing children at different schools would be extremely difficult. Even with staggered start times, it would mean longer mornings, more time off work, and additional childcare. Families would also face the challenge of juggling different inset days, parents' evenings, and school events. This is simply not practical for working households. Parental Choice and Community Voice: Langley was my family's first choice when applying for schools because of its ethos, caring staff, and nurturing environment. Appletree Gardens was not a preference then and would not be now. We saw that a recent survey by Friends of Langley showed that nearly 90% of parents did not list Appletree as a preferred option. Many said they would look elsewhere or even consider home-schooling if Langley closed. This reflects my own view. Parents want the freedom to choose the right school for their children, not be told where to send them. Langley is a popular, successful school with strong leadership and dedicated staff. Closing a school that is thriving, while keeping open one that struggles to fill places, feels completely wrong (and a naïve step from the authorities) and out of step with what families in the area want. Support for Children with Additional Needs: Langley has a strong record of supporting children with additional needs. Around a quarter of pupils receive extra help or are on the SEND register, and staff are trained in mental health approaches. Even children without identified needs benefit from this inclusive environment. The school's proximity to Woodlawn should be seen as a strength, enabling collaboration between mainstream and special education settings. This is exactly the kind of inclusive practice the government says it wants to encourage. To add to this I want to include a personal note about the importance of Monkseaton Middle School for the "SEN Betweener's." There are SEN children who wouldn't qualify for a place at Woodlawn school, and who can thrive in mainstream schools. However, only if they are given appropriate levels of support, and crucially quiet spaces and/or smaller class sizes. My Nephew is a SEN "betweener" having really struggled in a very busy secondary school environment [redacted] He was not properly supported and the class he was in was just too busy for his needs. The result was that he lost over 2 years of schooling and was totally let down by the system. We are so lucky and appreciative that this doesn't happen at Monkseaton Middle or Langley First. They are exceptional at supporting SEN children to stay in mainstream schools (better preparing them for a future in the "real world"). If the plans from NTC go ahead, many many SEN children will be seriously let down and their education and future life chances compromised Quality of Education and School Philosophy: Although the council has said this proposal is not about school

quality, for parents that is the most important factor. Langley provides excellent teaching and a supportive, inclusive ethos that helps children flourish. My daughter, who is naturally shy, has grown in confidence thanks to the care and encouragement she receives there. The facilities at Langley are outstanding for young learners. Spaces such as The Nest and The Hive, along with sensory rooms, have been invaluable. These resources cannot simply be replicated elsewhere and moving children risks disrupting their progress and wellbeing. Langley are already providing such critical spaces and a caring environment to provide for our children, why risk that? Space, Safety, and Site Issues: Appletree's capacity is listed by the Department for Education as 293, not 432, yet the council has NOT explained this discrepancy. There has been no reassurance about class sizes or how all children could be safely accommodated. Langley's building is efficient and well-designed, with ample outdoor space. Appletree, however, sits on a bus route that cannot be closed to traffic and lacks nearby parking, raising serious safety concerns for drop-off and pick-up. The road outside of Langley school is closed in the mornings to allow a safe entry for children. It stated in some of the comms from the Council that Langley didn't have access to outside space, but they do. This is hugely concerning that decisions are being made on such inaccurate information. Financial Considerations: Both schools are currently in surplus. Langley's forecast deficit is small and manageable, and the council has not even met with the school's leadership or governors to discuss alternatives before proposing closure. That is hugely concerning that no discussions have been had here to assess and consider the true picture of the situation. Langley is also far more efficient to run. Government data shows it spends around £4 per square metre on utilities compared to £29 at Appletree. Closing the more efficient, popular school makes no logical sense. Concerns About the Consultation: This is an area that is really concerning around the whole process. I work in a business where data integrity is critical and if data is not correct/accurate, then business/trust/reputations are lost. The consultation documents contain inaccuracies that undermine confidence in the process. For example, the council claims Langley does not have its own playing field, when it clearly does. They suggest the school is already in deficit, which is not true. It is only forecasting a small shortfall in 2025/26 and is already working with an independent adviser to address it. The council also claims children could walk to Appletree without crossing major roads, but many families would need to cross Seatonville Road or Cauldwell Lane, both busy and unsafe. No proper community impact assessment has been carried out, despite Langley being central to local life, offering wraparound care, after-school activities, and jobs. There are also concerns about conflicts of interest in decision-making, which need to be addressed. This is a serious oversight. [redacted]

[redacted] That is not fair or just. Future Pupil Numbers: The council argues that falling birth rates justify closure, but the data does not support this. The Office for National Statistics predicts birth rates will stabilise by 2026 and then rise. The council's own Local Plan notes that families moving into North Tyneside help keep pupil numbers stable. Langley continues to attract families from across the entire area, while Appletree has consistently had the highest number of surplus places. Corrected projections show Langley's surplus within acceptable ranges, while Appletree's is far higher. Langley quite clearly appears the more sustainable and more desirable school to continue in the long term. Wraparound and Early Years Provision: Wraparound care is vital for working families, yet the council has not considered it at all it seems with their current scenario. Langley's Schools Out childcare runs from 7.30am to 6pm and covers almost every holiday, making it reliable and flexible. It is also like an extension of the school, rather than a separate entity away from the school. In a time with full time, working parents, this care is absolutely crucial to allow parents and families to work as they do. Appletree's Little Pips service has shorter hours and closes early on a Friday. If Langley's wraparound closed, many parents, including myself, would struggle to balance work and childcare. I would need to consider reduced hours and do not have local support from wider family for example either. The presence of having the Schools Out service reduces so much stress from mine and my family's life. No doubt it will do that too for the other parents in the area utilising and relying on that key service they provide. Traffic and Local Safety: Traffic around Langley is already heavy due to Woodlawn School. [redacted]. If Woodlawn expanded across the Langley site, congestion would worsen. The road is narrow, vehicles often travel too fast, and children's safety would be at risk. This concerns me greatly. Not just for the safety of the local children walking to the school but also to the wider community and elderly neighbours who live in the area and are a key part of our community. Conclusions: Langley First School is a thriving, inclusive, and much-loved school. The council's proposal is based on flawed information and fails to consider the real impact on families, children, and the community. I urge the council to reconsider. Please take into account the quality of education, the importance of wraparound care, and the wellbeing of children who are already settled and happy. Langley provides stability, a nurturing environment, and excellent teaching. It should remain open. Thank you for taking the time to read all of this information and consider these points.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:33 PM

Emotional disruption: our son is 5 years old and in year 1. At such a young age, children thrive on routine and familiarity. Being moved to

a new school, with new teachers, buildings and classmates, is likely to cause our son significant distress and anxiety. Attachment and trust: My child has just settled into his 1st year of primary education, formed bonds with teachers and classmates, and feels safe and confident in this environment. Closing the school would undo that progress. Learning impact: having to move to a new school will cause catastrophic disruption. At this stage such change can negatively affect learning and development, especially with early reading, writing and social skills. Travel and logistics: The proposed closure of Langley primary would mean a longer, more difficult school run, increasing travel time and costs for us as a family. This will affect us being able to get to work on time and manage childcare for our younger child. Wrap around - we heavily rely on the wrap around childcare provided by Schools out on the Langley school site. We would lose this and can't be sure that wrap around would be available to us in Appletree. We physically can not work with wrap around care. Loss of a community hub: Langley school is central to local life, bringing families together and supporting community cohesion. Its closure would weaken these links. My son would lose friendships and I would lose community links. 6 weeks to offer a public consultation is unjust and unfair . We agree with the alternative proposals made.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:35 PM

[redacted] The proposed closure of NTC will have a devastating impact on me, both financially and emotionally. I chose to work locally so I could raise my child while remaining close to home, and my role has provided the stability and routine our family depends on. [redacted] due to budget constraints in other settings, it is unlikely I would be able to find alternative employment nearby for quite some time. I am deeply worried about how I will manage to pay my mortgage and afford even modest family activities such as holidays. Losing this job would not only mean the loss of my income, but also the loss of a workplace community that has been a vital source of support and belonging. I am very concerned about the impact this will have on my mental health and wellbeing, as well as on my family's stability. The emotional upset so far has been massive for my family. [redacted] I am currently seeking support from my GP regarding support for anxiety due to this and I know this will only increase if the proposal moves forward. [redacted] This has knocked me drastically and I'm so dissatisfied with the lack of concern, support and empathy by the members of staff at

the council and HR.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:36 PM

I oppose this proposal. My son is in year two at Langley. He is extremely settled, well supported and happy. He is on the SEN register and has been exceptionally well supported by the dedicated staff team. The progress he has made with his self regulation and resilience has been incredible. As a family, we are very worried that this proposal would involve two huge transitions for him within a year. We cannot see how the level of support would be replicated through this merger and our son would be at risk of regression, overwhelm and ultimately, disengagement. He struggles with transitions and relies on trusted adults. We bought this house when our son was born, because we wanted him to go to Langley. [redacted] I also moved jobs in order to live in the area. We have felt so happy with the choices and sacrifices we have made as our son is thriving. I oppose this consultation as it would be detrimental for my son and would place considerable stress and strain on our family, we are extremely worried about how our son will manage and his Mum is even talking about giving up her career and home educating him. We hope you will reconsider this proposal and avoid closing a hugely valued and successful school which is a vital part of this community.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:38 PM

This consultation asks the public to identify solutions the council should implement something the council hasn't done to the best of its ability yet. I strongly oppose the closure of Langley for numerous reasons. I moved to Monkseaton before starting my family specifically because of the school choices available. Langley was always my first choice—the staff ethos and nurturing environment were key reasons I enrolled my eldest daughter there, and she thrived. My youngest daughter, now in Year 2, spent her early years in lockdown. Since joining Langley, she too has flourished. Forcing her to move would further disrupt her childhood in ways beyond her control and it would be wholly unfair. The closure will affect my family in multiple ways—not only my children's wellbeing but also house prices, increased traffic from taxis for Woodlawn, and my work commitments. I may need to reduce my hours or seek wraparound care, which will not be available if Langley closes. I have tried attending council surgeries and speaking to members, but every event I attended lacked engagement—staff simply directed me to the website. This is unacceptable. Please look at Northumberland's recent decision based on parent feedback and decide not to close schools based on birth rate and instead agree it's a larger issue. Key Objections Timelines Children in Year 4 typically spend a full year preparing for transition, building resilience and skills for the move into middle school, it takes a whole year to prepare for this transition. You

propose this change at the end of Year 3 (for my daughter) without sharing details on class sizes, placement, or how integration will work. Teachers have not been prepared to support this transition. My daughter would then face another school change after just one year to go to middle school. For a generation already impacted by lockdown, this lack of continuity is unfair. Parental Choice I moved here for Langley and the areas schools, as did my neighbour. Closing Langley removes parental choice. Appletree was not even in my top three preferences, and I will not send my daughter there. The closure of Monkseaton Middle also reduces middle school options. Each middle school offers a unique environment, and choice is essential. Reducing numbers across all middle schools and closing Monkseaton leaves parents with minimal options. This consultation assumes parents will choose to send their children to Appletree Gardens if Langley First School is closed. This would certainly be true for the current year 2 group, where there are no spaces across the whole of Whitley Bay to house these children other than at Appletree (where we understand there are currently two spaces). However, with a surplus at many of the other schools in the area, it cannot be assumed that Appletree would be the school of choice. The council's consultation document shows 44% of catchment children attend Appletree compared to 73% at Langley; 12% of Langley pupils attend from the Appletree Gardens catchment area In the most recent 2 previous years of higher birth rates, 2020 reception and 2023 reception intakes, Appletree was the only NEPA first school with surplus spaces in admissions, 14 and 6 respectively. For the 2 lowest birth rate years, 2024 and 2025 intake, Appletree had the largest portion of surplus places in admissions against PAN, 32% and 45% respectively When looking at the 2025 admissions data, the distance of the last place offered at Langley was nearly 6 miles, compared to 3.6 miles for Appletree, demonstrating a far wider geographic draw and a greater ability to attract families from further afield. Of the 187 parents who responded to the survey carried out by Friends of Langley, 88.2% said Appletree Gardens was not one of their school preferences when they applied for their school places. That same survey also asked which school would be their first choice of school for their children if Langley were to close. Of the 187 responses to this question: • 38.5% chose South Wellfield (72 parents) • 20.3% chose Southridge (38 parents) • 11.2% chose Marine Park (21 parents) • 11.2% chose Appletree (21 parents) • 3.2% chose Whitley Lodge (6 parents) • 3.2% chose Coquet Park (6 parents) When asked if they would take a place at Appletree Gardens if offered, • 43 parents said no. • A further 62 parents said they would potentially consider home-schooling their children if Langley closed. An analysis of birth rates mapped against six years' of reception offers data for each school showed Appletree Gardens is ranked as the most sensitive school in the entire planning area to falling birth rates. Langley, by contrast, has a medium sensitivity, cushioned by its

proven popularity and wider draw. The council's proposal is therefore not just to close the more popular school, thereby ignoring parental choice, but also to close the more demographically stable and resilient one, leading to a longer-term risk Flawed Data and Lack of Foresight This proposal should be withdrawn, and a full review of North Tyneside education undertaken. At consultation stage, accurate and complete data should be available. Parents deserve clarity on their child's full educational journey. When Monkseaton High closed, the council should have outlined future pathways for all children. Data has not been properly analysed and these plans not thought past a number a figure and lack detail. A full review should be engaged, and there should be engagement with schools and governors. SEN provision, proposed class sizes, and other critical factors must be addressed thoroughly. You haven't shared all the data you have and we haven't had all the data for the full 6 weeks in order to have a fair chance at considering options and working on feedback. The online information has constantly been changed and updated which is makes forming an argument difficult, we haven't had the same opportunity to look at the data the council has. There is also data you don't have which I feel is important for example, if its local people moving into the new housing development, who is moving into those houses, in the rings you have drawn around schools how many children live in those streets impacted and many more. Inaccuracies in Council Documentation The cabinet papers used to justify consultation contained several errors: • Playing Fields: It was claimed Langley lacks adjacent playing fields and escorts children off-site for PE. This is false. Langley has a well-used playing field next to the building and a separate field across a minor road used only for sports day. Additional outdoor spaces include a reception garden (forest school ethos), a potting garden, and an outdoor classroom for children with SEND or those overwhelmed by the playground. • Financial Deficit: Incorrect. Langley has only predicted a deficit for 2025/26—the first time ever—and is working with an independent financial advisor to improve the budget. • Safe Access: The claim that most dwellings in Langley's catchment can access Appletree without crossing major roads is wrong. Many children would need to cross Seatonville Road and/or Cauldwell Lane. • Headteacher Briefings: Meetings were brief, and governors were excluded, limiting opportunities for solutions. • Consultation Document Errors: These include projected pupil numbers, deficit forecasts, and inaccuracies in pupil data at other schools. • Community Impact Assessment: None has been done for Langley's closure. The only assessment was for Monkseaton High in December 2024. • Wraparound and Early Years Provision: Not considered. • External Communication: No contact with Langley's 'School's Out' governing body or senior managers. This is just some of the inaccuracies I'm sure there are more had I and others had more time we may have been able to look further. Not a Merger If closure proceeds, at least make it a genuine merger—close

both schools and create a new one, combining the best teachers and practices. This approach has not been considered because it requires effort, but decisions should prioritise children, not convenience. A true merger would: • Prevent community division and allow both schools—and their pupils—to contribute to a new school's name, ethos, and uniform. • Retain the best aspects of both schools, including staff, and ease the transition for children. • Increase scrutiny by requiring approval from the Secretary of State and the Office of Schools Adjudicator. • Ensure decisions are made carefully, not rushed. Langley is not yet in deficit, so why the urgency? Wraparound Provision The council admits wraparound and early years provision were not considered. At Whitley Bay High, an officer said they would "work with providers" but offered no assurance. Availability at Little Pips remains unclear. What we know: • Schools Out Northern (Langley): Childcare 7:30am–6pm, flexible booking, day care from 9 months to 9 years, holiday provision (Mon–Fri, 8am–5:30pm). • Little Pips (Appletree): Childcare 7:45am–5:30pm (4:30pm for nursery), day care from age 2, holiday provision Mon–Thu 8am–5pm, Fri 8am–3:30pm. • Parent Survey: Of 190 respondents, 60.5% regularly use Schools Out; 4.2% use it for emergencies. If unavailable: o 52.8% had no alternative. o 35.6% would cut work hours. o 19% would seek childminders. o 14.7% would rely on family. o Others feared quitting jobs or insufficient childminder availability. • Waiting Lists: 23 children for Langley nursery in 2026, nine for 2027, one for 2028. Impact on Other Schools The proposal affects all NEPA schools and has long-term implications not addressed in council documents. Woodlawn The Langley field is earmarked for development—why not build a purpose-built school for the 32 children who need it? This would be cheaper than closing and redeveloping Langley and Appletree. Current plans displace 300 children for the benefit of 32, creating a false choice between mainstream stability and SEND provision. The consultation outlines the intention for the council to repurpose the Langley site and move the post-16 provision from Marden High School (32 children in total according to Ofsted), thereby displacing 300 children for the benefit of 32 children By bundling the two issues - the alleged need to close a school with the need to expand Woodlawn - the council is effectively creating a false choice: asking the community to accept a suboptimal and unstable mainstream solution in exchange for a desirable SEND solution. The long-term health of the mainstream school system should not be compromised to solve a logistical problem for SEND provision, however important that provision may be. Coquet Park First School The council considered closing Coquet Park but deemed it unviable due to a PFI contract until 2032. The school ended 2024/25 with a £0.325m deficit and cannot balance its budget within three years. Classified as in structural deficit, it faces long-term financial issues. With one-form entry and high PFI costs, its future viability is questionable. Without proposed solutions, closure after 2032 seems inevitable. Close this

school and pay the fees again cheaper than current proposals. Building space Capacity and Accommodation Concerns The council's consultation document states that Appletree "can accommodate 432 pupils, which is more than the combined total of both schools when future birth rates and admission numbers are adjusted." However, government data lists Appletree's capacity as 293. This discrepancy requires clarification. To date, the council has provided no assurance regarding how pupils from Langley will be safely accommodated on the Appletree site, nor any confirmation of projected class sizes. Class Size and Educational Impact While early years provision is legally limited to a maximum of 30 pupils per class, there is no statutory limit for children aged seven and older. Without clear guarantees, there is significant concern that pupils may be placed in larger classes, potentially compromising educational quality and wellbeing. The actual size of classrooms is also an issue, Langley's classrooms are up to government guidelines, Appletree's are not and are in fact smaller. Again another issue that shows the timelines and work on this has not been fully thought hrough. Financial Considerations According to the government's school spending comparison tool, Appletree incurs utility costs of £29 per square metre, compared to Langley's £4 per square metre. This raises questions about the long-term financial sustainability of the proposed arrangement. Birth Rates This consultation relies heavily on the argument that birth rates are falling. While there is no denying the downward trend in birth rates throughout North Tyneside up to 2023, the Office for National Statistics predicts that birth rates will level off from 2026 and then begin to increase again. Birth rates within the NEPA have been declining since 2008. However, despite this, the numbers within NEPA schools have remained resilient to this downward trend, with the majority of schools* being within the council's 10% acceptable surplus range on average since 2020. Internal migration has also not been taken into account for this consultation. Aside from a decline in 2022, the Office for National Statistics shows more young children move into North Tyneside than out of it. Although these statistics don't go down to NEPA level, we do know many families move specifically to the coast take advantage of the three-tier system. The parenting survey conducted by the Friends of Langley showed 58% of respondents (out of 185 responses) moved to this area specifically to send their children to Langley First School, with a further 3% planning to move to the area for the same reason. The North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 also contradicts the rationale for closing Langley due to falling birth rates, as it states: "Net inward migration from neighbouring areas, primarily Newcastle, helps to sustain the overall working-age population and limits the fall in the number of children in the borough." *Appletree Gardens has had a 23% surplus level on average over the last five years. Traffic No evidence has been provided in the supporting documents in relation to traffic impact as a result of these proposals • Langley currently

closes the street outside school every morning to make it safer for the children. Appletree cannot close the street to cars in the mornings or at collection times due to it being on a bus route. • Langley also has a free public car park very close by, which Appletree Gardens does not have. • The assumption appears to be that children will walk to school. • The parent survey carried out by Friends of Langley asked parents how they currently travel to school: o 78% (150) said they walk o 18.3% (35) said they drive o When asked how they they would travel is their children attended Appletree: o 55% (104) said they would drive o 37.6% (71) said they would walk Finance Within its consultation documentation, the council states: While currently both schools are in surplus (they receive more funding than they spend), Langley First is predicting a deficit (spending more than they receive) in 2026 which is projected to grow to £0.751m by 2028. At the same time Appletree Gardens is predicting it will enter deficit by 2028. School leaders have made changes and worked hard with the Council to make the financial situation better, but because low pupil numbers mean less funding, the situation is not improving. If left unchanged, the risk is that the two schools would continue to grow in deficit, and this in turn would limit their ability to sustain high quality education. Whilst these figures are not inaccurate, they are somewhat misleading. Appletree Gardens is in receipt of additional funding, known as Falling Rolls funding, to help it make up for its surplus places Langley is not in receipt of this funding, as its surplus figure is within the council's acceptable range. The council has not met - nor offered to meet - with the leadership or governing team at Langley to address its forecasted deficit Current year 2 children All schools within the North East Planning Area (NEPA) are currently full for this year group, apart from Appletree Gardens, which we understand currently has two spaces • A merger with Appletree would mean 118 children in year 4 • As yet, the council has not provided any information as to what the class sizes would be in the 'merged' school. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, there is a concern amongst us that our children will be placed in larger class sizes, which could have an adverse affect on their education and wellbeing. Implementing this merger in 2027 would mean disrupting the largest cohorts of pupils currently moving through the system. If this merger is to go ahead, a far more logical approach is to wait until the smaller birth-rate cohorts are in the schools.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:39 PM

The closure of Langley would be deeply unsettling for my child, who has grown in confidence thanks to the supportive staff and familiar environment there. Moving to Appletree would cause significant distress and could negatively impact his progress and development.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:41 PM

Emotional disruption: our son is 5 years old and in year 1. At such a young age, children thrive on routine and familiarity. Being moved to a new school, with new teachers, buildings and classmates, is likely to cause our son significant distress and anxiety. Attachment and trust: My child has just settled into his 1st year of primary education, formed bonds with teachers and classmates, and feels safe and confident in this environment. Closing the school would undo that progress. Learning impact: having to move to a new school will cause catastrophic disruption. At this stage such change can negatively affect learning and development, especially with early reading, writing and social skills. Travel and logistics: The proposed closure of Langley primary would mean a longer, more difficult school run, increasing travel time and costs for us as a family. This will affect us being able to get to work on time and manage childcare for our younger child. Wrap around - we heavily rely on the wrap around childcare provided by Schools out on the Langley school site. We would lose this and can’t be sure that wrap around would be available to us in Appletree. We physically can not work with wrap around care. Loss of a community hub: Langley school is central to local life, bringing families together and supporting community cohesion. Its closure would weaken these links. My son would lose friendships and I would lose community links. 6 weeks to offer a public consultation is unjust and unfair . We agree with the alternative proposals made.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:46 PM

I strongly oppose the closure of Langley First School outlined in this proposal under the premise of a “merger”-type. The proposal is rushed, contains many errors, poor extrapolations and omission of data as justification. The consultation messily conflates multiple issues: Too many children in the area for high school, not enough children in the area for first school, Private finance initiative obligations and special needs provision. The consultation does not provide adequate source data to which factual evidence-based decision can be made. Furthermore, during the initial stages of the consultation data held by the council was veiled and inaccessible in the public domain due to website access. This has been confirmed by the information governance team during my attempts to access disclosure logs for example. Our youngest child currently attends Langley First School, as did our oldest child. Langley was our first choice for both children. We migrated to the NEPA catchment from Newcastle and performed school visits therefore not captured on birth-rate based figures being the sole predictor in the consultation. Proximity to Langley First school was a key part of the decision to choose our home. Appletree was not a consideration after our arranged visit to the school where we entered with the head teacher to an unattended classroom of children without any adult present. Should this proposal go ahead then my child’s education will be heavily impacted with the attrition of staff, students (with associated

funding), community, ethos, morale and ambition from the school. The detriment to his education would likely result in us homeschooling for the remainder of first school. The council presents a case based on falling birth rates. Whilst there is undoubtedly a downward trend, birthrates are cyclical and the UK as a whole has started to see an increase in 2024 of 0.6%. Unlike Appletree Gardens, Langley First School is directly adjacent to a large housing development. Families purchasing these homes will favour houses in close proximately to this highly desired school (like we did). It is inappropriate to use average figures of the number of children entering an area from new housing without also considering proximately to schools. The councils own data supports that Langley First School is highly desirable, unlike Appletree Gardens. With the large majority of in catchment children choosing the school compared to that minority case in Appletree Gardens, many of whom preferentially choose Langley. It is noteworthy that the council's prediction of the future surplus places at Langley First School shows that even by 2033 Langley First School will have a surplus below what currently exists at Appletree Gardens. These data however should be questioned as to why, despite Langley showing a greater historic parental preference and having the same birth rates, does Appletree Gardens shows an initial reduction in surplus places that is not shown in the Langley data? The councils weird 800m map circles, not representing catchment, omits housing plans from the Murton Gap fields. This presents a distorted view of future demand. The validity if these theoretical circles are also quickly rebuffed by the large numbers of Appletree gardens children who already travel to Langley from outside these areas. In short, the reality already shows parents are happy to travel that distance to Langley despite a closer proximity of Appletree Gardens. The proposal also states that Appletree has more homes in catchment. The 800m circle used by the council will cover between 2/5 to ½ of the Murton gap development equating to approximately 1200-15000 new homes. One of the proposals key points is the commuting distance of the most easterly point of the Appletree gardens catchment. To the east, the furthest point of catchment for Appletree Gardens lies within only 500m of Rockcliffe first school and 600m of Cullercoats primary. Many of the easterly dwellings also sit within 500m of Marine Park first school. Rockcliffe First school has a 1.5 form entry due to a small catchment area and could accommodate the most easterly portion of Appletree catchment in conjunction with filling spare capacity at Marine Park. Alternatively, moving student catchments to Cullercoats primary would further alleviate pressure on the 3 tier system to align PAN to Whitely Bay High. Langley First School has served the community of Monkseaton for almost 75 years, often with multiple generations of the same families passing through the school. It is a cornerstone of our community and generates a respectful ethos that permeates through the area and local school system. Multiple independent businesses have formed immediately

around the location (withn 200m) including gyms, sandwich shops, garages, a doctors surgery, pharmacy and cafes. These community businesses, frequented around pick up and drop off times by parents, will suffer significant loss of trade if a move to Appletree was to take place. Appletree Gardens has no such businesses in the surrounding 200m vicinity. Langley First School is served by a large carpark a short walk from the school. This car park is immediately off a major transport route. This has multiple benefits: There is limited traffic impact on and through residential streets, a traffic restricted “school street” has been implemented to promote active travel and child safety at the schools daily entrance and parents requiring a car commute have efficient access. Conversely, no such facilities exist at Appletree Gardens which is centred in a residential area without parking provisions nor any “school street” safety implementations. There have been countless community reports of traffic issues and dangers in the area for many years. The additional distance to travel for existing Langley parents to get to Appletree has shown by parental survey to increase car usage in order to fulfil their working hours. This will put further strain on a residential area that is not equipped to cope. Importantly, it will place more children in danger of traffic, reduce the health benefits of active travel and expose them to the harmful effects of idling engines at the school gates. Together this positions Langley as a more robust physical location and desirable school to both mitigate against recent low birth rates as well as to benefit from growth from housing development, inward migration or if national birthrates continue to rise. The proposal also speaks of limiting parental choice. A key unanswered question is why, despite Appletree Gardens having a “larger catchment”, “a larger site”, “better financial viability”, does it have a high number of surplus places with a minority of their catchment choosing the school. Indeed, the surplus capacity and reputation of Appletree gardens brings in 61 students from out of NEPA and displaces 63 students from its catchment out of NEPA. Appletree Gardens leadership and governance have been at the helm of this decline and yet, under this current proposal, they will remain in place and unchecked to continue this performance level whilst the higher student attainment fostered by the leadership and governance of Langley First School will be lost. Appletree gardens have provided no reassurance or commitment to accept governors, leadership or ethos from Langley First Schools. If limiting parents’ choice is required, then logic demands that the “more chosen” school is retained i.e. Langley First School. Failing that, a full amalgamation with the closure of both schools and a reopening would give some influence of the Leaderships and governing body of Langley to steer their ethos and successes. An argument is presented from the council on costs stating that that Appletree Gardens is a more financially viable school based on a prediction that it will not enter a financial deficit for several years. These costs have been extrapolated out from budgets that the council had no involvement in setting nor any

oversight. It is somewhat simplistic and error prone and has not been subjected to scrutiny for accuracy as confirmed in the parent information sessions. With the hugely damaging consequences of the proposal on children's education and wellbeing this is highly inappropriate. Langley First School has not yet entered a deficit despite a small number of surplus places. Whilst this is also true of Appletree Gardens, Appletree is eligible for failing rolls funding due to its unacceptable surplus capacity to leverage additional funding from the council to financially prop up it up. How would the financial viability compare if the councils' subsidies were removed with Appletree Gardens having a larger student surplus places? The UK governments benchmarking reveals that the Appletree gardens site has high priority utility costs greater than 100% of similar schools. This is concerning for onward financial and environmental stability. Furthermore, no data or models have been presented in the consultation to demonstrate how the closure of Langley First School produces a financially viable solution when merged Appletree Gardens. Considerations would need to be made adjusting failing rolls funding and changes in the proportions of children eligible for pupil premiums. [redacted] No detail is given to how all the children could be accommodating in this "merger" as some current year groups at Langley are at or near maximum capacity. Accounting for vital nursery provision, the total number of rooms required within Appletree would exceed the school's space provisions if class sizes were kept as standard. Adjustments such as removing Library and SEND provisions may be required which would be of huge detriment. Furthermore, unlike Langley, the majority of classrooms in Appletree gardens are smaller than government guidelines and are therefore less suited to high capacity teaching. Similarly, Government guidance is that a hall suitable for use by KS2 children should be 140m2. Appletree has a hall of 130m2, less than the recommendation. Langley has a hall of 192m2. Even if Langley temporarily partitioned 55m2 to provide another teaching space to increase the overall capacity of the building to 12 classrooms, it would only be 3m2 short of the recommended hall size (and still larger than the Appletree hall). Government Strategy is to encourage SEND provision in mainstream schools. By congesting children within the Appletree Gardens site and limiting space that can be utilised for additional needs then SEND provision in mainstream school will be severely impacted. Importantly, The proposal does nothing to address more pressing, larger and longer term issues in first school financial viability across NEPA. Coquet Park has single form entry , Whitley Lodge and Rockcliffe have 1.5 form entry, at PAN of 45, requiring undesirable split year teaching. Coquet represents a particular concern in that it is in debt to >£300K and an annual deficit of approx. £125k. Again, Langley First

school has maintained two form entry, single year group teaching, high in-catchment desirability and excellent educational standards without yet entering a deficit. Despite this it is being targeted for closure. Coquet Park is in close proximity to both Whitely Lodge and Marine Park First schools. An alternative proposal would include closure of Coquet in conjunction with other measures such as utilisation of the school for Special School provision . Closure of Coquet would redistribute students between Whitley Lodge (to allow two form entry) and Marine Park which would, in turn, gradually reshuffle more students to Rockcliffe which also has a 1.5 form entry. Correctly managed and gradually introduced this would present longer term educational stability beyond the end of PFI deals with a reduced impact on children's education. This also works towards the councils goal to reduce the total PAN within NEPA even if not doing so entirely. Although the council does not provide sufficient information on all schools in the proposal, Coquet Park's building could provide an excellent location for Special School SEND provision (e.g. Woodlawn). Special school's children primarily arrive and depart in taxis with them currently filtering and congested through residential streets. Coquet is positioned off major roads with well maintained access and parking via Waves Leisure Centre. This provides a better access route for these children compared to their current route through residential streets to their joint site with Langley. The children would also benefit greatly from the leisure facilities at Waves during times where the centre is under utilised. Any required adaptations within the centre would also be available for use by the wider community with additional needs creating an improved resource for disabled adults and SEND children in mainstream schools. It is also on the doorstep of a accessible beach access for greater enrichment. This would retain utility of Coquet Park site without it being vacant and still liable for PFI repayments. This may present an opportunity for Woodlawn to relocate (making more space at Langley First School to accommodate current high year group numbers who would struggle to be accommodated at Appletree Gardens.) Along with the above improving the onward viability of the school system proposed above there are several alternative proposals to the council's that retain Langley First school values, ethos and experience but work towards reducing surplus capacity. Primarily: A merger of Appletree Gardens into Langley First School. i.e. close Appletree Gardens First School and move students to Langley First School site As detailed above, Langley First School provides better future-proofing: Ideally positioned for Murton Gap development, high level of parental choice across both Langley and Appletree catchment (converse situation is true for Appletree) and existing lower surplus capacity. Langley First school is also a more cost effective site with lower utility costs (7% of Appletree gardens according to government financial benchmarking data). Langley First School has larger class room sizes: only two of the proposed 13 Appletree classrooms meet the government

	guidance of 62m2 for 30 reception children and 55m2 for 30 KS1+. Whereas 10 of the 11 Langley classrooms exceed the guidance. Langley First school has a larger Assembly/PE hall (approximately 45%% larger) as well as a separate dinner hall. Langley has two school fields (one large field contained within the boundary fence and a large “sports day” field across a very quite minor road) as well as two yards for reception and rest of school. Langley is served by a large council car park for commuting parents immediately off a main road without need to navigate residential streets. The entrance to Langley first school is served by a successful flagship “school street” for improved child safety. Langley Leadership have fostered a greater level of student persistent attendance well below regional and national averages. Appletree gardens have, by far, the highest a persistence absence rate of first schools in NEPA; higher than local and national averages (Langley First school persistence absence rate 5.9%, Appletree gardens 15%). This proposal may require a longer phased movement of students to the Langley site until the high-capacity years have moved to the middle school system. Alternatively, if coupled with a movement of Woodlawn (as detailed above with the closure of Coquet for example) or a reduction in their occupancy then a large capacity school would be realised for current and future proof usage. Langley First school was originally built as a first and middle school on one site: Langley occupies only half the site accommodating almost 300 pupils with the remaining half (a mirror of the first school) being used by Woodlawn. The area used by Woodlawn has an equal sized dining space, hall and an equal number of classrooms An assessment should be performed as to the full utility of that space. Utilising all or just some of the space (even on a temporary basis) for a merged school would eliminate concerns over capacity and loss of provision for specialist SEND space, computer rooms, libraries and dinner hall space. Woodlawn could retain access to the Hydrotherapy and specialist rooms if required and not served better served by Waves as suggested above. Better usage of the Woodlawn space and retaining Langley First on it’s site also provides a unique opportunity to provide greater SEND support in mainstream schools with hybrid access to specialist provisions currently existing at Woodlawn. Although a commitment exists for a 3 tier system, the larger site would provide resilience should a change to 2 tier education happen within NEPA as the school site is large enough to serve as a Primary (similar to the school’s original conception with first and middle school on one site). If moving Woodlawn to a more suitable site was not deemed feasible as a long term solution then utilising a number of their classrooms and spaces in the short term whilst high capacity year groups move through the system without investment in temporary buildings could be arranged.
Screen Name Redacted	I am writing as a grandparent of children who currently attend

11/12/2025 09:46 PM

Langley First School and as a former resident of North Tyneside. I strongly oppose the proposal to close this wonderful school. I have watched my grandchildren flourish at Langley, growing in confidence, kindness, and curiosity thanks to the dedication of staff and the school's inclusive, nurturing environment. Langley is not just a school; it is a caring community where every child is valued and supported. It is deeply upsetting to think that a place which has done so much good for so many families could be lost due to a proposal based on inaccurate and incomplete information. [redacted] It wrongly claims that Langley has no on-site playing field, that it is already in financial deficit, and that families could safely walk to Appletree Gardens without crossing major roads such as Seatonville Road and Cauldwell Lane, which anyone who lives locally knows to be untrue. These inaccuracies raise real questions about how well the Council understands the area and the daily lives of the families affected. Beyond the classroom, Langley plays a vital role in the wider community. It brings people together, parents, grandparents, teachers, neighbours, and fosters a sense of belonging that is increasingly rare. As someone who lived in North Tyneside for many years, I know how important that sense of community is. When schools close, that sense of belonging is lost, and the impact is felt across generations. There are also practical and human costs. The closure would mean job losses, it would increase traffic risks for families having to travel further to Appletree Gardens, where the road layout and lack of parking already make drop-off times difficult and potentially unsafe. Most unsettling in this situation is the fact I speak from experience, having had to move my daughter to Appletree Gardens for just one year after Monkseaton Village First School was closed in 1994. To hear that history is about to repeat itself for my own grandchildren is beyond disappointing. Langley First School represents everything that is right about local education in North Tyneside. It is inclusive, forward-thinking, and built on strong relationships. I urge the Council to withdraw this proposal and work with the community to find a fair and sustainable solution that protects both the children's education and the heart of our local community.

Screen Name Redacted

11/12/2025 09:47 PM

The proposals are not a merger, regardless of the language used by the council. It is the closing of one with those pupils being absorbed by the other - there is no merging of the staff or ethos of Langley First with Appletree. It is important that this is established - if this is what you want to happen, own it and be clear about it, don't pretend it's something that it isn't. This would mean my child having to cross multiple main roads, be at a school with greatly increased class sizes which would be no good for anyone's education. This is before consideration of the fact that the teachers at Langley will be losing

their jobs, with no guarantee that they will be re-employed at Appletree.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:51 PM

[redacted] We were really looking forward to both of our children being part of the same caring, community-focused school and having the same great start to their education. The proposal to merge Langley First School with Appletree Gardens First School would directly and negatively affect our family life, our ability to work full-time, and we believe our children's future education. The first major issue for us is location and accessibility. Langley is within safe walking distance from our home, and walking to school each morning is an important part of our family routine. The proposed move to Appletree would mean our route to school would involve crossing busy roads such as Seatonville Road and Cauldwell Lane and increase risks with all the traffic, especially at peak times. The Council's consultation documents incorrectly suggest that most Langley families could reach Appletree without crossing major roads, but this is not true in our case or for many others. According to the parent survey carried out by the Friends of Langley, 78% of families currently walk to school, but if children had to attend Appletree, that figure would fall to 37.6%, with 55% saying they would need to drive. This would add considerably to local congestion and safety risks. Langley currently benefits from a safe, closed street at drop-off and collection, and a nearby free car park. Appletree cannot close its road because it lies on a bus route, making access more difficult and less safe for families. Our second major concern is the potential loss of wraparound childcare. Both of us work full-time, and Langley's Schools Out Northern provision is absolutely vital to us. It provides flexible childcare from 7.30 am to 6 pm with full holiday cover, allowing one convenient drop-off for children from nine months to nine years old. Appletree's Little Pips does not offer the same level of support — its hours are shorter (7.45 am–5.30 pm, and only until 4.30 pm for nursery children) and its holiday cover is limited (Monday–Thursday until 5 pm, and Friday until 3.30 pm). The Friends of Langley survey found that 60.5% of parents regularly use Schools Out, with another 4.2% using it occasionally or for emergencies. If it were to close, 35.6% of parents said they would have to cut their working hours, while others said they might have to leave work or rely heavily on relatives. We would personally fall into this group — without Schools Out, we would be forced to reduce our working hours, which would have a serious financial and practical impact on our family. The Council has already admitted that wraparound and early years provision have not been considered in this proposal, which is deeply concerning for working families. We are also very worried about class sizes. The Council has provided no clear

information about how all pupils from both schools could be safely accommodated at Appletree. Its published capacity is 293 pupils, not the 432 claimed in the consultation. If the schools merge, class sizes are likely to increase significantly, meaning less individual attention and support. Our daughter is thriving at Langley precisely because of its smaller, nurturing environment, where every child is known and supported. Larger classes would inevitably make it harder for teachers to give the same personal attention and could negatively affect her learning and confidence. Another important point is parental choice. When we applied for our daughter's school place, Appletree Gardens was only our third choice school during the admissions process, behind Langley First School and South Wellfield First School. The Friends of Langley survey found that 88.2% of parents said Appletree was not among their school choices, and only 11.2% would choose Appletree if Langley were to close. Closing Langley would therefore remove genuine parental choice and force families into a school they did not select. Our daughter is thriving at Langley — both academically and emotionally. She loves going to school every day, her confidence has grown enormously, and she feels safe, supported, and valued. The teachers know her as an individual, and the inclusive, community-focused ethos of the school has allowed her to flourish. We want our baby to have that same opportunity when he is old enough to start school. Langley is not just a school — it is a central part of our family life and our community. The proposal fails to consider the real-life consequences for working families or the emotional wellbeing of the children affected. For all these reasons — location, safety, childcare, class sizes, and the loss of genuine parental choice — we are firmly opposed to the proposed merger. We urge the Council to reconsider and to conduct a full, evidence-based assessment of the impact on local families, accessibility, and children's wellbeing before making any final decision.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:55 PM

My daughter is potentially neurodivergent. We are starting off on the road of whether she needs extra support and assessment. Langley have been so helpful and receptive. They have immediately put in place adjustments to support her where needed. This has been done by knowing her well. Bigger class sizes and upheaval of moving schools would undermine this. Our efficient commute to work is often dependent on the convenient car park near Langley meaning we can park & stroll to school but still get to work easily. Wraparound care at FOL is excellent and has better hours for our needs than little pips at Appletree. There has been no information about whether little pips will be able to accommodate all the children for wraparound care. A loss of wraparound care would be devastating to our jobs, we cannot be available for drop offs at 9am and pick ups at 3.30pm. When walking our walk to school would include crossing more busy roads to get to

Apple tree. Moving schools would be highly disruptive for my son. We moved him to the Langley nursery specifically to have a seemless transition into Reception to give him the best start at school. This was organised beautifully by Langley. Moving to another school would completely wipe out that benefit. Both my children have close relationships with all the staff at Langley. They feel supported and loved by the school's community. Allowing Appletree to keep their staff and losing all of Langley's staff in a "merger" that is in actual fact just a closure of Langley would be devastating for my kids.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:56 PM

I am writing to express my strong concerns regarding the proposed closure of Langley First School. While I understand the challenges involved, I believe this decision requires reconsideration or, at the very least, a fairer approach. In your documentation you mentioned that Appletree has more classrooms. Although this is correct, its overall floorspace is smaller. Larger class sizes in smaller rooms raise suitability and health and safety concerns, and could negatively impact children, like my child for example, who need quiet spaces to manage overwhelm-facilities currently available at Langley. You also stated that Appletree has two halls and an enclosed field as a benefit over Langley, but Langley also has two halls and an enclosed field. The children at Langley First School do PE/Sports on their enclosed field, but they also have access to a public field which is used for Sports Day. Surely this additional field is a benefit for Langley. They also have additional outdoor space in the reception garden used with a forest school ethos and can be used by children who find the playground overwhelming. This is one of the things that attracted us to the school. Furthermore, a transition plan for children has not been communicated. We enrolled our child into Langley First School Nursery to support a smooth transition into reception should he get a place as transitions can be difficult for him. Appletree's leadership team has refused to engage with Langley, which undermines confidence in their commitment to children's best interests. For children who struggle with large groups, doubling school size is not an acceptable solution. Early years provision and wraparound care at Langley appear overlooked in consultation. Their service is exceptional, accepting children from nine months—critical for working parents, as we are. Appletree's wraparound care starts at age two, operates shorter hours, and cannot accommodate the combined demand. This would force many parents to reduce working hours, contrary to the government's intent behind free childcare funding. Langley benefits from nearby public parking, reducing congestion. Expanding Woodlawn into Langley would increase traffic near school gates. Walking to Appletree would require crossing Seatonville Road which is very busy, and navigate additional traffic around the school, with no safe parking options. Unlike Langley, Appletree cannot close the road outside the gates due to its bus route, creating further safety

risks. Finally, if closure remains the only option, a genuine merger should be implemented to ensure fairness for all children. This includes establishing a shared ethos, a new school name and uniform, and a transparent process for selecting the leadership team, teachers, and support staff from both schools. It would be unacceptable for Appletree's governing body to retain its staff while making Langley's redundant simply because a more complex process involves the Secretary of State. Additional scrutiny should be welcomed, as this decision must prioritise children, not administrative convenience. I urge you to reconsider this proposal or ensure that any merger is fair, child-focused, and addresses these critical concerns. Decisions of this magnitude must prioritise the welfare of children and families above administrative convenience.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 09:58 PM

Please be transparent about the proposals; this is not a merger but a closure. My daughter is currently in Year 2 at Langley, this is currently a FULL year group and the proposal will put over 100 children into a two form entry school. While the forecasted numbers might meet the TOTAL capacity of the school, they don't for this specific year group and there are NO plans which have made it clear how this large year group will be accommodated. It is likely that there will be an increase in class size thus reducing the quality of education that my daughter receives. While there is not a statutory limit of class size for key stage 2, countless research shows that large class sizes have a negative impact on the learning of students, particularly in their younger years (despite what your FAQs say, without the link to any evidence). During the most recent element of the Covid-19 inquiry, looking at the impact on children, evidence was given that one of the lessons for future pandemic preparedness would be that smaller class sizes would reduce the spread of infection. This proposal goes against this advice. This also impacts other common contagious conditions that would spread more quickly in larger class groups. The plan means my daughter would have to make two school changes within a short period of time. The experience of closing Monkseaton High School has shown that the transition of pupils is not an easy one, and that was with teenagers. This is a huge upheaval that you will be asking eight year olds to go through. They will move school, try to get used to new teachers, new expectations and just when they have got to grips with that it will be time to do it again at a middle school. That is an awful lot for a young child to go through, and even the most resilient of children will struggle which will impact learning, and potentially attendance figures. Your job is to safeguard the care of the young people of our community and you are not doing that by taking away their safe place. You are putting finances before children, the 'easy' solution above the needs of all. [redacted]

[redacted] You propose to take away the staff that know her, know us and know our history. You are ripping away a comfort blanket and a safe place from our family without giving us the opportunity to make a decision based on sound data - there are some many inaccuracies and falsehoods within your documentation - nor are we being giving the opportunity to select a replacement that we deem suitable. The children, parents and community have been sidelined in this review and a two question form where you 'consult' us doesn't allow us to be heard. Given that the delivery of key elements of the curriculum are delivered differently at the two schools, for example the phonics schemes and teaching of reading are different at the two schools, there will be a negative impact on the students who enter Appletree having been taught in a different way, if no Langley staff follow them and therefore there is no continuity of teaching. This has been seen for students who have entered the two-tier system from the three-tier system following the closure of Monkseaton High. With students having 'gaps' in their learning - or rather different elements have been taught at different times creating differences between the learning/knowledge of pupils taught at different schools. The year 2 pupils would enter Appletree as the outsiders, albeit the larger cohort of pupils, and this is something that they wouldn't be able to shake in a single year. Your proposals have caused division within the community, pitting schools against each and the children are aware of that. They want to be Langley pupils, they want their staff, their community.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:00 PM

I am not only a parent of a Reception child attending Langley First School [redacted] I deliberately chose to purchase my home within the Langley First catchment area because of the school's strong reputation, the community values it upholds, and the understanding that proximity to such a highly regarded school would be an asset for any future sale. My son was born during lockdown and spent over a year of his early life in social isolation during the critical "first 1001 days" developmental period. The effects of this have been profound for many children of his age group. He began attending the Schools Out provision at 2.5 years old, before progressing to Langley Nursery at age 4. Initially, he found it difficult to engage with unfamiliar adults and struggled to feel confident in a nursery environment. [redacted] Both Schools Out and Langley Nursery offered him exceptional, nurturing support. [redacted]

[redacted]

Langley's staff understand his anxieties and work proactively to prepare him for change, ensuring he always feels supported. He still experiences confidence issues, particularly with unfamiliar adults and new environments, but the consistency and understanding he receives at Langley has been transformative. The proposed closure would completely disrupt this progress. It would remove him from a familiar, trusted environment where staff know him, understand his needs, and have the expertise to support him. It would force a transition to an unfamiliar school, with unfamiliar adults, in an unfamiliar environment - all the things he finds most challenging. This risks undoing years of positive development during a critical stage of his childhood. The emotional and mental health implications of this for my child, and many others like him, are deeply concerning. Children who experienced lockdown during their early years already face additional challenges. Removing them from supportive, consistent environments where they have finally begun to thrive seems particularly cruel and short-sighted. IMPACT ON MY WIDER FAMILY - DISRUPTION TO APPLETREE PUPILS WITH SEND I also have two nieces and a nephew who attend schools in this area. My nephew has a vision impairment and receives support tailored to his needs at his current school. This proposal would not only devastate Langley families like mine, but would also significantly impact children already at Appletree Gardens, particularly those with special educational needs like my nephew. The proposed influx of 300 additional children from Langley into Appletree Gardens would fundamentally disrupt the learning environment for children already there. Children with SEND thrive on consistency, familiarity, predictable routines, and appropriately sized learning environments. Suddenly increasing the school population by such a significant number would: - Overwhelm existing support systems, specialist staff, and resources - Create more crowded, chaotic, and noisy environments that are particularly challenging for children with sensory needs, autism, or those who require visual/spatial consistency for safe navigation (like my nephew with vision impairment) - Dilute the attention and resources available to current pupils with SEND - staff time and specialist provision would have to be spread across far more children - Force changes to classroom arrangements, routines, familiar spaces, and visual landmarks that children with SEND rely upon for independence and security - Potentially require current pupils to change classrooms, teachers, or support staff to accommodate incoming pupils - breaking established relationships that are crucial for children with additional needs - Increase anxiety and dysregulation for vulnerable children who depend on predictability - Disrupt established peer relationships and support networks For my nephew with vision impairment, who has spent time learning to navigate his current school environment, building mental maps of the layout, establishing relationships with

staff who understand his specific needs, and developing independence within a familiar setting, this massive disruption could be devastating. He relies on consistency in his environment - knowing where things are, having established routes he can navigate safely, and working with adults who understand how to support his vision impairment effectively. The sudden chaos of 300 additional children, potential changes to his classroom or teacher, increased noise and crowding in corridors and communal spaces, and the redeployment of staff and resources to accommodate the merger could severely impact his confidence, independence, and educational progress. The consultation has completely failed to consider the impact on Appletree's current pupils with SEND. Everyone is focused on what happens to Langley children, but this proposal would cause significant harm to vulnerable children already at Appletree. It is not just Langley families who will suffer - Appletree families with children who have SEND will also experience serious negative impacts. Additionally, we understand that Appletree was in the process of applying for the development of an Additionally Resourced Provision (ARP) to accommodate children with SEND, but this plan has been put on hold due to this consultation. This means children at Appletree who desperately need enhanced specialist provision are being denied this development because the school and council are focused on this merger proposal instead. Children with SEND at Appletree are already being harmed by this process, even before any decision is made. TRAVEL, WORK, AND DAILY LOGISTICS IMPACT Currently, I walk my son to Langley First School every morning. The school is in my local community, easily accessible on foot, and the walk is part of our daily routine that he enjoys and finds comfortable. However, if forced to send him to Appletree Gardens, I would have no choice but to drive, as the school is in the completely opposite direction to my work route. This creates multiple serious problems: Road Safety Concerns: - Appletree is located on a bus route and cannot close the street to cars during drop-off and collection times, unlike Langley which closes the street every morning between 8:15-9:15am specifically for child safety - [redacted], I have seen first-hand the positive impact of this active travel initiative. The restricted vehicle access has dramatically improved safety, reduced congestion, and fostered the school's ethos of walking to school - Appletree's location on a busy bus route means children are exposed to moving traffic at the most chaotic times of the school day - Many Langley children would need to cross Seatonville Road and/or Cauldwell Lane - major roads - to reach Appletree, despite the council's false claim that the majority of dwellings can access Appletree without crossing major roads Parking Crisis: - Appletree has no free public car park nearby, whereas Langley has a free public car park very close by that many parents currently use - According to the Friends of Langley parent survey (192 responses on this question), currently 78% (150 parents) walk to Langley and only

18.3% (35 parents) drive - However, when asked how they would travel if their children attended Appletree, 55% (104 parents) said they would drive, and only 37.6% (71 parents) said they would walk - This represents a massive increase in car journeys - from 35 parents driving to 104 parents driving - creating dangerous congestion, pollution, and parking chaos - Where will all these cars park if there is no car park? - The assumption in the consultation appears to be that children will walk to school, but the evidence clearly shows parents would be forced to drive Personal Work Impact: - Appletree is in the opposite direction to my work, making the logistics of drop-off extremely difficult - The awful traffic and parking situation at Appletree, combined with its location opposite to my work route, would make timely drop-offs practically impossible for me - I would face the choice of being late to work every day or leaving home much earlier, disrupting our morning routine and reducing time with my child - This would have professional consequences and would increase stress for both me and my son The reality is that I would likely be forced to apply for an alternative school that is actually on my route to work, in a completely different direction from Appletree. This completely undermines the council's assumption that parents will simply choose Appletree if Langley closes. The Friends of Langley survey evidence supports this - when asked which school would be their first choice if Langley closed, only 11.2% (21 parents out of 187) chose Appletree, while 38.5% chose South Wellfield, 20.3% chose Southridge, and 11.2% chose Marine Park. Additionally, 43 parents said they would refuse a place at Appletree if offered. Environmental and Community Impact: If Woodlawn School expands onto the Langley site as proposed, the significant increase in specialist taxis and bus services required would reverse all the benefits of Langley's current active travel initiative. It would inevitably increase traffic in our residential area, create noise and air pollution, and require use of Langley's main gates to accommodate these vehicles throughout the school day. While I fully support the vital need to expand specialist educational provision within the borough, I do not believe Langley First School is the appropriate site for this purpose. The impact on our residential community and the loss of a successful active travel initiative should be considered. WRAPAROUND CARE AND EMPLOYMENT IMPACT Schools Out at Langley First School provides childcare services from 7:30am-6pm with flexible booking. This provision has been essential for my family and allows me to maintain my employment. Schools Out also provides day care services, allowing parents to have one drop-off and collection for their children from 9 months until 9 years old. It provides holiday provision for all school holidays apart from Christmas from 8am-5:30pm Monday-Friday. In contrast, Appletree's Little Pips provision provides childcare from 7:45am-5:30pm (4:30pm for nursery children) - a significant time difference for working parents. Little Pips provides care from age 2 only (not from 9 months like Schools Out). Little Pips

holiday provision is 8am-5pm Monday-Thursday and 8am-3:30pm on Fridays - much more limited than Schools Out. The loss of Schools Out provision would have serious implications for my ability to work. I am not alone in this concern. From the Friends of Langley parent survey (190 responses on this question): - 60.5% (115 parents) said they regularly use Schools Out - A further 4.2% (8 parents) said they use it for last-minute emergencies When asked what they would do if Schools Out wasn't available: - 52.8% of parents didn't have an answer - demonstrating how essential this provision is - 35.6% of parents said they would be forced to cut their hours at work - 19% of parents said they would need to look for a childminder (but is there capacity for 115 additional children needing childminders in this area?) - 14.7% of parents said they would need to rely more heavily on family (but not everyone has family available) - Several parents expressed serious concern about having to quit their jobs altogether, whether there would be enough childminders to support the area, and needing to change schools to one which could provide adequate wraparound cover For families like mine who rely on wraparound care to maintain employment, the loss of Schools Out or the reduction in hours/flexibility at Little Pips could force impossible choices between career and childcare. This impact has not been assessed by the council at all - they have admitted that neither early years provision nor wraparound provision have been considered as part of this consultation. IMPACT ON CHILDREN WITH ADDITIONAL NEEDS AND SEN PROVISION While my son does not have diagnosed SEN, his confidence issues and anxiety around unfamiliar adults and new situations mean he benefits enormously from Langley's inclusive, supportive environment. However, many children at Langley have more significant additional needs. Langley currently supports 40 children (13.5%) on the SEN register, plus 24 additional children receiving support following early identification - meaning 24% of pupils receive some form of additional support. This is a significant proportion, and these children benefit from: Specialist Facilities: - Ground-level building with ramp access, accessible toilets, and specially adapted changing space with bed (for a child with a catheter) - Sensory room with no windows allowing fully darkened experience if needed, with padded walls and floor - Forest school outdoor space in the reception garden, used for children with SEND throughout their time at Langley - Potting garden offering gardening opportunities for small groups - Three specially adapted spaces: The Nest in Nursery, The Sensory Room (Hive) which offers an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming, and a specifically adapted KS2 space allowing for breathing space and targeted intervention - Every classroom has a 'haven' area which children can use to regulate and re-set - Lunchtime club away from the dinner hall for children who find that environment overwhelming Inclusive Educational Approach: - Flexible seating arrangements, visual timetables (both universal and bespoke), use of 'Now and Next'

boards, incorporating special interests into learning, movement breaks, 'soft landings' approaches, additional support and intervention for reading - Neurodiversity affirming environment with subtle adaptations: soft lighting, clear visuals, adapted seating arrangements, resources for movement and heavy work in place, strategies for regulating emotions throughout the school - [redacted] This inclusive culture and staff expertise have been developed over time at Langley - The culture is authentic and reliant on the staff team - their strong relationships, communication skills, connection and dedication to the children - This cannot simply be transferred to another school - Staff at Langley know the children, understand their needs, have established relationships and trust - Many of these children have taken years to build confidence and trust with their teachers and support staff No Guarantees from Appletree: - As yet, no guarantees have been given about what, if any, adapted provision, SEN specific places, or breakout spaces would be available at Appletree following the closure of Langley - It is unclear how all children will be accommodated into classrooms at Appletree before even considering the need for SEN specific spaces - The government website shows Appletree's capacity is only 293 pupils, not the 432 claimed by the council - Appletree was in the process of applying for an Additionally Resourced Provision (ARP) to accommodate SEND, but this plan has been put on hold due to this consultation - so even Appletree's SEND provision is being harmed by this process For the 64 children at Langley receiving additional support (24% of pupils), the loss of these specialist facilities, the inclusive culture, and the staff who know them would be devastating. These children cannot simply be dropped into a different school environment and expected to cope. Many have complex needs that require consistent, specialist support in appropriately adapted environments. STRATEGIC OPPORTUNITY BEING WASTED Rather than being viewed as a candidate for closure simply because it is located next to a special school, Langley's position represents a strategic opportunity. Its proximity to Woodlawn Special School allows for potential dual registration arrangements, enabling pupils to access targeted interventions and therapies as needed while continuing to participate in mainstream classes and interact with a diverse peer group. This approach supports the government's key priority of inclusive education, keeping children with additional needs in mainstream settings wherever possible. The council's proposal wastes this opportunity and instead chooses to displace 300 mainstream children for the benefit of 32 post-16 SEND students (according to Ofsted data for Marden High School's post-16 provision that would move to the Langley site). This seems like an extremely poor use of resources and a failure to think strategically about SEND provision. PROPERTY VALUE AND

COMMUNITY IMPACT As a homeowner who deliberately purchased within the Langley catchment area because of the school's reputation, the closure would negatively impact my property value. The proximity to a highly regarded school was a significant factor in my purchase decision and adds value to properties in this area. The closure would remove this asset. More broadly, the closure would damage our local community. Langley First School is a community hub. It hosts events, brings families together, and creates a sense of belonging in our neighbourhood. The Schools Out provision serves working families across the area. The active travel initiative creates a safe, child-friendly environment each morning. Losing all of this would fundamentally change the character of our community. LACK OF CONSULTATION ON CATCHMENT CHANGES It is also concerning that no changes to catchment areas have been proposed as part of this plan. As residents currently within both the Langley First and Monkseaton Middle catchments, we believe it is essential that residents are consulted on any future catchment alterations should these closures or mergers proceed. Our property value and school access rights depend partly on catchment designations, yet the consultation is silent on how catchments would be affected. CONCLUSION - CUMULATIVE IMPACT The cumulative impact of this proposal on my family would be severe: 1. My son's educational progress and mental health would be seriously harmed by removal from his supportive environment 2. My nephew's learning environment would be disrupted and his SEND support compromised 3. I would be forced to drive instead of walk, increasing costs, stress, and environmental impact 4. The logistics of drop-off in the opposite direction to work may make it impossible to use Appletree at all 5. Loss of or reduction in wraparound care hours could force me to cut my work hours or change jobs 6. My property value would decrease due to loss of proximity to highly regarded school 7. My local community would lose an important hub and the benefits of the active travel initiative 8. I would lose confidence in the council's ability to make decisions based on accurate data and proper assessments This proposal would harm my child's development, compromise my ability to work, disrupt my nephew's learning environment and support for his vision impairment, ignore parental choice, destroy an exceptional inclusive learning environment, and destabilise our community - all based on flawed data and incomplete assessments. I strongly oppose this proposal and urge the council to consider the alternative options I have outlined in Question 4.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:03 PM

We have 3 children all of whom.have attended Langley, we live in the area due to the high calibre of schools and Langley was my only choice for my youngest who is still a student there, if Langley closes my child will have to walk almost twice as far to a school he is not familiar with for one year,.the school teaches a different form of

phonics among the things, he may lose friends and it could impact his learning and growth long term. Moving to appletree takes away the element of choice I had when originally selecting the schools and may also impact us financially as we will have to drive him to school rather than walk, he will the of course lose valuable time with friends on the walk and not get the valuable exercise he now.gets. the original proposal is flawed and is incorrect in large parts, any trust we have in the government has gone as the proposal was clearly not based on evidence and has an ulterior motive

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:03 PM

My son [redacted] and has thrived at Appletree where he struggled at his previous, larger primary school [redacted]. I am very concerned that a merger with Langley will create a large and impersonal school. [redacted] Please remember that the cohort of children in the later years at Appletree and in the middle schools have had their early years significantly disrupted by Covid-19 closures. The last thing they need is further disruption at this point in their schooling.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:11 PM

I currently have a four-year-old child in Reception and a three-year-old attending Langley Nursery. Both children have settled extremely well, feel safe, and are thriving in their environments. Before my husband and I started a family, we knew that our children would attend Langley First School. This decision was largely influenced by my own positive experience there—I attended Langley myself and truly believe it gave me the best possible start to my education. I have always valued the three-tier system and the way it provides a gradual, more nurturing transition between each stage of schooling. [redacted] If Langley were to close or merge with Appletree Gardens, we would face significant challenges. We would need to purchase a second car simply to manage school runs, an expense we cannot afford and one that would cause real financial strain for our family. We currently rely on Schools Out Langley, the wraparound care service linked to Langley First School. They are fantastic, providing flexible childcare both before and after school, as well as during school holidays. As a

family with no other childcare options, this service is a lifeline—without it, I would not be able to work. Again causing even more financial strain on us as a family. I have contacted several nearby schools with wrap around facilities, but all have confirmed they are full and do not offer childcare during the holidays. Last half term, while dropping my children at Schools Out, I spoke with a friend from North Shields whose daughter also attends the service during school holidays. This demonstrates how essential Schools Out is to many families in the wider community, a factor that I feel has not been fully considered by the council. Many young families are moving into the new Story Homes development—families with school-aged children as well as expectant parents. I personally know two families who visited Langley Nursery the day before the council's announcement; they were extremely impressed and excited that their children would be able to attend a school within walking distance of their new homes. Since the announcement, both have contacted me expressing disappointment that their plans may no longer be possible. There is a clear and growing demand for Langley places from within Robinson Fields, and many of us are deeply concerned about where our children will go if Langley closes. Story homes are building 300 homes and there are plans for different developer to build 2700 homes- where will all the children go? A close friend of mine, who has a three-year-old and another baby on the way, has also expressed anxiety about school options. It is clear that no proper research has been carried out into the demographics of the new housing development. [redacted] Closing Langley would remove the ability for families in the area to walk to a local three-tier first school. Parents would be forced either to drive further distances, apply for a Catholic school, or move into the two-tier system—effectively removing parental choice. It feels as though the needs and voices of our growing community have not been fully taken into account. Finally, Langley holds deep personal significance for me. I attended Langley, then Valley Gardens, and later Whitley Bay High School. Being able to give my children the same positive, supportive educational experience that I had would mean so much to our family.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:13 PM

Currently have a son in year 2. I am concerned about: - how you're going to fit all the students in and adequately teach them if he goes to Appletree in year 4 as will have almost 120 year 4 students. - he's going to have significant disruption to a stable education as will need to move schools in year 4 and then year 5. He is a more anxious child so this will have a bigger impact on him than if it had happened to my elder child. - potential lack of availability of wrap around care to support both me and husband working. Would current Appletree

parents get preference for provision? Could they take on the extra students if Langley and schools out Langley closed? - longer commute to school over busy main road. Due to where we live we're in the catchment area for all schools that are closing or proposing to close (Langley, Monkseaton middle, Monkseaton high). This has had a significant impact on our mental well-being due to continuous uncertainty about where our children will be schooled, a reduced choice from what we had expected when we brought our house 12 years ago. Contributing to this is the lack of information about proposed catchment areas and how these changes will be organised in the future if these changes do come to pass.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:16 PM

Every week we drop off and collect our grand daughter from school three times a week. I fear the traffic situation will be so bad outside of appletree and won't be able to park close to be able to collect her. It would be over a mile walk for us to get there so a more than two mile round trip which we cannot do easily due to health conditions. How do you suppose over 400 students will fit in appletree when the capacity is 293? I fear that the learning environment will not be suitable for my grand daughter and she will be in classroom which isn't big enough and with teachers she doesn't know. This is very detrimental to my grand daughter's education and emotional well being. The displaced children have not been considered in this.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:25 PM

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed merger of Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School. As both a parent of a pupil in Year 2 at Langley [redacted] I urge the council to reconsider this proposal based on the following concerns: 1. Flawed Process and Incomplete Consultation [redacted] I know how vital it is for school decisions to be built on accurate information and inclusive consultation. The initial documentation contains factual inaccuracies about Langley's facilities, finances, and catchment area. Nobody involved in this decision took the time to visit Langley and it is extremely worrying and disappointing that significant errors have been brought to my attention e.g. mislabelling Woodlawn and Langley and stating that Langley did not have a playing field on site. How can the public trust anything being said when incorrect information has clearly been gathered and shared. There has also been no community impact assessment specific to Langley, and early years and wraparound provision have been excluded. 2. Not a True Merger I feel very strongly that calling this a 'merger' is a deliberate attempt to downplay what the true plan is to the public. This proposal amounts to the closure of Langley rather than a genuine merger which parents would have been more open to. A fair and inclusive

approach would involve creating a new school with a new name, governing body and shared input from both communities. [redacted] I've seen how important it is for staff, pupils, and families to feel ownership of their school's identity. The staff at Langley have gone above and beyond to support both of my children and I find it appalling that they are not being given a fair opportunity to apply for any jobs available if the pupils from both schools were to come together. 3. Building and Capacity Concerns Appletree's stated capacity contradicts government data, and there are no guarantees about class sizes or safe accommodation for Langley pupils. Larger class sizes can significantly impact learning outcomes and emotional wellbeing. [redacted] The council's consultation document says Appletree "can accommodate 432 pupils, which is more than the amount of both schools combined when future birth rates and admission numbers are adjusted". However, looking at the gov.uk website for the capacity of Appletree, the capacity is stated as being 293. 4. Traffic and Safety Risks Langley's safer street closure policy and nearby public parking offer a secure environment for children. Currently we walk to school using a very safe route with very little traffic. Appletree's location on a bus route with limited parking raises serious concerns. Increased traffic and congestion pose risks to child safety and mental wellbeing, particularly for children with sensory sensitivities or anxiety disorders. I feel very sad that we would be forced to use the car to drop my child off if she were to attend Appletree. 5. Financial Misrepresentation Langley's projected deficit is being used to justify closure, despite it being the first in its history. The school is actively working with financial advisors, yet the council has not engaged with its leadership to explore solutions. [redacted] Appletree Gardens is in receipt of additional funding, known as Falling Rolls funding, to help it make up for its surplus places Langley is not in receipt of this funding, as its surplus figure is within the council's acceptable range. I feel it is misleading to compare the two schools due to this. 6. Loss of Inclusive SEN Provision Langley provides exceptional support for children with special educational needs, including adapted spaces and a neurodiversity-affirming culture. [redacted] Losing a school which offers this provision would be a devastating setback for many families. Appletree currently have good space for their SEN pupils to access when needed. It is unclear how ALL children will be accommodated into classrooms

before even considering the need for SEN specific spaces. SEN children from both schools will be disadvantaged. 7. Questionable Pupil Projections The council's pupil projections extend beyond the published methodology and contain unexplained discrepancies. Langley's projected surplus is within acceptable limits, while Appletree's is significantly higher. 8. Disregard for Parental Choice Langley is the more popular school, with a wider geographic draw and stronger parental preference. Survey data shows that most parents would choose other schools over Appletree if Langley closed. As both a parent and long-time educator, I believe parental choice is essential to maintaining trust in the education system and ensuring children are placed in environments that suit their needs. 9. Impact of New Housing The Murton Gap development will bring thousands of new homes and hundreds of new primary-aged children. Langley is geographically well-positioned to serve this growth, yet the proposal ignores this strategic advantage. Planning for future demand should prioritize sustainable, community-rooted schools like Langley. 10. Wraparound and Early Years Provision Langley's wraparound care is more flexible and extensive than Appletree's, supporting working families with longer hours and broader age coverage. [redacted] 11. Wider System Risks The proposal displaces 300 children to repurpose Langley's site for 32 post-16 pupils, creating a false choice between mainstream and SEND provision. Meanwhile, Coquet Park First School remains open despite structural financial issues. This raises questions about fairness, transparency, and long-term planning. In conclusion, this proposal is not in the best interests of our children, families, or community. With over 20 years of experience in education and a current role in children's mental health, I see the potential harm this plan could cause—not just academically, but emotionally and socially. I urge the council to reject the current plan and instead pursue a fair, transparent, and inclusive process that genuinely considers all stakeholders and long-term implications.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:26 PM

I want to send my own children here (when I can afford to move to the area as that is also completely out of control). I went here and would not be who I am without it. The staff will lose their jobs (like the teachers at MHS!) and the pupils will be combined into classes that are too big and the children won't get the education they deserve.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:28 PM

I strongly reject the councils plans to merge Langley First School and Appletree and demand the council reconsider this poorly thought out proposal. [redacted]

[redacted]

The choice to move here was underpinned by our desire to walk our children to school, and to have them grow up with friends nearby, to have access to a solid community base where parents know each other and can rely on each other. We were moved in for a matter of weeks before these proposals came through, and what I've seen from our new community has completely validated our choice to move here. What we've seen from the council on the other hand, seeks to undermine all of that. We knew that taking on our property in this area, while being challenging in the short term, secured us financially for the foreseeable. We made financial projections which gave us home security: a property with a little room to grow, but with the confidence that a house on this street, in this particular area, with safer roads and access to good schooling, would sell comfortably in the future. Having Langley close could potentially affect house prices on these streets, especially with the proposal to extend Woodlawn, creating more traffic from out of area children in taxis. These are quiet, narrow streets that cannot support a rise in traffic to the area. Has an assessment of this nature been carried out when considering parking and accessibility in this regard? I question whether the council has actually considered this aspect, in regards to local residents- aside from parents from the school- who don't have children or a vested interest in keeping the school open. On the point of extending Woodlawn into the Langley site, I have some issues that seem obvious to everyone but the council: The consultation outlines the intention for the council to repurpose the Langley site and move the post-16 provision from Marden High School (32 children in total according to Ofsted), thereby displacing 300 children for the benefit of 32 children. But by bundling the two issues - the alleged need to close a school with the need to expand Woodlawn - the council is effectively creating a false choice: asking the community to accept a suboptimal and unstable mainstream solution in exchange for a desirable SEND solution. I agree with the Save Langley campaign that the long-term health of the mainstream school system should not be compromised to solve a logistical problem for SEND provision, however important that provision may be. Sending our children to Appletree would defeat the entire point of us moving here to Langley Avenue. While I see this as a personal problem, rather than the councils problem, my aim here is to state that a number of people move from out of area to this part of Monkseaton so they have the best chance of sending their kids to Langley First School. This is not to mention that 12% of children from the Appletree catchment go to Langley instead; showing a clear preference for Langley. Sending our kids to Appletree also undermines our decision to move here: we would have to cross the incredibly busy and unsafe Seatonville Road, then Bromley Avenue, to walk them to school, all at rush hour. This

point also undermines the councils argument in relation to 'crossing a road for field access,' when in reality, "merging" these schools will drive more children across unsafe routes to go to school. While the council promotes healthy lifestyles and celebrates walking to school, they are actively creating an environment whereby parents are forced to drive their kids to school just to get them there on time. If I had to send my children to Appletree, I foresee the car being utilised more on late mornings, or to avoid crossing busy traffic. At this point in time, Langley currently closes the street outside school every morning to make it safer for our children, which is a huge factor for us as local residents too. Appletree cannot close the street to cars in the mornings or at collection times due to it being on a bus route. This is not encouraging. Langley also has a free public car park very close by, which Appletree Gardens does not have. On the point of a "merger," we also take umbridge. This proposal is clearly not a merger but a closure. Langley would cease to exist, with no security for staffing, no retention of school ethos and Appletree keeping their DfE number whilst Langley would be stripped of theirs. This is only a merger in respect of the children joining the classroom of another school and nothing more. We've seen that the current consultation has already created divides within our community in this regard, effectively pitting one school against another, which are unhelpful. Both schools are good schools, it’s not fair to penalise one over the other. A true merger should mean both schools - and most importantly the children - could have an input into a new school’s name, ethos, uniform etc and would mean we could keep the best bits from both schools, including staff. It would also make the transition smoother for the children. The requirement to ask permission from additional routes (the Secretary of State and then final approval from the Office of Schools Adjudicator) increases the scrutiny over the decision making process, which I see can only be a good thing, especially if the interest here is truly on making our childrens education better. At the end of the day, this should be about doing the right thing, not the easier thing. Surely if we want to get this right for our children, we shouldn’t be rushing the process. Given Langley isn’t yet in deficit (as incorrectly stated in the councils proposals) why does it matter that it will take longer? I am also concerned that not enough information has been considered when it comes to placing Langley children in Appletree: only two of the proposed thirteen classrooms at Appletree meet the government guidance of 62m2 for 30 reception children and 52m2 for 30 KS1+. I am concerned as a parent that this is not a safe environment for any child to learn in. Langley however have 10 of 11 classrooms that exceed this guidance. Would it not make more sense to join Appletree with Langley, and have a more solid, long-term plan to ensure childrens education comes first? The council’s consultation document says Appletree “can accommodate 432 pupils, which is more than the amount of both schools combined when future birth rates and admission numbers are adjusted”. However on the gov.uk

website states the capacity of Appletree as being 293. As yet I understand the campaign has received no clarification on this. The council has also offered zero assurance about how the Langley children could be safely accommodated on the site, which troubles me greatly as a parent. There has also been no assurance I can see on class sizes. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, I am concerned that our children will be placed in larger class sizes, which could have an adverse affect on their education and wellbeing. While we are at the beginning of our school journey with our young family, and there is a lot to understand, I understand this: closing a school with such a fantastic local reputation is deplorable. I find the councils actions here to be underhand and manipulative. There has been little effort to include the schools in the conversation, effectively forcing them into a short window of time to create alternative proposals inside of while this has been in the councils planning books for months. While our government speaks on prioritising childrens education, it seems the council has proposed something that seems clean on paper but in reality does not prioritise the childrens welfare first and foremost. I urge the council to reconsider these proposals and listen to the 6000+ people who reject it in the area, to listen to the community and the students, parents and teachers at the school.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:31 PM

I have 2 children currently attending Langley First School. My son is in year 2 and he is thriving in an inclusive and nurturing environment. He does not have diagnosed SEN but I believe he would have struggled to settle in many other settings, as the staff at Langley have so much skill and expertise in making inclusivity at the heart of what they do. He struggles with change and transitions, but has never once struggled with going into school, or changing classes each year, thanks to the wonderful staff and ethos at Langley. I fear that the disruption caused by this proposal will be so unsettling for him that he will struggle to engage with such a big change forced upon him. The current proposal would mean that my child has to move to Appletree Gardens for just year 4, before moving onto middle school. Year 4 is a very important year, preparing for the first big educational transition into middle school, a transition with which great care is taken at Langley to prepare children for. Taking this away and moving the children into a massive year group of 120 children (bigger than both Wellfield Middle School and Monkseaton Middle school, which would be the two choices of middle school for my child) is hugely unsettling and disruptive. Added to this, there is no evidence that the Appletree Gardens building can actually accommodate such a large number of pupils. Their hall is significantly smaller than Langley's, and the majority of their classrooms are also below the recommended DfE size guidelines for classrooms. The statement that Appletree Gardens

is a bigger school building is not factually correct, and I don't believe that the children will safely or comfortably fit within the school. I am hugely concerned about the impact of this lack of space on my child's wellbeing; no children should be crammed into overcrowded (as you've given no promises about class sizes) and cramped classrooms every day. I'd rather home school him until middle school if that was his only option. My youngest child is currently attending Langley Nursery, where she is also thriving. Being nearly 3 years younger than my son means that for as long as she can remember, she has been excited to join her big brother at school. Now, she is wearing the uniform, attending school, eating in the lunch hall and taking part in school events just like her brother. She is a fully included member of the Langley community, well known and cared for by many of the staff already. This proposal would have a DEVASTATING impact on my daughter. It is unreasonable to expect us to explain to a not-yet 4 year old child that she is no longer allowed to attend her school, but that her older brother will still be attending for another year before closure. It is cruel and discriminatory on very young children to pull them (and only them, not their older siblings) away from their community. Langley is the only community she has ever known, having attended Schools out at Langley since she was 16 months old. In addition to the huge emotional and developmental impact this proposal will have on my children, practically it is unworkable. We will not be able to manage 2 school drop-offs and pick-ups during the next academic year. It seems to be assumed that Langley parents will choose Appletree instead if Langley is no longer an option. I can assure you that is not the case. We will not be sending my youngest child to Appletree, due to the attitude of the current headteacher there. I don't feel that my child would feel welcomed there or thrive in the environment of that school. I will have no choice but to drive my youngest child to school if she cannot attend Langley. The traffic along Seatonville Road and Earsdon Road (one or both of which I will have to travel along or cross to reach any of the other first schools) is already problematic at school start and end times, and is only going to get worse if this proposal goes ahead. Langley has a safe street, and a public car park a couple of streets away from school. This is far more suitable than the area outside of Appletree Gardens, which frankly, is already dangerous at times on a busy rat-run and bus route. My family also relies on the wonderful wraparound care provided by Schools out at Langley. They are so flexible, not requiring us to book fixed days, and offer breakfast club from 7.30am and after school club until 6pm. The hours available at Appletree are not as long - 8am until 5:30pm and there have been no assurances given about space, availability or flexibility. The holiday club at Langley also runs 8-5pm, and is the only holiday club in the area which is available to under 4s. This is a lifeline for so many parents and would cause so many issues if it was lost. We moved to the area for this school, as did many of our neighbours, stretching ourselves

financially to do so. This school is so loved by our community, and has been for generations. It is rare to have so many multi-generational families strive to stay in the area (which is increasingly difficult at the coast due to house prices) for a specific school, but this school has achieved it. Do not rip out the heart of our community.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:34 PM

We live outside the catchment for Langley so the proposal puts our child at risk of not having a place at Appletree and missing out on the final 2 years of education with his teachers, friends and school community that he has come to know and love. [redacted]. Aside from the stress and uncertainty of not knowing where our child might be attending, the closing of Langley will likely increase travel time before and after school. We also use Langley wraparound services which will no longer available. We have a 2 year old who we wanted to start at the Langley nursery from 2026 and the Council's proposal also put this in jeopardy.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:44 PM

Merging Langley and Appletree under the current proposals would have a significant negative impact on me and my family. As a parent of a current Year 2 child, they face moving to a new school on a new site for Year 4, before moving again to middle school in Year 5. This is a large amount of change, especially for my child who thrives on routine and familiarity. He currently loves attending Langley and I have huge concerns that unsettling him through this closure could have a significant impact on his attitude to education. My other child currently attends Langley Nursery. Under the current proposal, she would have to move to Reception at a different school to the one her brother attends. Trying to explain to a 4 year old why she cannot attend the same school as her brother and the school of which she is already part of the community is hugely difficult and will create a huge amount of upset. She currently loves seeing her brother at lunchtime each day and that will not be possible on different sites. As we live next to the school, she also faces seeing children walk past her house to attend Langley every day while being told she is not allowed to attend. This is extremely difficult for such a young child to understand and I am extremely concerned about the potential impact on her mental health. Should the proposals go ahead in this manner, the impact on our family logistics will also be significantly negative. Currently, we are able to walk both our children to school at the end of our street. This allows us to fit it around work easily. Under the current proposal we will have children at two different schools in opposite directions, one of which will require a car journey due to the nature and distance of the walk. (It would involve two major roads

despite the council claiming no child would need to cross major roads to attend Appletree instead of Langley.) It would mean the school run would likely take much longer affecting our working patterns or the need for additional childcare, which would have a financial impact. It is also unlikely we could drop off/pick up both of our children on time each day due to the time and distance involved. This may affect their attendance and punctuality at school. As a parent, we actively chose Langley First School for our children due to its ethos, curriculum and excellent staff. I have major concerns about how this would be maintained under the current proposal. It seems that my children would have to move to Appletree and follow their ethos and curriculum and be taught by their staff. This is not the choice I made for my children and so our parental choice is taken away. [redacted] I am also concerned about the impact on my children of removing the Langley catchment as I feel it leaves in a very vulnerable position for both first and middle schools (especially with the potential closure of Monkseaton Middle School). This is because we will be on the edge of the catchment for every school and so potentially end up being in the position where we are not able to really get a school of choice and are instead just left with the school where there are places. Another major issue is the availability of wraparound care. Currently we use the available provision at Schools Out at Langley. My daughter attended there from age 1 and is very happy and comfortable with the staff there who all know her and her brother extremely well. Were Langley to close, it is likely that Schools Out would too or would certainly not be an appropriate wraparound service for our children at Appletree. This would be devastating for us as parents, as we trust them to look after our children. It would be devastating for our children to lose the care they receive and have to move to another wraparound provider, if available. It would also be devastating for the wonderful staff working there who care for our children. The impact on the community should not be underestimated. I am very concerned that there is simply not the capacity at Appletree's wraparound care for all of the children from Langley. If childcare wasn't available, this would have a significant impact on our family, potentially requiring us to adjust or reduce our working hours in order to pick up children from school. This would have a financial impact on us as a family. Even if capacity were there, the shorter hours offered make the service a poorer quality service to that currently offered by Schools Out. [redacted] and have had serious discussion about home schooling our children if this proposal were to go ahead due to my concerns mentioned above both about Appletree location, its

leadership and the availability of wraparound services. This is not a path we had previously considered but we feel it could be the best option under the current proposal. It should be clear to North Tyneside Council that Langley is the heart of our local community. The strength of local feeling and outpouring of support for the school over the past 6 weeks should be a strong indicator of the grave error moving ahead with this proposal would be. I appreciate there may be a need to reduce the PAN for NEPA and also to provide Woodlawn with more space, but this is entirely the wrong solution and risks the education, happiness and safety of 300 children and their families, as well as that of the wider community. My other major concern is that we, as parents and residents, have been unable to provide feedback on the poor quality of this proposal and consultation. The provided documents are filled with errors, perhaps more errors than facts, and the questions in the consultation do not provide a real opportunity to comment on this. Information has not been forthcoming to allow a fully informed discussion and indeed, my freedom of information request for data to support my submission is overdue the statutory timeframe for response. This was only acknowledged when I chased it up and even though the council is aware that this information was required for this review, it has not managed to provide it within the statutory guidelines. This total failure should prevent this consultation going any further until all of the requested information is provided to support a full discussion based on correct facts and data, not the inaccuracies provided by North Tyneside Council.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:54 PM

Primarily it will destabilize my child’s education and cause long term damage (due to a lack of foresight). I now lack any confidence in the council’s ability to look after education. They have shared misinformation and shown complete disregard for the communities that they have a duty to. They have misrepresented opportunities to intervene and DfE guidance in their application of the use of the term ‘merger’. In addition, the council claim that they had previously suggested a different school model in 2022 while omitting that they had tried to pass on a £5 million debt from Monkseaton high school as part of their proposals to schools that were not in financial distress. This proposal would have effectively dragged them all under. The council has already listed one of Langley school fields on the call for sites for the emerging plan for 2026, even though a proposal about the future of the school is “under consultation”. Their action show a council more interested in stripping a school for parts than doing their duty in providing a sustainable educational system. Furthermore, in omitting key impact assessments from its proposal has been discriminatory to kids with SEND that attend Langley First School (Equality Act 2010).

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:54 PM

The impact to my family will be huge, not just to myself or my wife, but my two young children who attend Langley. I believe the council are using data which conveniently benefits their plan but doesn't represent the truth or community behind the data. I understand the councils need to hit a 390 PAN at Whitley Bay High School (WBHS) and understand the issue of falling birth rates. I see the deficits beginning to increase and see the need for change. This is undeniable and I understand why a decision is being made. We differ on what the outcome of this decision should be. I was concerned about certain aspects of the consultation so did some work trying to model the councils thinking. To start, birth rates. They are indeed falling, no questioning that. A deeper dive proves a more concerning trend for the future. The average age of a resident in North Tyneside is 78 for men and 82 for women. As NEPA has a larger cohort of 60+ residents (as per the last census - 2021) we can expect in the next ten to twenty years an increase again in births as younger families take up the spaces left by elderly households becoming available. This is clearly modelled in the ONS data and shows an expected increase in births from the early to mid 2030s, this means any decision made by the council should best prepare for any increase in future years. This makes it even more pressing to protect the area's most popular schools. The council's projections on the consultation go until the early to mid 2030's so don't take this into account at all. I then modelled the last 11 years of reception intake from the Local Authorities (LA) Essential Guides and found some interesting statistics. Across the last 11 years only one school falls below the 90% threshold the council believes is sustainable. This is Appletree Gardens at 81% capacity over this period. Langley sits at a healthy 93%. Adjusted for a 5 year period Appletree drops to 73% and Langley under the 90% needed, to 87%. This is driven by the last two years COVID baby intake. In only one year in the past 11 years has Appletree proved a more popular choice with families than Langley. Another thing to look at is parental choice from catchment. Out of the 8 NEPA first schools Langley is the 3rd most popular with 66% of choices from within the catchment. Appletree ranks 6th at 52% (only Southridge and South Wellfield are lower). Langley is a school people trust from the area the live in and the LA's own Essential Guides prove it. As well, closing the more popular school with parents seems ludicrous. I have spent many a late night and early morning conversing and researching with parent groups, and the community around this school has built undeniably strong. To choose to close this school seems crazy when such an outcry happens. Take for example the relevant case in Northumberland around the Cheviot Trust. In the Prudhoe area, a consultation to shut a school has been stopped due to parental outcry. This was a suggested merger as well. They received just over 2000 signatures on their petition and the council and Trust felt that deemed the 'strength of opinion' was too strong and it couldn't continue. As we are over 6000 signatures at this

point, I find it extremely sad that this council (whom I voted for) does not deem it equivalent. I understand a Trust is different, but the damage this is causing to the council and any future election success in a tightly contested seat is bewildering. My next step was to look at inaccuracies in the original document which caused me concern as well. - The consultation document states no ‘major highway’ will need to be crossed to get to Appletree, this categorically is a lie. The horrifically busy Seatonville Road will need to be crossed by countless families, including ours. We often have to pick our two children up in the car to go to clubs after school, or when grandma picks them up as my wife and I work as she lives out of the NEPA region. This is something we will not be able to do due to the horrific parking and traffic ALREADY at Appletree. This will be made excessively worse with an extra 120 children attending as part of the current plan. Even the local Fire Department thinks the traffic is unmanageable, as stated in the past few years when they couldn’t access the street during a school pickup time. No safety analysis has been done for this by the LA. - The school itself is SMALLER than Langley, not larger as stated. The class bases are increased at Appletree. This issue at Appletree is, per current guidelines not one of the classes are of regulation size for a Nursery class of 30 children (62m2). Meanwhile KS1 and KS2 require 55ms and only 4 classes meet this classification in the whole building. Langley on the other hand is over the initial 62m2 on all but one class (9 total). The halls at Langley are larger as well, as stated by the government KS2 need a hall suitable at 140m2 and Appletree’s two halls are both under this scale. Langley’s are both larger. It proves a choice has been made simply on counting ‘class bases’ (some of which are IT and Library spaces) and again not looking at underlying data, as Langley is the larger school and Appletree can’t comply with current governmental recommendations. - Langley is claimed to have only one field and a highway needs to be crossed to reach it, this is incorrect. There is a field my children play on after school every day with their friends before we take them home. What I find far more concerning is the actual field the council refers to is up on their website on a ‘call for sites.’ This currently would need Sports England approval to sell on I believe as it’s a sports field, which I’m sure would be snapped up as part of the councils home building initiative. Yet, as part of Woodlawn this is no longer an issue as the schools needs diverge and a field is unnecessary. This is something that needs to be reviewed and is highly suspect, why would it be on a call for sites as part of a school in use? [redacted]

[redacted] This has been ruled out by the local authority at meetings with parents so was a lie to potential parents. The financials behind the school are confusing, with excess Pre-16 grants provided to the school even as intake drastically falls compared to other schools. A 32% growth in Pre-16 grants over the past 5 years against only 11% at Langley seem to skew any deficit they should have into a more reasonable figure. This seems highly suspect and there is no reasoning explained for this anywhere, it could potentially be in house nursery but the % increase is ludicrous against another school. I hate a conspiracy, but the following does ring true: [redacted] 2. This Trust supports Appletree as one of its partner schools. 3. The proposal is to close Langley and consolidate into a building of the Trust. [redacted] At what point does unexplained higher grants and decisions made by council become conflict of interest? All this leads me to a lack of trust in Appletree governance. Under the current plan, in 2027 my oldest is due to move into Appletree in year four, and my youngest will move into year two. I will be looking for other schools instead as I do not want them in an environment which has shown to disregard the best interests of my children or worried parents. I'm genuinely worried someone at Appletree finds out I wrote this, as I worry it will be taken out on my children if they were ever to attend. Due to the roll numbers, my year 2 child should be able to move to another school due to space in the NEPA system. If my son in year 4 is unable to due to capacity across the NEPA region, I will look to homeschool alongside my wife before entrance to a middle school a year later.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:55 PM

By removing wrap around care you will force more parents out of work - therefore reducing tax paid to the economy. You are proposing to force children into a school which cannot handle all of the Langley children, by doing so you are putting children's lives at risk due to fire safety capacity at apple tree. [redacted] Langley is a thriving school in the heart of a booming community yet the labour government have their desires to destroy this. No fair consultation period, delayed freedom of information requests with inaccurate accountancy from the beginning. The labour government won by only a few thousand votes in north Tyneside, the residents and community will remember this destructive act at the next elections.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 10:58 PM

My family's choice of Langley First School was deliberate, and was a major factor in our choice of house [redacted] The school's ethos, kind

and caring environment whilst maintaining high educational standards, made this our first choice of school. Closure would harm my child's education due to loss of staff, community, and morale—potentially forcing us to homeschool as we would not consider a move during the remainder of his early school years education.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 11:01 PM

im worried about the disruption to my daughter's education. i also worry with the number of new housing developments springing up that we will be in a position ini a few years time that there arent enough places at the school - after all the council's analysis is based on flawed data. i also think you have a big fight on your hands with the community here - a council in debt generally would be better to listen to the real concerns of the people affected and act upon them rather then spend more money getting fightingthe inevitable legal challenges that are coming their way otherwise. Also, we all know this is a tick box exercise for you guys, the way one of you rolled your eyes at the suggestion to another meeting really gave the game away. Because of that attitude, i genuinely hope you lose this one.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 11:02 PM

We have grave concerns about the effect of the proposed school closure on our child, currently in year 3. Whilst, under the current proposal, she would see out her time at Langley, the disruption (already occurring) is only going to get worse. There is the very real risk of the loss of exceptional staff as they inevitably look for enhanced job security elsewhere. Morale will decline and the quality of their education will start to suffer. The loss of the school will be a blow to the community. As a family, the closure of the first school in addition to the threatened closure of our catchment middle school adds even more uncertainty to our future. There is no clear plan publicised to allow us to explain to our children what their future education looks like - will friendships be broken, unnecessary travel be forced upon us. There are already problems associated with significant traffic congestion in our local area, much of it related to poor connectivity to Appletree Gardens - this will greatly worsen, causing declining air quality and safety. Many families move into this area due to the excellent quality of schools and education. These plans, and the uncertainty around them - not least the devasting lack of quality research findings, poor attention to detail and failure to fulfil statutory requirements - will also have a negative impact on house prices, affecting our family directly in yet another way.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 11:04 PM

Certainly. Here's your statement rewritten from the wife's perspective, maintaining the emotional weight and detailed reasoning while shifting the voice to reflect a mother's personal experience and concerns: --- How This Proposal Will Affect My Child and Our Family

– A Mother's Perspective Langley First School isn't just where my daughter learns—it's where she feels safe, supported, and part of a nurturing community. The proposal to close Langley would have a devastating impact on her education, her wellbeing, and the rhythm of our family life. Loss of Stability and Quality of Education My daughter thrives because of the strong, trusting relationships she has with her teachers—people who know her, understand her needs, and bring out the best in her. Uprooting her to a new school would mean losing that familiarity. Larger class sizes at Appletree would inevitably reduce the individual attention children receive and place more pressure on teachers. I worry that overcrowding could lead to children being taught in unsuitable spaces—converted storage rooms or temporary portacabins. That is not the environment I want for my child. Impact on Learning and Development Langley's approach to phonics is consistent and highly effective. A sudden shift in teaching methods could disrupt my daughter's progress in reading and writing at a crucial stage. These early years are the foundation of her education—any setback now could have long-term consequences. Wraparound Care – A Lifeline for Working Families Our family relies on Langley's wraparound care to balance work and parenting. Its flexible hours—from 7:30am to 6:00pm—allow both my partner and me to work full-time. We've never had an issue accessing this service. Appletree's provision is shorter, less flexible, and with more families competing for fewer places, there's no guarantee we'd even get a spot. Losing this support would force us to reduce our working hours or even change jobs, putting financial strain on our household. This isn't a minor inconvenience—it would fundamentally alter how our family functions and could have wider economic effects across the community. Specialist Support Langley has dedicated spaces and experienced staff for children with additional needs. My daughter benefits from this every day. There's no assurance that Appletree can offer the same level of support, and no clear plan for how SEND provision will be maintained or improved. Increased Commute and Work Disruption Our current school run is a five-minute walk. Under this proposal, it would become a 15-minute journey each way. That might not sound like much, but it triples our total commute time. Right now, I can walk her to school and still be home in time for a 9am work call. That won't be possible if she's moved. For families without cars, this change is even more difficult. Increased traffic around Appletree and the expanded Woodlawn site will bring more vehicles, raising safety concerns and environmental impact. Loss of Independence and Safety We live so close to Langley that I had hoped, in the near future, my daughter could walk to school on her own. The route is safe, and the road is closed to cars in the morning. That independence will be lost if she has to attend Appletree, where the distance and busy roads mean I'll have to accompany her every day until she leaves. Community Connections Torn Apart Langley is the heart of our community. Events like the summer fair and the parents'

	quiz night bring families together and create a sense of belonging. Closing the school would tear apart these connections and erode the social fabric that supports both children and parents. Emotional Toll on Children Children need stability, routine, and familiar faces. Forcing them into a new environment with larger classes, fewer resources, and unfamiliar staff will cause anxiety and stress. For some, this could lead to long-term issues with confidence and engagement in learning. Financial Strain New uniforms, higher travel costs, and the hidden costs of managing childcare gaps all add up. This proposal isn't just about numbers—it's about real children and real families. It threatens to disrupt education, damage wellbeing, and dismantle a thriving community. --- Why I Strongly Oppose the Proposal Beyond the personal impact, there are broader reasons why I cannot support the plan to close Langley First School and merge it with Appletree Gardens First School. A. This Is Not a True Merger This is, in effect, a closure of Langley. Appletree retains its identity, governing body, and DfE number. That's not a merger—it's an erasure. It's divisive, unfair, and doesn't allow for a genuine blending of cultures, staff, or ethos. B. Flawed and Incomplete Evidence - The council's documents contain factual errors about Langley's facilities, finances, and accessibility. - Capacity figures are disputed: Appletree is said to hold 432 pupils, but government data lists its capacity as 293. - Langley is only forecasting a deficit for the first time in 2025/26 and is actively addressing it. - No community impact assessment has been done. - No traffic or transport assessment has been provided. - No detailed SEND transition plan exists. C. Key Issues Ignored - Parental choice is being dismissed: 73% of catchment children attend Langley, compared to 44% at Appletree. - Langley's wraparound care is more flexible and accessible. - ONS data shows birth rates are expected to rise after 2026, and new housing developments like Murton Gap could reverse current trends. - Langley has a strong, neurodiversity-affirming culture and specialist spaces that are not guaranteed elsewhere. D. Democratic and Procedural Gaps - Our MP has not responded to repeated requests for engagement—mine or other parents'. - Several Freedom of Information requests remain unanswered or delayed, meaning key facts won't be available before the consultation ends. This undermines the legitimacy of the process. --- Conclusion This proposal is not robust. It's based on incomplete and sometimes incorrect information, and it fails to consider the full impact on children, families, and the community. The lack of engagement from our MP and delays in FOI responses only deepen the concerns. There are better, fairer, and more innovative alternatives. I urge the council to pause, listen, and work with us to find a solution that puts children first and protects the unique strengths of Langley First School. ---
Screen Name Redacted	I have many concerns about the proposed merger of Langley First

11/12/2025 11:08 PM

School and Appletree Gardens First School. As a parent/carer of two children who have attended both schools (daughter attended Appletree for nursery and wraparound care, and has been a student at Langley from reception and is now a Y3 student; son currently attends wraparound care at Appletree Gardens), I can confidently say that both are very good schools. Having attended the Council's consultation meeting, it concerned me that figures around declining birth rates (and the knock-on effect this has on school budgets) seemed to be a key driver in the decision making. In particular, there are several flaws in this logic, and while the Council stated that this was not the key factor in the decision to make this proposal, the narrative continued to return to these two key points. As was raised in this meeting, data around the budget of Langley First School was not accurately published, but even more importantly there are a number of key issues with any decision being based on birth rates alone: 1) Birth rate statistics can be unreliable, and do not accurately capture all movement in and out of the North Tyneside region 2) Declining birth rates are a national problem, but we need to consider the other benefits that schools provide to children and local communities In regards to point 1 (birth rates), I would add the following: ● While there is no denying the downward trend in birthrates throughout North Tyneside up to 2023, the Office for National Statistics predicts that birth rates will level off from 2026 and then begin to increase again. ● Birth rates within the NEPA have been declining since 2008. However, despite this, the numbers within NEPA schools have been resilient to this downward trend, with the majority of schools* being within the council's 10% acceptable surplus range on average since 2020. ● Internal migration has also not been taken into account for this consultation. Aside from a decline in 2022, the Office for National Statistics shows more young children move into North Tyneside than out of it. Although these statistics don't go down to NEPA level, we do know many families move specifically to the coast to take advantage of the three-tier system. ● The parenting survey conducted by the Friends of Langley showed 58% of respondents (out of 185 responses) moved to this area specifically to send their children to Langley First School, with a further 3% who had been planning to move to the area to send their children to Langley. ● The North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 also contradicts the rationale for closing Langley due to falling birth rates as it states: "Net inward migration from neighbouring areas, primarily Newcastle, helps to sustain the overall working age population and limits the fall in the number of children in the borough" The Royal College of Pediatrics and Child Health, in a 2024 report, further adds: Modelling by birth rate remains a simplistic approach to child health workforce planning. Recently, there has been unpredicted reversals in birth rate projections, with a 1.8% increase in birth rate 2021 -2022, and the Total Fertility Rate now rising. Modelling by birth rate does not take into account changes through immigration, child health inequalities, increased survivorship

beyond infancy, and the rising complexity in CYP health and care. This quotation is in relation to child health, but many of the points raised can be applied in relation to pupil rates: we simply cannot accurately predict the number of children who will contribute to pupil rates based on birth rates alone. In regards to point 2, I have several points to raise around community cohesion and the wider value of schools to local communities, outlined as follows: As a Senior Lecturer in Children's Literature, I have worked closely with policymakers and practitioners focused on community integration, and another key concern I see in the approach so far with this proposal is how little time our community has been given to come up with solutions that impact us all, and the way this has had a negative effect on community cohesion. Parents and carers understandably want to protect the schools their children attend, and the proposal provides a lot of uncertainty for the Monkseaton area. The recent decision to close Monkseaton High, and a quick subsequent proposal to close Langley First and Monkseaton Middle have even led me to consider moving to be in a catchment that would ensure my children can be admitted to Valley Gardens and Whitley Bay High School, as I see few alternatives in our area--this would mean spending more on housing, having a smaller home, and making other sacrifices for stable education for my children. Moreover, I was planning to have my son attend reception at Langley while my daughter was in Year 4, saving significant time in pick ups and drop offs, as I commute to Newcastle for work. The Council's proposal is to stop the nursery and reception classes starting next year, foreclosing this possibility. My own concerns aside, it alarms me how the proposal is leading to division within the Monkseaton community. It shows how much everyone cares about their schools, but if the Council placed more trust in our ability to work together, and gave time for these conversations, I think a better solution for all could be provided and mitigate some of these drawbacks of a rushed proposal. There are great models of innovative solutions to difficult problems within Local Authorities, such as the 'Wigan Deal' in the Greater Manchester area. In this instance, the LA lost over 1/3 of its budget overnight, but developed a social contract solution with community members to resolve this financial crisis. It continues to be touted as a great model of community empowerment and local governance at the highest levels of government, and was a key point of discussion in a recent roundtable session led by the British Academy in London where I was an invited participant. The Wigan Council describes the deal as follows: In 2010, the British government introduced austerity measures across the country. Wigan, a borough in the north-west, was the third most affected local authority in England. Wigan Council had to deal with substantial budget cuts and devise new ways to continue providing services and serving the community. As a result, Wigan Council created The Deal, an informal agreement between the public sector, citizens, community groups and businesses to create a

better borough. The Deal's main objectives are to eliminate waste from its budget and reduce demand for services while improving the lives of citizens. The Deal is composed of several smaller deals on healthcare, children, social services and community funding. It has been successful in many ways: Wigan Council has reduced its expenses, improved certain services, frozen council tax, and improved health outcomes for citizens. While we must find our own solutions in North Tyneside, the level of trust provided to community members, and the positive outcomes yielded as a result, in the case of the Wigan Deal provides an important previous example. While tensions between parents of different schools have risen among some individuals, others have stuck to a strong message of working together as a community, done countless hours of research, supported families and children, and gone above and beyond in many ways. If given the opportunity, the emotion behind early responses from families can be channeled to develop creative solutions to the problems the Council has raised--and we are not lacking talent in our area! I stated as one of my other key points that schools offer much more than education. Having contributed to multiple policy briefs in response to government calls for evidence on community cohesion, as well as worked closely with children themselves, I can speak confidently in this area: schools provide so may services that support our communities, and this support decreases pressure on other services in our area. As just one example, we might take the significant support that both schools provide to parents of children with SEND. Those parents/carers have picked either Langley or Appletree as they are the best fit for their child, and having the right support means that families have less need to rely on other services to support their child--services which are often oversubscribed, with long waiting lists. My own daughter does not have SEND, but she does have a long-term health condition and it was extremely stressful picking a school and ensuring she would receive appropriate care. When she was younger, she would often need to miss school for her health, much more than other children, and I needed to be confident that the school would keep her safe as she was severely allergic to cow's milk (and still is). She has epipens and has had an analphyactic reaction when exposed as a young child, and has only improved after enrolling on a clinical trial for children with allergies and even still has to carry epipens and avoid milk at school. There is a shortage of schools in our area that truly care about children with health conditions or SEND, with some focusing more on attendance and test results. But these children need good education too, and a willingness of staff to be supportive of families. To be honest, I would be upset if either Langley or Appletree were closed, and think school closure needs to be put to the side as a solution and a radical rethinking of potential solutions--acknowledging, as poart of this process, how schools contribute to the wellbeing of children and families, reduce pressure on other services (e.g. within the NHS) and

give families the peace of mind to have their children go to mainstream schools, enabling parents/carers the peace of mind to work fulltime rather than taking on extra caring responsibilities due to concerns their child won't get the right or best care in their absence. For more on my research into the contributions of schools to community cohesion, you can go to www.beyondschoolgates.org. This includes data from children themselves, as well as results from parent/carer surveys, and was led by a team of six academics from six different universities across the UK. The short timeframe to consider this proposal means my response isn't as coherent as I'd like. I work full-time, and in addition to my daughter who attends Langley I have a two-year-old son who was hospitalised frequently last year and continues to have more fragile health--as a result, it's not easy to put together the response needed so quickly despite having expertise that could contribute to a more positive solution. At the very least, I urge the Council to give everyone more time to have transparent and open conversations about solutions for North Tyneside. I also urge the Council to think of this in terms of the wider impacts of the proposals put forward, so that the community is considering not just one school but the wider changes being proposed to education in our area together and can decide on solutions that work for children at all stages so we can have confidence in the educational pathways for our children, and that these will be fairly distributed and provide equal opportunity for all. The UK Government has committed to an 'Opportunity Mission', and North Tyneside's solutions should reflect this commitment, thinking as I've stated about the various contributions schools make to our communities and not being led be unpredictable data like birth rate predictions. I hope my position is clear: I do not support the closure of ANY school at this point, and think we need to more carefully consider options in consultation with families who will be affected by any closures, and who are *already* being impacted by the uncertainty raised by the proposals themselves. I will end with one final appeal--in my time working with policymakers, I have been told that no one goes into the public sector to cut services--please, let us help North Tyneside keep its vibrant schools in a way that is a resilient and sustainable model for our area.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 11:17 PM

I strongly oppose the proposal as a parent of children at Langley First School. Both of my children [redacted] are current pupils who are thriving under the care and guidance of fantastic teachers and support staff. It is beyond belief that a proposal of this nature makes it to consultation stage in its current format, littered with inaccurate information and with no consideration of the impact on children and families in the community. There is a lack of clarity around future state of education provision for younger children impacted by this change. My son has just entered the school nursery

and is due to start in reception at Langley in September 2026. We moved him to Langley this year to support him with his transition to school education and to help support his development as he was identified as requiring additional support at his previous early years setting. He has thrived in his first few months at Langley and quickly has developed close relationships with staff and pupils. He loves a “Langley day” and is always excited to go to school. I am very anxious about a second transition when he is settling so well into the school and we are starting to work with the SEN team to provide him with additional support. My daughter is transitioning to middle school in 2026 but the uncertainty around the future of the school for her younger brother and her cousin who recently relocated to the area and started in reception this year is causing a lot of angst and confusion at a time when she should be focusing on enjoying her final year and getting ready to move. Issues with the proposal that lead my husband and I to feel strongly that this is not the decision for our children or the community: The information provided under the proposal has a number of inaccuracies; * Langley has a field separated by a public highway, meaning groups of children are escorted ‘off site’ for each PE/sporting activity and have no access to playing fields for lunch and dinner breaks. This simply isn’t true and reads as a fabrication designed to bolster a weak proposal. The school does in fact have a well-used playing field immediately adjacent to the building, with a separate field across a minor road which is used once a year for sports day. Langley also has an outdoor space in the reception garden, which follows a forest school ethos and is also used for children with SEND as well as a potting garden and an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming. My daughter has taken advantage of joining extra garden activities during and after school and this is something I would also want my son to have the opportunity to enjoy. * The school is in financial deficit. This is incorrect. The school has only predicted a deficit for the year 25/26, for the first time ever and is working with an independent financial advisor to see where the budget can be improved. Given the financial situation of other schools in the area including those with private funding contract which will expire within the next 10 years this to me is not a valid reason to select Langley as a school to close over others with lower pupil numbers and worse financial projections. * The majority of dwellings currently in Langley catchment can access Appletree without crossing major roads. For my family a move to Appletree would mean crossing both Seatonville Road AND Cauldwell Lane. Furthermore I would need to drive due to the increased distance from my home making a school drop off on foot (our current arrangement) incompatible with work commitments. * There were also several inaccuracies around data published in the consultation documents, including but not limited to: Projected pupil numbers, Deficit forecasting and Inaccuracies in pupil data at other schools * There has been no community impact assessment done in

relation to the closure of Langley First School. A community impact assessment was done in December 2024 but this was in relation to the Monkseaton High School closure. * Neither early years provision nor wraparound provision have been considered as part of this consultation both of which are relevant for my household and extended family who also have children at Langley and make use of wraparound around provision. No governing body or senior manager of 'School's Out' (out of hours provision) at Langley has been contacted as part of external communication. It is fundamentally wrong for the council to position this as a merger of two schools. The proposed closure of Langley school could have been made more palatable had a TRUE merger been considered with staff and governance also transitioning together with pupils to maintain and continue our community rather than requiring the youngest members of our our community to adapt on their own. It is not clear how Appletree gardens will accommodate such a high increase in pupil numbers by absorbing all of the pupils who are in scope to move, nor has the impact on class sizes and the educational impact of larger classes been assessed. I would not want my son at a larger school where he doesn't get the individual care and attention that he currently receives at Langley. This consultation assumes parents will choose to send their children to Appletree Gardens if Langley First School is closed. This certainly would not be the case for my family and with a surplus at many of the other schools in the area, it cannot be assumed that Appletree would be the school of choice. The council's consultation document shows 44% of catchment children attend Appletree compared to 73% at Langley; 12% of Langley pupils attend from the Appletree Gardens catchment area. In the most recent 2 previous years of higher birth rates, 2020 reception and 2023 reception intakes, Appletree was the only NEPA first school with surplus spaces in admissions, 14 and 6 respectively. For the 2 lowest birth rate years, 2024 and 2025 intake, Appletree had the largest portion of surplus places in admissions against PAN, 32% and 45% respectively. When looking at the 2025 admissions data, the distance of the last place offered at Langley was nearly 6 miles, compared to 3.6 miles for Appletree, demonstrating a far wider geographic draw and a greater ability to attract families from further afield. Of the 187 parents who responded to the survey carried out by Friends of Langley, 88.2% said Appletree Gardens was not one of their school preferences when they applied for their school places. That same survey also asked which school would be their first choice of school for their children if Langley were to close. Of the 187 responses to this question: * 38.5% chose South Wellfield (72 parents) * 20.3% chose Southridge (38 parents) * 11.2% chose Marine Park (21 parents) * 11.2% chose Appletree (21 parents) * 3.2% chose Whitley Lodge (6 parents) * 3.2% chose Coquet Park (6 parents When asked if they would take a place at Appletree Gardens if offered, 43 parents said no. An analysis of birth rates mapped against six years' of

reception offers data for each school showed Appletree Gardens is ranked as the most sensitive school in the entire planning area to falling birth rates. Langley, by contrast, has a medium sensitivity, cushioned by its proven popularity and wider draw. The council's proposal is therefore not just to close the more popular school, thereby ignoring parental choice, but also to close the more demographically stable and resilient one, leading to a longer-term risk for the local area, which is further compounded by the building of new homes in the Murton gap development which will come almost as fast as Langley First School and which is predominantly family sized homes. Furthermore, per earlier comments the need to drive to school means that Appletree is not the preferred option for our family as the roads around the school are not safe. There is no pedestrian segregation during the busy drop off and pickup period with buses and commuter traffic in the area. Langley currently closes the street outside school every morning to make it safer for the children. Appletree cannot close the street to cars in the mornings or at collection times due to it being on a bus route. Langley also has a free public car park very close by, which Appletree Gardens does not have. The assumption appears to be that children will walk to school. The parent survey carried out by Friends of Langley shows that for many families like ours the need to drive to school would increase which is not only worse for the environment, it doesn’t teach sustainable travel habits to the children and increases the risk of a collision with a child on the school run a safety concern which does worry me if my son is placed there. We are heavily reliant on wraparound provision to allow both my husband and I to work full time. It is not clear how this would work if our son is moved to another setting. Other schools connected to this proposal but without sufficient detail or consideration: 1. Woodlawn The consultation outlines the intention for the council to repurpose the Langley site and move the post-16 provision from Marden High School (32 children in total according to Ofsted), thereby displacing 300 children for the benefit of 32 children By bundling the two issues - the alleged need to close a school with the need to expand Woodlawn - the council is effectively creating a false choice: asking the community to accept a suboptimal and unstable mainstream solution in exchange for a desirable SEND solution. The long-term health of the mainstream school system should not be compromised to solve a logistical problem for SEND provision, however important that provision may be. 2. Coquet Park First School Within the consultation documents, the council makes reference to considering the closure of Coquet Park but that this was not deemed financially viable. This is due to a private finance initiative (PFI) school, which the council is contractually obligated to until 2032. According to the council’s cabinet paper, 2022/23 was the first financial year that the school ended with a deficit balance, and it ended 2024/25 with a cumulative deficit of £0.325m. The school has been unable to submit a budget

plan which shows it coming back into financial balance within three years. In line with Scheme for Financing Schools, the school is classified as being in a structural deficit, which means there is a long-term financial problem that requires significant, strategic changes to resolve. The school currently also has a one-form entry, something the council says is not financially viable. As well as being poor value for money for the taxpayer, due to the high interest charges the PFI contract is costing the council, this school is not financially viable by the council's own recognition. In the absence of any proposed solutions being made available, it is difficult to understand how the council proposes to stop this school from being forced to close once the PFI contract ends in 2032. Finally I would like to share that the culture of Langley First School is truly fantastic and it would be a true loss for the monkseaton community should the school disappear. This culture is authentic and reliant on the staff team – their strong relationships, communication skills, connection and dedication to the children. The team at Langley truly put our children and families at the heart of what they do and I strongly believe that any change to school provision should do the same. This proposal DOES NOT consider the children or the families impacted nor does the consultation window give sufficient time or information to develop alternative proposals which could achieve the same goal in a different way. Should Langley First School close North Tyneside Council will be doing a significant disservice to our children and our community.

Screen Name Redacted
11/12/2025 11:34 PM

The decision to merge these schools would impact on other schools in the Whitley bay and monkseaton area. My child attends a nearby school. The birth rate information does not appear to be based on reliable data. The proposal appears to be a knee jerk reaction and not properly thought through. There are other schools in the locality that are oversubscribed- why is consideration not being given to levelling out the numbers and allocating places to the two under subscribed schools? There is considerable development in the nearby area - why are schools merging and closing when the development is going to attract more families to the area? This will place more pressure on local schools and create a strained admissions system in years to come. There does not appear to be any foresight and forward thinking applied here. It is a real concern that in future all schools in the area will be oversubscribed and there will be calls to build another school to cope with the demand.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 12:11 AM

While the general negative impacts of this proposal are clear, I wish to detail the specific and severe consequences the closure of Langley First School would have on my sister's family, where both parents are full-time employees. The proposed merger is not simply a relocation; it is a fundamental disruption to a family's ability to work and live in

the community due to the inadequacy of the provision at the proposed receiving site, Appletree Gardens. 1. Critical Disruption to Full-Time Childcare and Employment The most significant negative impact on my sister's family is the loss of Langley's superior out-of-hours provision, "Schools Out," which is essential for a two full-time working parent household. Inadequate Hours: The current provision at Langley runs from 7:30 am to 6:00 pm. The provision at Appletree, "Little Pips," runs only from 7:45 am to 5:30 pm (4:30 pm for nursery children). This loss of 30 minutes in the afternoon is critical. For a family with typical full-time working hours and a commute, this makes collecting my nephew by 5:30 pm untenable. Loss of Holiday Care: "Schools Out" at Langley provides provision for all school holidays except Christmas. This vital support would be lost entirely, forcing my sister to find and pay for separate holiday childcare for the majority of the year. Forced Reduction in Working Hours: The loss of this specific wraparound provision would force 35.6% of parents to cut their working hours. My sister would be placed in this position, forcing a reduction in household income and a negative impact on her career, solely due to the Council's proposal failing to ensure equivalent childcare. 2. Increased Safety Risk and Logistical Strain on the Daily Commute The relocation to the Appletree Gardens site would introduce unnecessary safety risks and logistical strain. Road Safety: Relocating the school would require my 5-year-old nephew and his family to navigate busier roads. The campaign information confirms that many Langley catchment dwellings would require crossing major roads like Seatonville Road and/or Cauldwell Lane to access Appletree. Traffic Congestion: The Appletree site is not suited to an influx of new families. The Council's data fails to account for the major increase in vehicle use: the parent survey found the percentage of parents who drive to school would increase from 18.3% to 55%. This will create significant traffic congestion, making drop-off and collection more stressful and dangerous. Lack of Closure: Unlike Langley, Appletree is on a bus route and cannot close its street for safety during peak times, compounding the risk from increased traffic. 3. Compromise of SEN and Inclusive Culture Langley First School has an established, highly regarded reputation for an inclusive culture and a Neurodiversity Affirming approach, supported by specific resources like a dedicated Sensory Room. While my nephew may not currently be designated as having Special Educational Needs (SEN), should any additional needs emerge during his time at school, the closure would remove access to these proven resources and the school's proximity to Woodlawn Special School for potential dual registration. The Council has provided no guarantees that the quality, staffing, or specialized adapted spaces would be retained at Appletree, creating a risk that my nephew's educational and developmental needs will be compromised. In summary, this proposal places an undue and unfair burden on my sister's family, forcing them to choose between their careers and

adequate care for their child. I urge the Council to consider this specific impact on working families as a reason to reject the proposal and retain Langley First School.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 12:26 AM

As mentioned above on a personal note, should the current Council proposal go ahead my youngest child will be amongst the last to go to Langley first school. The nursery, Year one and year two would be moved to Appletree gardens. My concern means that the teaching staff who are now losing their jobs would have to seek more stable employment elsewhere leaving a small skeleton crew behind. The wealth of knowledge, expertise and general excellent support that the school currently offers my daughter would be lost. I fear her education and development might suffer also. This along with changes to the middle/ high school admissions may also effect her future. Every parent wants the best for their Child and I believe that Langley is one of the best schools. I know the Council is under huge financial strain, but I do believe that closing our schools could be a huge mistake that we all may struggle to recover from. So if we can't keep the schools open, building a 'new' larger school with a new identity for all maybe the best option. Woodlawn making use of the old Langley site is one of the few advantages. A slower closure and well structured merger would hopefully mean fewer job losses also. For those whom ultimately have to make the decision please consider all the views and alternatives before making the decision that will affect so many young lives.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 12:47 AM

I am a parent of two young children at Langley First School, with my eldest in Reception and my youngest in Nursery. I write to express my strongest possible rejection of this proposal. My family's decision to move into this catchment was deliberate and intentional. We chose this community specifically for Langley First School and the stability of the three-tier system. This proposal seeks to undo the very reason we are here. Langley has been more than just a school; it has been an exceptional, nurturing community for our family. My eldest son is a sensitive, shy little boy who struggled with his starts in both nursery and reception. The staff at Langley didn't just accommodate him; they actively supported and championed him with a patience and kindness that has allowed him to flourish. Today, he is a confident boy with a tight-knit friendship group. He feels safe, secure, and known - [redacted] This is the kind of environment you cannot simply recreate or merge. This stability is precisely why his younger brother, who just started nursery, has settled immediately. He sees his brother, he already knew his teachers from walking in, and he instantly felt part of the Langley family. This seamless, supportive ecosystem extends to Schools Out, which shares Langley's values

and, crucially, has minimal staff turnover. These are the same familiar, trusted faces our boys rely on every day. This proposal threatens to shatter this stability. The impact on my family would be profoundly disruptive and damaging. You are proposing to dismantle the very community that has allowed my children to thrive, causing anxiety and uncertainty for the pupils who need stability the most. This is made worse by the fact that the proposal effectively engineers a situation with no parental choice. We do not want to send our children to Appletree. But by merging these schools, you are deliberately creating a capacity crisis. Your own figures prove this: with Marine Park having only 4 reception spaces and South Wellfield having none, families like mine with siblings are left with no viable alternative. You would be taking away our choice entirely, forcing us to send our children to a school we actively chose against. This feels like a complete betrayal of the families who, like mine, moved to this area specifically for the promise of an outstanding local school like Langley. Beyond the personal cost, the rationale provided for this decision is built on a foundation of fundamentally incorrect assumptions. Your entire case for this merger rests on four factors, every single one of which is demonstrably and deeply flawed. 1. Aligning admission numbers to 390 Your projection of needing to align admission numbers to 390 is unrealistic. Historical data shows a stable link between local (NEPA) births and admissions. To exceed the 390 cap, admissions would need to inexplicably jump by over 59% from births. Based on historical data, there is less than 1% probability this will happen. (this data has been shared with you separately and is part of the pre-consultation process) You have not forecasted anywhere near the housing yield to justify this, and with falling birth rates across North Tyneside, it is illogical to assume an increase of out-of-area applicants will fill these surplus spaces. The reason your forecast is wrong is that your entire model is fundamentally broken at a planning-area level. Your model simply distributes the borough's total reception numbers by recent shares; it completely ignores where children are actually being born. A far simpler, more accurate, and DfE-compliant model is to anchor the forecast to actual NEPA births (NEPA births x K). This method is demonstrably the better predictor for this area. You are using a flawed, borough-wide model to create the potential for a ‘‘capacity crisis’ that will not exist in the forecast period. Your 390 cap is a pretext to justify an unjustifiable decision. 2. Langley is an a worse financial position Using Langley's 'worse financial position' as a primary justification is dangerously short-sighted and ignores the most critical data; parental demand and long-term stability. These deficit figures are a single forecast at one point in time. Almost every school in the area, and indeed over half in North Tyneside, are facing the exact same financial pressures. Singling out Langley for a problem that is systemic is a disingenuous pretext for this proposal. This short-term view completely ignores the fact that Langley is, by every key

metric, the more popular, resilient, and sustainable school. - Stronger Demand: For over a decade, Langley has averaged ~93% full, versus Appletree's ~82%. For 2025, Langley's first preferences account for 78% of its places; Appletree's are only 50%. Parents are choosing Langley. - Less Sensitive to Falling Births: This is the most important factor you are ignoring. Langley's intake is materially insulated from falling birth rates (elasticity of ~0.80). Appletree's is highly vulnerable (elasticity of ~2.05). - The Stress Test: In simple terms, a 10% drop in local births would cause only an ~8% drop in reception admissions for Langley, leaving it viable and sustainable. That same 10% drop would cause a disastrous ~20% drop for Appletree, leaving it clearly unsustainable. (this data has been shared already and is part of the pre-consultative process) Langley is, without question, the safer long-term investment for this community. Any short-term deficit could be addressed by capitalising on clear opportunities - like creating an under-3 provision or bringing wraparound care in-house. 3. Appletree has a larger school building The claim that Appletree has a "larger school building" is a classic example of valuing quantity over quality. This supposed "advantage" is, in fact, a significant liability. This proposal would force children from superior facilities into inferior ones. - Only 2 of Appletree's 13 classrooms actually meet the government's own guidance for class sizes. - In stark contrast, 10 of Langley's 11 classrooms exceed that guidance. - Appletree's hall is below the minimum recommended size for a KS2 school. Langley's assembly hall is significantly larger and fully compliant. - The Appletree building comes with massively higher running costs (approx. £44,000 vs. Langley's £7,000) and will be far less space-efficient. Langley is, by all practical and qualitative measures, the superior site. 4. Woodlawn to expand into Langley Finally, the proposal presents the repurposing of the Langley site for an expanded Woodlawn Special School as a significant community benefit. This constructs a false choice. You are asking this community to accept a permanently suboptimal and unstable mainstream education solution as the price for improved SEND provision. The long-term health of our local mainstream school system should never be compromised to solve a logistical real-estate problem for SEND provision, no matter how vital that provision is. You are effectively pitting the needs of one group of children against another, rather than solving for both. Furthermore, you are overlooking an alternative that complements both schools. Langley is one of the few first schools in the country already uniquely co-located beside a special school. There is a rapidly growing national demand for meaningful mainstream inclusion for special school students - Langley is perfectly situated to deliver this. Instead of closing us down, you have the opportunity to work with parents and staff to create a flagship Inclusive Learning Community for the area. This is not a theoretical idea; it is a proven model. Schools like Hob Moor Oaks & Community Primary in York, and the Broadwaters Inclusive

Learning Community (The Brook & The Willow) in Haringey, demonstrate that co-located integration creates thriving environments for all children. You have the potential here to create a model of excellence for the entire region instead of choosing to dismantle it. The execution of this proposal is timed to be maximally disruptive and dangerous. You are forcing this merger at the worst possible time, just as two very large cohorts move across from Langley. This will push Appletree to 100% of its physical capacity of 404 children. This means children will be cramped into small classrooms that are already below government guidance, and the entire school will feel the crush in shared areas. You are creating an unmanageable environment by forcing this merger. Appletree's assembly hall is already 10m2 under the minimum government guidance for KS2 children. Langley's hall, by contrast, is a spacious 192m2. To put this in perspective: you could build a full-sized, compliant KS2 classroom (55m2) inside Langley's hall, and the remaining space (137m2) would still be larger than Appletree's entire 130m2 substandard hall. You are actively choosing to move children from a superior, spacious, and compliant facility into one that is cramped and inadequate. You are creating a short-lived expansion crisis that will see Appletree at ~100% capacity in 2027, creating a self-imposed manufactured educational disaster. The school will be forced to hire a wave of temporary staff to manage this 'bulge,' creating a revolving door of unfamiliar faces at the exact moment our displaced children will be desperate for stability and support. All leadership energy will be diverted to crisis management, not pastoral care. Then, just as quickly, this chaos will evaporate. The school will collapse to a ~70% surplus on an enlarged, inefficient estate by 2030. All the painful, disruptive adjustments made to cope - the staggered lunches, the split-playgrounds, the temporary timetables - will have been for nothing. Worse, you are simply kicking the can down the road. Given how susceptible Appletree is to falling birth rates, we estimate reception admissions will then decline further, to around 83% of PAN from 2032, leaving the "merged" school just as financially unsustainable as it is now. You are inflicting permanent disruption and instability on our children to solve a temporary, self-inflicted problem. Perhaps most cruelly, by stopping Langley's reception admissions in 2026, you are targeting the youngest and most vulnerable children first. My youngest son, who has just settled, found his place, and wears his uniform with pride, will be uprooted again in a year. You are telling a four-year-old he is part of a school, only to tear him away from his brother and everything he knows. You are disrupting those newest to school-life simply to manage flawed capacity numbers at Appletree. Capacity chaos will inevitably congest traffic at the merged site. Our own parent survey shows the number of parents who drive will increase from 36% to 58%. This is a clear safety hazard. Parking near Appletree will become dangerously congested, and walking routes will be compromised by cars on pavements. The street

Appletree is on has already seen two minor accidents involving children, has had the fire service brand it as “an accident waiting to happen”, and just this week there was a crash on Bromley Avenue at 9am. Pushing many more pupils and cars into this exact spot feels reckless. Viable alternatives that avoid a merger entirely have been ignored. But even if a merger is forced upon us, there is a far more humane and logical approach than this one. A two-year delay with a split-site 30 PAN model would lower the combined roll to a manageable ~325 pupils. This would put less pressure on everything - the classrooms, the halls, the children, and the roads, and it would crucially allow the existing nursery children to complete their first school journey in the school they have come to know and love. My family moved to this area for Langley First School. We made a choice. Your proposal not only takes that choice away from us, it seeks to force my children into an inferior, unsafe, and unsustainable environment based on a fantasy forecast and a complete misreading of the facts. You have been presented with an argument that is not just flawed; it is a failure of logic, data, and due diligence. You are planning to close a thriving and superior school to solve a problem that you yourselves have manufactured. This is a failure of policy and a failure of care. I am not just a statistic in your flawed model; I am a parent of two small boys whose stability and happiness you are threatening to shatter. I urge you in the strongest possible terms to listen to the evidence, listen to the parents, and abandon this ill-conceived and deeply damaging proposal.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 12:53 AM

Other local schools having to take on further pupils. Unsettling for the children feeling misplaced and unwanted at such a critical time in their lives. Further cars in the road and congestion through Monkseaton, which is already quite unbearable as a resident using that road during rush hour, as all the families that currently walk to Langley will need to get their children to school by transport, therefore safety is a concern and local residents will endure further parking frustrations. Lots more complaints to the council! Effects middle school catchment and has a knock on effect for high school catchment further down the line. Even goes as far as effecting house prices, as people will move to be closer to different catchment schools, would start to make the area less desirable

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 02:48 AM

Our child has additional needs, for which Langley first school have been brilliant in handling. They have helped our little one cope with herself - for some may say she misbehaves - when she just finds being still difficult. The teachers and care at Langley have been incredible, and she thrives at a school which shows love, compassion, understanding. She has grown into a caring, wonderful young girl who looks out for others and always wants to help.

Because that is what she has been taught by the teachers and staff at Langley. Appletree, by comparison - we have news of parents attempting to get their chlidren with additional some help and the teacher themself refusing (despite a plan being put in place) Imagine that. Those there to teach, to help, to cherish the children are instead unwilling to do so. What a horrific thing to bear, having the very teachers refusing to do what is best for the children. This is where my daughter may struggle. From bright and alive, to likely punished and made to feel at odds with the world? This, to me, is not acceptable - and it would be another part of a Legacy decision that would leave us as a family deeply hurt. That is the fear with Appletree, which also runs a Truancy rate nearly three times that of Langley. We have seen Appletree not engage at all with proposals, clamming up. Somehow they have pitched themselves against Langley. [redacted] This is the choice the council is proposing - frankly it is terrifying to thing we would have to send our daughter to such a place. Parental choice is now being stripped away from us also, and this is supposed to be paramount in planning and thinking. Another effect of all of this. We would be concerned about Appletree, and would have to consider what to do in this case. We moved to this area for Langley, and the promise of school that cared about our daughers well being.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 05:03 AM

I have recently moved to North Tyneside after several years living in a different local authority. In deciding to move here, the options for schools was something important to us in planning our future. The high quality schools and parental choice this provides across the borough, and particularly across NEPA, was something that drew us to this area. I am therefore extremely concerned about the impact on parental choice by the closure of a high quality schools and such as Langley First School. Furthermore, the process that has taken place with regard to the merger of Langley First School and Appletree Gardens has caused me to lose complete trust in the ability of North Tyneside Council to do its job and to have the best interests of the local community at the centre of decision making. Factors impacting my trust in the councils ability include the number of inaccuracies in the documentation provided around this consultation, the lack of Community Impact Assessment around Langley First School, the decision making around merger vs closure and the inability of the council to answer pertinent questions that have been raised. Inaccuracies - Langley First School not having access to a playing field that is not across a road. This is untrue, there is a well-used playing field immediately adjacent to the building. - the majority of dwellings within Langley catchment area would be able to access Appletree Gardens without crossing a major road - this is untrue, with

a large proportion of Langley students needing to cross either Seatonville Road or Cauldwell Lane to reach Appletree Gardens. - Langley First School is not currently in financial deficit These are a small example of the number of inaccuracies in this consultation. Considering the significant impact of this proposal on the children in our local community, I am extremely concerned by the council's apparent lack of competency that these inaccuracies highlight. Community Impact Assessment The lack of a community impact assessment again makes me question the council's priorities. I appreciate that funding changes often mean difficult decisions need to be made, however the local community must be prioritised in these decisions and not considering the direct impact of the merger before proposing it is extremely concerning. Merger vs amalgamation If a reduction in the number of schools is unavoidable, I struggle to see how a merger is preferable to an amalgamation. Divides are being felt in the community already by this proposal, and the proposition that children from Langley First School are expected to move into another existing school community and be able to flourish is misguidedly optimistic. Amalgamating would at least give the children the opportunity to all feel part of the process and that their thoughts and wellbeing matter. Furthermore, the FAQs that have been published by Notth Tyneside Council only strengthen my opinion that a merger is being suggested as the "easier option". I am extremely concerned that my council would take the easier option rather than the right option. Seeking permission from external bodies such as Secretary of State would increase the scrutiny of the process, which can only be a good thing in terms of ensuring that the best possible decision has been made. If the council are willing to take shortcuts regarding the wellbeing of the children in our community, what faith can I have that shortcuts are not being taken everywhere? Insufficient response to questions and lack of planning The council have seemingly been unable to answer several concerns that have already been raised, further questioning my trust in their competency and transparency in decision making. For example, there has been no assurance about how children from Langley will be accommodated on the Appletree Gardens site, a building with an advertised capacity of only 293. Furthermore, questions around how there will be capacity for SEN provision in such increased numbers have not been answered, nor have queries around class sizes. There has also been lack of planning around lots of areas, for example traffic. Langley closes the road to traffic every morning to prioritise children's safety. Appletree is unable to do this, and as a result of the difficulty walking to Appletree and lack of local car park, the traffic around Appletree is already extremely problematic for the local neighbourhood. I can't imagine how adding all of Langley pupils into this would be feasible, the impact this would have on the local neighbourhood or indeed the safety of children who are able to walk to school. I can't imagine the impact primarily because North Tyneside Council have done nothing

to reassure me that this has even been considered. Summary To summarise, I am extremely disheartened by the process North Tyneside Council has taken with regard to this proposal. The lack of long-term planning, numerous errors in the information used to underpin the proposal, and lack of consideration for the impact on the community has really made me question the competence of the Council in making decisions. I have lost trust in their ability to prioritise the local community, and can only hope that our opinions will eventually be heard through this consultation to ensure the council will make the right decision, not the easy one.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 05:10 AM

My son [redacted] has just started reception at Langley First School. I also have 2 older children [redacted] that have previously attended Langley. [redacted] Most first schools would deem support for middle school as not their issue but not at Langley, they really do care and support the children even if they will not benefit. [redacted] Support from Langley has enabled [redacted] to remain in mainstream school. Unlike many other children with an ASD diagnosis, [redacted] has a great future ahead of him where we can see him in employment when he is older and contributing to society – we

truly believe this is due to his great start at Langley. [redacted] I learnt from this nursery that not all early year's staff are good at their job which is one of my fears for this proposal as poor staff and teachers do exist. The private nursery could not retain their staff and had frequent staff turnover, due to his ASD [redacted] could not cope with this, he would not want to go to nursey and would scream as soon as we drove in. I knew from my experience with [redacted] and [redacted] at Langley that [redacted] would be supported there. [redacted] As soon as [redacted] commenced Langley nursery they went above and beyond yet again. [redacted]

[redacted] Langley is unique as the school entrance is at the opposite side of the school yard entrance which permits [redacted] to have a quiet route in and out. Due to his needs I drive [redacted] to school as he is unable to walk more than a few steps whilst in an unsecure area. As the majority of children at Langley walk to school or park in the car park next to the school there are always lots of parking spaces near the school where I can park legally and safely. I have driven past Appletree several times since the proposal and there is nowhere I can park to get [redacted] into school. The outside of the school has school no parking markings where several cars are usually parked illegally outside the school gate's partly on the pavement. The traffic at Appletree is extremely busy and from data Langley have obtained from a parent staff survey 104 parents out of 175 confirmed they would drive to Appletree. This would create a very dangerous situation for our children, and this has not been assessed by NTC as part of the proposal. Seatonville Road is grid locked at drop off times and it takes 20 minutes to drive through, drivers currently cut through the streets including ours speeding as they are frustrated with the traffic. The proposal would make this worse. At Langley once the school children are inside the building, they then lock the yard and nursery gates at set times. I have never seen any of Appletree gates locked at any time of the day. [redacted] I am worried as it's likely that sensory/breakout spaces at Appletree will be used for classrooms as there won't be enough space for both, no assurances have been given regarding this from NTC. As the proposal includes putting several year groups together in an overcrowded school [redacted] will not be able to cope with this. [redacted]

[redacted] I attended the parents' questions and answers session at Whitley Bay High. At the meeting we were asked to not record partly due to children being in attendance in previous meeting, there were zero children in attendance in this second meeting, this instantly set the precedent that this was not going to be a transparent meeting. By holding both meetings in the evening single parents were discriminated against, this meeting should have been recorded for those parents that could not attend. The presentation in this meeting included inaccuracies within its data. The children were never mentioned at all which was very concerning. There was no reference to how their education or wellbeing would be supported, no mention of assessments being undertaken or what SEND provisions would be put in place. None of our questions were answered, responses were "we hope" or "we will complete an assessment". Answers could not be given regarding class sizes. It became apparent that little to no actual plans had been done regarding how the Appletree school would look and when we asked several times "why Langley" this question was not answered, again providing no transparency. As no answers were given during this meeting it felt pointless to parents and added more unanswered worries, it was clear this was a tick box exercise for NTC to confirm they had held a questions and answers session but in reality, we didn't get answers. It was very concerning when a parent asked regarding if an equality assessment had been completed for the children's transition particularly as Langley has lots of SEND children. The response was "this has not been done but we can look at the assessment from the Monkseaton High School children". First School

children are very different to High School children and from the parents I have spoken to that were affected by the Monkseaton High School closure, these children are unfortunately not OK, their mental health has been impacted. The children that are still there in year 11 have also returned to lots of new teachers in September. They are currently in their GCSE year, potentially the most important year of their education which is detrimental to their future. If this proposal goes ahead Langley staff will look for jobs at other schools most likely outside of North Tyneside and will leave prior to September 2027. [redacted] these employees will most likely struggle mentally with the financial strain of redundancy which will result in sick leave. Teachers leaving will also impact negatively on the children's mental health. The loss of these teachers and support staff that have high teaching standards will be a loss to North Tyneside. The proposal includes several inaccuracies which have been used to select Langley. This includes the reference to Langley having no school field and children having to cross a public highway for PE lessons, this is incorrect Langley has a school field. It also references Appletree as having two halls, Langley also has two halls. It is stated that Appletree and Langley use the same phonics teaching methods, this is incorrect and would impact the children significantly. These inaccuracies show that NTC have not visited Langley or the other first schools in Whitley Bay, this is concerning for such a big decision affecting hundreds of children. The proposal includes that Appletree has more classrooms than Langley however Langley is a larger school. The proposal advises that the majority of children can get to Appletree without crossing major roads. This is incorrect most of the Langley children live at the other side of Bromley Avenue and Seatonville Road, both extremely busy roads. Seatonville Road previously had 2 lollipop attendants, it currently has none providing no assurance that road safety is a priority of NTCs. The proposal includes data regarding predicted birth rates/children in Langley catchment. There has been no data provided regarding who lives in the houses in Langley and Appletree catchment from Census data, this data is pivotal to obtaining more accurate and useful data. As Monkseaton is one of the more expensive areas to like in North Tyneside families move there for Langley First School and the 3 tier system at a later stage. [redacted] We saved up and bought our house in Monkseaton for Langley First School when our daughter was 2 years old therefore we were not in the 'predicted birth rates' in Whitley Bay. During this proposal which NTC advise is due to falling birth rates and finances NTC have announced the reopening of Battle Hill Nursery. [redacted] It is very difficult for Langley parents to understand how

this is being reopened when our nursery and 'schools out' provision which includes pre nursery childcare is being closed which affects children already in these provisions. As part of the Facts section on the website NTC advise that parents getting children to and from different schools is the same as when parents have children at different first and middle schools. The proposal would mean that some parents will have children at different first schools/nurseries. Unlike children at middle schools first school children cannot be dropped off and left they need to be taken into the schools, this would not be possible to do with children at two different first schools, parents can't physically be in two different places at the same time twice a day, this would result in parents needing to reduce working hours impacting them financially. Since the proposal over 6000 people have signed a petition against the closure of Langley, we ask you that you consider these alongside all of the views submitted. Langley is the heart of Monkseaton Village and vital to the whole community. It is a nurturing, friendly and inclusive school with high teaching standards as soon as you walk through the door it's clear it is a very special school, to lose it would be a great loss.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 05:50 AM

Every year we get some fantastic pupils from Langley consistently to our middle school . The decision has not been made on reputation that staff have worked so hard for but on practical reasons which will undermine the quality of education in north Tyneside as a direct result

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 08:02 AM

I attended Langley, as have my daughters and many of my friends children. Langley has and always will give any child the best educational experience and grounding to develop which is the very least any child deserves. [redacted] In my immediate locality young families have moved in with the clear intention of sending children to Langley (before we even consider Robinson Fields which will increase demands on Monkseaton and it's infrastructure). I now see a steady flow of families safely taking young children to Langley on a daily basis on foot Additionally I notice the huge volume of traffic already going through Monkseaton. Closing Langley is a huge concern for children getting to school, for the majority I suspect parents will be forced to use cars instead of walking. This adding to the poor traffic situation and removing the small walk that enhances a start to anyone's day. Couple this with the parking concerns and issues already prevalent around Appletree, this Has to be considered for any child's safety. This very shortsighted plan based purely on spreadsheet and no site visits is shocking. I fear if this merger takes place the overall standard of any childs education and development will be hugely impacted as they are "lost" within a larger school environment, that is not at all suitable for any child (be they Langley or Appletree) Larger class sizes and stressed teaching

staff will mean overall focus is lost and all children become nameless numbers who will not have any opportunity to be developed to their full potential Hardly a good strategy for our combined future NTC.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 08:06 AM

I strongly oppose the proposal as a parent of children at Langley First School. Both of my children [redacted] are current pupils who are thriving under the care and guidance of fantastic teachers and support staff. It is beyond belief that a proposal of this nature makes it to consultation stage in its current format, littered with inaccurate information and with no consideration of the impact on children and families in the community. There is a lack of clarity around future state of education provision for younger children impacted by this change. My son has just entered the school nursery and is due to start in reception at Langley in September 2026. We moved him to Langley this year to support him with his transition to school education [redacted] He has thrived in his first few months at Langley and quickly has developed close relationships with staff and pupils. He loves a “Langley day” and is always excited to go to school. I am very anxious about a second transition when he is settling so well into the school [redacted] My daughter is transitioning to middle school in 2026 but the uncertainty around the future of the school for her younger brother and her cousin who recently relocated to the area and started in reception this year is causing a lot of angst and confusion at a time when she should be focusing on enjoying her final year and getting ready to move. Issues with the proposal that lead my wife and I to feel strongly that this is not the decision for our children or the community: The information provided under the proposal has a number of inaccuracies; Langley has a field separated by a public highway, meaning groups of children are escorted ‘off site’ for each PE/sporting activity and have no access to playing fields for lunch and dinner breaks. This simply isn’t true and reads as a fabrication designed to bolster a weak proposal. The school does in fact have a well-used playing field immediately adjacent to the building, with a separate field across a minor road which is used once a year for sports day. Langley also has an outdoor space in the reception garden, which follows a forest school ethos and is also used for children with SEND as well as a potting garden and an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming. My daughter has taken advantage of joining extra garden activities during and after school and this is something I would also want my son to have the opportunity to enjoy. The school is in financial deficit. This is incorrect. The school has only predicted a deficit for the year 25/26, for the first time ever and is working with an independent financial advisor to see where the budget can be improved. Given the financial

situation of other schools in the area including those with private funding contract which will expire within the next 10 years this to me is not a valid reason to select Langley as a school to close over others with lower pupil numbers and worse financial projections. The majority of dwellings currently in Langley catchment can access Appletree without crossing major roads. For my family a move to Appletree would mean crossing both Seatonville Road AND Cauldwell Lane. Furthermore I would need to drive due to the increased distance from my home making a school drop off on foot (our current arrangement) incompatible with work commitments. There were also several inaccuracies around data published in the consultation documents, including but not limited to: Projected pupil numbers, Deficit forecasting and Inaccuracies in pupil data at other schools There has been no community impact assessment done in relation to the closure of Langley First School. A community impact assessment was done in December 2024 but this was in relation to the Monkseaton High School closure. Neither early years provision nor wraparound provision have been considered as part of this consultation both of which are relevant for my household and extended family who also have children at Langley and make use of wraparound around provision. No governing body or senior manager of 'School's Out' (out of hours provision) at Langley has been contacted as part of external communication. It is fundamentally wrong for the council to position this as a merger of two schools. The proposed closure of Langley school could have been made more palatable had a TRUE merger been considered with staff and governance also transitioning together with pupils to maintain and continue our community rather than requiring the youngest members of our our community to adapt on their own. It is not clear how Appletree gardens will accommodate such a high increase in pupil numbers by absorbing all of the pupils who are in scope to move, nor has the impact on class sizes and the educational impact of larger classes been assessed. I would not want my son at a larger school where he doesn't get the individual care and attention that he currently receives at Langley. This consultation assumes parents will choose to send their children to Appletree Gardens if Langley First School is closed. This certainly would not be the case for my family and with a surplus at many of the other schools in the area, it cannot be assumed that Appletree would be the school of choice. The council's consultation document shows 44% of catchment children attend Appletree compared to 73% at Langley; 12% of Langley pupils attend from the Appletree Gardens catchment area. In the most recent 2 previous years of higher birth rates, 2020 reception and 2023 reception intakes, Appletree was the only NEPA first school with surplus spaces in admissions, 14 and 6 respectively. For the 2 lowest birth rate years, 2024 and 2025 intake, Appletree had the largest portion of surplus places in admissions against PAN, 32% and 45% respectively. When looking at the 2025 admissions data, the distance

of the last place offered at Langley was nearly 6 miles, compared to 3.6 miles for Appletree, demonstrating a far wider geographic draw and a greater ability to attract families from further afield. Of the 187 parents who responded to the survey carried out by Friends of Langley, 88.2% said Appletree Gardens was not one of their school preferences when they applied for their school places. That same survey also asked which school would be their first choice of school for their children if Langley were to close. Of the 187 responses to this question: 38.5% chose South Wellfield (72 parents) 20.3% chose Southridge (38 parents) 11.2% chose Marine Park (21 parents) 11.2% chose Appletree (21 parents) 3.2% chose Whitley Lodge (6 parents) 3.2% chose Coquet Park (6 parents When asked if they would take a place at Appletree Gardens if offered, 43 parents said no. An analysis of birth rates mapped against six years' of reception offers data for each school showed Appletree Gardens is ranked as the most sensitive school in the entire planning area to falling birth rates. Langley, by contrast, has a medium sensitivity, cushioned by its proven popularity and wider draw. The council's proposal is therefore not just to close the more popular school, thereby ignoring parental choice, but also to close the more demographically stable and resilient one, leading to a longer-term risk for the local area, which is further compounded by the building of new homes in the Murton gap development which will come almost as fast as Langley First School and which is predominantly family sized homes. Furthermore, per earlier comments the need to drive to school means that Appletree is not the preferred option for our family as the roads around the school are not safe. There is no pedestrian segregation during the busy drop off and pickup period with buses and commuter traffic in the area. Langley currently closes the street outside school every morning to make it safer for the children. Appletree cannot close the street to cars in the mornings or at collection times due to it being on a bus route. Langley also has a free public car park very close by, which Appletree Gardens does not have. The assumption appears to be that children will walk to school. The parent survey carried out by Friends of Langley shows that for many families like ours the need to drive to school would increase which is not only worse for the environment, it doesn't teach sustainable travel habits to the children and increases the risk of a collision with a child on the school run a safety concern which does worry me if my son is placed there. We are heavily reliant on wraparound provision to allow both my husband and I to work full time. It is not clear how this would work if our son is moved to another setting. Other schools connected to this proposal but without sufficient detail or consideration: 1. Woodlawn The consultation outlines the intention for the council to repurpose the Langley site and move the post-16 provision from Marden High School (32 children in total according to Ofsted), thereby displacing 300 children for the benefit of 32 children By bundling the two issues - the alleged need to close a school with the need to expand

Woodlawn - the council is effectively creating a false choice: asking the community to accept a suboptimal and unstable mainstream solution in exchange for a desirable SEND solution. The long-term health of the mainstream school system should not be compromised to solve a logistical problem for SEND provision, however important that provision may be. 2. Coquet Park First School Within the consultation documents, the council makes reference to considering the closure of Coquet Park but that this was not deemed financially viable. This is due to a private finance initiative (PFI) school, which the council is contractually obligated to until 2032. According to the council's cabinet paper, 2022/23 was the first financial year that the school ended with a deficit balance, and it ended 2024/25 with a cumulative deficit of £0.325m. The school has been unable to submit a budget plan which shows it coming back into financial balance within three years. In line with Scheme for Financing Schools, the school is classified as being in a structural deficit, which means there is a long-term financial problem that requires significant, strategic changes to resolve. The school currently also has a one-form entry, something the council says is not financially viable. As well as being poor value for money for the taxpayer, due to the high interest charges the PFI contract is costing the council, this school is not financially viable by the council's own recognition. In the absence of any proposed solutions being made available, it is difficult to understand how the council proposes to stop this school from being forced to close once the PFI contract ends in 2032. Finally I would like to share that the culture of Langley First School is truly fantastic and it would be a true loss for the monkseaton community should the school disappear. This culture is authentic and reliant on the staff team – their strong relationships, communication skills, connection and dedication to the children. The team at Langley truly put our children and families at the heart of what they do and I strongly believe that any change to school provision should do the same. This proposal DOES NOT consider the children or the families impacted nor does the consultation window give sufficient time or information to develop alternative proposals which could achieve the same goal in a different way. Should Langley First School close North Tyneside Council will be doing a significant disservice to our children and our community.

Screen Name Redacted

11/13/2025 08:26 AM

[redacted] I live within the catchment of the one remaining high school following the decision to close Monkseaton High School, and I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed closure of Langley First School. In my professional role, I see first-hand how stability, community connection, and consistent education contribute to the wellbeing and resilience of our young people. [redacted] I am deeply concerned that this

proposal, much like the process leading to the closure of Monkseaton High, risks causing long-term disruption and harm to families, children, and the wider community. The Council's handling of these school reorganisations appears increasingly reactive and inconsistent. The recent decision to close Monkseaton High, set for 31 August 2026, has already left families uncertain and anxious about their children's futures. Now, the same justifications, "declining numbers," "financial deficits," and "low local demand", are being used to close yet another successful school. The parallels are impossible to ignore. It gives the impression that decisions are being made to meet financial targets rather than the needs of children or the realities of our local area. What makes the Langley proposal particularly troubling is the number of factual inaccuracies and omissions within the supporting documents. Having reviewed the campaign information, I was alarmed to learn that the Council's papers incorrectly state that Langley lacks an on-site playing field, that it is already in financial deficit, and that families can safely walk to Appletree Gardens without crossing major roads such as Seatonville Road or Cauldwell Lane. These are not small errors, they fundamentally distort the picture being presented to decision-makers. [redacted] I am acutely aware of the road safety issues around these routes. They are busy, with high traffic volumes and limited safe crossing points. Increasing the number of children travelling longer distances to Appletree Gardens will almost certainly heighten risk at peak times, particularly given Appletree's location on a bus route and lack of a nearby public car park. Langley, by contrast, benefits from a street closure at drop-off times and a public car park nearby, making it one of the safest setups for school access in the area. Beyond these practical concerns, I want to stress the emotional and social impact this decision will have. Many of my close friends and neighbours have children at Langley. I have seen the positive difference this school makes every single day, the confidence, kindness, and inclusivity it instils in its pupils. Langley is not just a school; it's a community hub that brings families together and offers a supportive, inclusive environment where all children, including those with additional needs, can thrive. The school's staff are dedicated professionals who go above and beyond, and their loss would be felt deeply, not just by the pupils, but by the whole area. I am aware that the Save Langley campaign represents hundreds of parents, residents, and staff, people who care deeply about education and community life in North Tyneside. These are not just campaigners; they are voters, taxpayers, and volunteers, people who contribute daily to the wellbeing and safety of this borough. The scale of public opposition should make it clear that this proposal does not reflect community priorities. Having witnessed the fallout from Monkseaton High's closure, the uncertainty, the pressure on other schools, and the sense of frustration among residents, I would urge the Council to stop and reconsider before repeating the same mistakes. Closing

Langley would not just remove an excellent school; it would weaken the very fabric of this community. [redacted] I can only see the closure of another very good school having a significant detrimental and negative impact on our area and communities. Closing our schools will contribute to future anti-social behaviour and add workload to an already stretched police service. Please, take the time to revisit the data, consult meaningfully with those affected, and explore alternatives that protect local education, employment, and community stability. [redacted]

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 08:32 AM

The danger of becoming “just another number” in an enlarged school, thereby losing individuality, and degradation of the community spirit that currently surrounds Langley.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 08:36 AM

This is not a merger ! It is a closure !The children are settled and doing well, our oldest grandson in year two would have to move school too many times and unsettling, our youngest grandchild set to start reception in September, currently at Langley nursery and part of the school community, it would be too unsettling to pull him away and away from his sibling in year two . It would not benefit any child to have larger class sizes, there would be no wrap around care. The SEND provision would be decreased , the school would lose its Library even though Labour government banging on about how each school will have a library , forest school would go and on top of all that the parking and access to Appletree gardens is not safe and questionable! The data the council have used is not correct , haven’t even visited site , saying school don’t have a field , they clearly do as the children play on it every day !

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 08:38 AM

The area needs this school open. It is better for the community overall. The children thrive at Langley. People move to this area for the schools. Not only will it affect childrens education. It will have an impact on traffic and house prices. Please do not close Langley. It is such a beautiful, caring and safe environment dor the children in this area.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 08:39 AM

We moved to North Tyneside to start a family, buying our home because of the proximity to Langley First School, a community school with an outstanding reputation. Our situation is not unique with many young families choosing to relocate here, evidenced by the Office for

National Statistics showing more young children moving into North Tyneside than moving out of it. The current approach to closing schools across North Tyneside will have impacts beyond purely education, forcing people to move out of the area and discouraging movement into the area with associated impacts on the local economy. Our eldest daughter has just started at Langley First School, her confidence has soared as she has quickly built strong relationships with her teachers and classmates. A decision to close Langley First School would cause us disruption, upheaval and emotional distress. The consultation provides no assurance or explanation on how closing the school will solve any of the problems facing many schools and councils across the country, but it will clearly lead to the area losing valuable resources and losing resilience to meet educational needs in the future. Our daughter has severe food allergies which can lead to anaphylaxis. There is no detail in the consultation of how her needs might be met or whether it will even be possible to meet her needs as two schools are forced into one. Langley First School currently has excellent provision and we feel safe sending our daughter there. Given the lack of detail on how the closure of Langley and increased pupil numbers at Appletree would be managed, we would not currently feel safe sending our daughter there. Practically, we would have to now cross two busy roads, one of which does not have any pedestrian crossing, on the way to school. The consultation has provided no detail on whether childcare provision has been considered and it seems likely that we would now need to make two drop offs in different locations, which would necessitate driving the car, placing an increased burden on the already overwhelmed local roads and the associated environmental impact. While the consultation states that class sizes do not necessarily mean a reduction in the quality of education, the Department for Education commissioned an evidence review which found that smaller class sizes have a positive effect on attainment and behaviour in early years. There is no detail in the consultation as to how two schools will be accommodated in one or how the disadvantages of larger class sizes will be negated. The consultation to close Langley, alongside the other consultation on Monkseaton Middle School, is incredibly concerning both as a parent and as a resident of North Tyneside. The consultation focuses solely on closing a school in the area, without any detailed consideration of alternative approaches. The consultation information has contained inaccuracies and misleading interpretations of the data, for example the consultation does not make clear that Appletree's budget forecast include a Falling Rolls Fund due to its surplus places, which Langley is not in receipt of, due to having an acceptable level of surplus places. This adds to the sense that the consultation has been rushed through and not given the due diligence a decision of this magnitude should be given. The consultation gives no detail on how closing a school will solve the overarching challenges faced by an

	unsustainable funding model, costly PFI deals and the immediate pressure on high school places caused by the closure of Monkseaton High School. Closing a school, losing the physical assets and the knowledge, experience and care of excellent staff, will have a long-lasting impact on the area. Closing a school should be an absolute last resort once all other options have been exhausted. While the national birth rate is declining, the Department for Education and ONS acknowledge the uncertainty of both future fertility predictions and the impact of net migration, limiting projections to 2030. A long-lasting decision to close a school based on birth rate data, which the government accepts is unpredictable beyond the next five years is incredibly short sighted. The National Audit Office is currently preparing a paper on planning for school places, scheduled for Spring 2026, examining the Department for Education's approach to overseeing and supporting a resilient school system in England and the ability to respond to changing pupil demand. This government has also advocated for a test and learn approach to improving public services. A new innovative way of working, in partnership with councils, businesses and local organisations as set out in the Plan for Change. I believe there is an opportunity for North Tyneside to be at the forefront of reforming education funding and strategy, leveraging the high quality of schools in the area and the community support to establish itself as a test case for how education could and should be prioritised. There are social entrepreneurs, like Hillary Cottam, who have done fantastic work redesigning systems and services, whose approaches can provide a framework for how to design around the challenges and build resilience. The challenges we're facing in North Tyneside are not unique to us and I'm incredibly concerned as both a parent and a resident that this consultation does not adequately address these challenges. There is a real opportunity here to shape how the country responds and to deliver better outcomes both locally and nationally. We should not just settle for good schools at 90% capacity having to close, for parents having less choice in their children's education or for teachers being stretched as thinly as possible when we can design something better which will allow everyone engaging with the education system to flourish.
Screen Name Redacted 11/13/2025 08:40 AM	It will affect the local business around here. It will change the community. It will increase traffic on an already hugely busy road. (More taxis to Woodlawn and more children needing to be driven to schools further away). It will affect my child as the middle schools are reducing numbers. We live here but some friends don't live in Whitley Bay. It will make class sizes bigger, teachers will leave. Uncertainty in the community. The list is endless.
Screen Name Redacted	My grandson loves his school. His school of choice. His little brother

11/13/2025 08:56 AM

and sister would also like to attend Langley in the future, keeping all siblings together. Apple tree Gardens is not 1st, 2nd or even 3rd choice as their first school.

Screen Name Redacted

11/13/2025 09:06 AM

As a parent of a child at Langley I am fundamentally opposed to the closure of an excellent school. My understanding of the evidence that you have provided is that the decision is short-sighted and not thought through. You have published no plan providing any detail about what will happen to current pupils, and as such there is nothing substantial for us to be consulted on... other than to express our abject horror. It is not a merger and any suggestion otherwise is misleading. You are proposing to close Langley without any plan of what is going to happen to affected children in the next few years. The proposal explains how various re-organisation and changes to admissions policy will mean that Appletree will be able to cope with the expected pupil number in the long-term... but by your own figures, the capacity of Appletree is 300 and the combined number of pupils in both schools is currently 529. There is no explanation in the proposal about how all pupils from Langley and Appletree are going to be accommodated in the next few years. This uncertainty is very unsettling for all involved and the inevitable disruption will make things worse. How can we be consulted on a proposal that does not include a plan of what might happen to our children. It seems that you are creating a massive upheaval, now, to address long-term forecasts. Given the long-term nature of the population projections, it doesn't warrant the immediate disruption to these pupils. By all means, plan for the future but not at the costs of current pupils education and wellbeing. Langley is a brilliant school. We deliberately chose to send our child there based on its nurturing ethos and reputation. The groundswell of love that has been shown for the school since the start of the consultation is testament to this. I am sure Appletree is also a great school, so I cannot fathom why you are planning to disrupt the good work all the staff are doing. As for the alternatives you say you have considered, the only justification for not considering closure of Coquet Park, which seems to be in a much worse financial position than either Langley or Appletree and geographically overlaps with surrounding catchments... is the PFI funding. This is short-sighted. A reasonable transition plan, that does not dramatically impact on the well-being of current pupils, would negate this oversight. The PFI ends only five years after you hope to close Langley. If you had a more long-term, sustainable view, this would be insignificant. This is not a suitable justification for ignoring this option I urge you to reconsider the decision to close Langley; at the very least, do no proceed without a plan of what is going to happen to existing pupils. If you are going to make the terrible decision of closing a great school, then at least have the decency to the pupils and parents to do it without causing unnecessary harm.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:06 AM

I have serious concerns about the proposed merger between Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School. While I understand that the Council must plan carefully for future pupil numbers and budgets, I believe this merger would have significant and long-lasting negative effects on the children, the staff, and the wider community that both schools serve. The children who attend Langley and Appletree are between four and nine years old, a period that is absolutely critical to their emotional, social, and cognitive development. At this age, children are learning how to form relationships, regulate emotions, and build a sense of belonging and confidence. The environment around them — the teachers they know, the routines they rely on, and the friendships they make — plays a central role in shaping who they are and how they feel about school and learning. Disrupting that environment risks real emotional harm. Moving young children into a different school building, with new teachers, different routines, and unfamiliar peers, can create anxiety, fear, and confusion. For some children, particularly those who are shy, sensitive, or have additional needs, this level of disruption could have a lasting effect on their confidence and engagement in learning. Schools like Langley and Appletree are known for their nurturing, family-like environments. Every child is known personally by staff, and that sense of being seen and cared for is something that cannot easily be replicated in a larger, merged school. When schools grow in size, it becomes harder for staff to maintain the same close relationships that young children rely on for reassurance and emotional stability. A merger on this scale, involving two well-established and distinct school communities, would inevitably cause upheaval. For many children, it would mean the loss of familiar adults and friends, changes to class groups, and an extended period of uncertainty. This is particularly concerning at a stage where children thrive on routine and predictability. If the goal of the education system is to give children the best start in life, this proposal risks undermining that by prioritising numbers and buildings over relationships and wellbeing. It is also important to recognise the emotional and professional impact that the merger would have on staff. Teachers, teaching assistants, and support staff are the backbone of any school community. They create safe, welcoming environments and work tirelessly to support children not just academically, but emotionally and socially. Under this proposal, staff at both schools face the uncertainty of restructure and potential redundancy. Even for those who might ultimately remain employed, the process of waiting to find out, reapplying for posts, and adjusting to a new leadership structure is incredibly stressful. That stress cannot help but filter into the classroom. Children notice when their teachers are worried or distracted. At a time when consistency and emotional security are so vital, it is deeply concerning to imagine the impact on children of being taught by adults who are anxious about their own futures. It is

unrealistic to expect staff to provide the same level of emotional energy and care when they are facing professional insecurity. Furthermore, much of the strength of both schools comes from their dedicated and experienced teams who have built relationships with families and the local community over many years. If long-serving staff leave because of uncertainty or redundancy, the schools will lose irreplaceable knowledge, trust, and continuity. This would not only weaken the quality of care and education in the short term but also make it harder for the new merged school to build a strong identity and culture. The impact of the merger would not stop with directly employed school staff. At Langley, the staff at the on-site nursery and wraparound provision (SON) are not employed directly by the school. These staff members would not be part of the formal school restructure and therefore would not be redeployed at the Appletree site, losing their livelihoods. These staff are an integral part of the daily life of the school. Many of them know the children from infancy and support them before and after the school day, providing vital continuity and emotional security. For working families, they are often the most consistent adults in their children's lives. Excluding them from the restructure process sends a message that their role and contribution are undervalued, and it risks severing some of those key relationships that help children feel secure and settled. At Appletree, the Forest School provision is under threat. This is a hugely valuable part of the school's offer. It provides outdoor, nature-based learning and introduces preschool children to the school in a positive, nurturing way. It plays a major role in supporting early development, confidence, and social skills, while helping families feel connected to the school community before formal schooling begins. My 2 year old has thoroughly enjoyed the Tiny Oaks sessions at Appletree. The future of this external partnership is unclear under the merger. Any changes to contracts, location, or structure could disrupt the continuity of this programme or limit its accessibility. That would be a loss not just to current pupils but also to the wider local community who benefit from this unique, early introduction to education. In both cases, the merger risks damaging a broader network of support that extends far beyond classroom teaching — a network built on years of trust and collaboration between schools, external providers, and families. Langley and Appletree are not just schools; they are community anchors. They are places where families connect, friendships are built, and a sense of belonging develops. Closing one school and merging into another risks losing that community cohesion. It changes the daily patterns of life — where families walk, who they meet, and where children form their early social bonds. Local primary schools are often the heart of a neighbourhood, offering much more than academic education. They provide support for families, connections to local services, and a sense of shared identity. Once that is disrupted, it cannot easily be rebuilt. For younger siblings, future pupils, and local parents, the

closure of a familiar, accessible school is more than an inconvenience — it's a loss of local identity and pride. It sends a message that financial considerations outweigh community and care. I also speak from personal experience. When I was a child, the comprehensive school I attended merged with a neighbouring school when I was in Year 9, and it was absolutely catastrophic. Teachers were leaving lessons to attend interviews for their own jobs, the school's long-standing values were replaced with something vague and meaningless, and parents were suddenly expected to buy new uniforms. Although we were told we could still wear the old one, that only highlighted which families could afford the change. There was a complete loss of identity and pride in the school, and many teachers were absent with stress. The whole experience was unsettling and chaotic, and it had a lasting impact on how pupils felt about their education. I would not wish that experience on any child, particularly not on those as young as four to nine years old. No one denies that the Council faces difficult decisions about falling pupil numbers and financial pressures. However, the proposed merger is not the only way to address those issues. There are more measured and less disruptive alternatives, such as forming a federation or shared leadership model between Langley and Appletree. This would allow both schools to stay open while sharing a headteacher, leadership team, and key resources. Such an approach has worked successfully in other areas facing similar challenges, maintaining community presence while improving efficiency. A federation could also coordinate admissions and planning between the two schools, reducing surplus places without closing a site. It would allow gradual adjustment as demographics evolve, rather than a sudden and destabilising change. This approach would protect the wellbeing of children and staff, retain local identity, and give the Council flexibility to respond if pupil numbers rise again in future years — something that is entirely possible as housing and family patterns change. The proposed merger may seem logical on paper, but it does not account for the emotional, educational, and social realities of the children and families affected. Children between four and nine years old need stability, security, and strong relationships. Staff need to feel valued and supported to provide the care and attention those children deserve. And the wider community — including external providers and families — needs time and respect to adapt to change, not a forced consolidation that risks breaking apart what already works well. I urge the Council to reconsider this merger and to explore alternatives that safeguard children's wellbeing, protect staff morale, and preserve the community strengths that make Langley and Appletree such special places for local families.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:18 AM

I attended the public meeting at WBHS and in my opinion the attitude of the council is one that does not care about the education of young

people in the region. The council offers presenting were poorly prepared and not able to reassure parents whatsoever. Their responses to questions was lackluster and I left the meeting feeling incredibly sad about the situation. The admission numbers to schools in the area has been mismanaged by NTC for years, leading to this dilemma. The proposal put forward by the council seems to be fully of inaccuracies. Data has not been provided in a timely manner in response to FOI requests. In light of these issues I believe the consultation period should be extended.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:20 AM

Langley is a great school and I enjoyed being a pupil there - the staff are really friendly. I really enjoyed the outdoor area and playing on the field. [redacted] It's a lot for young children and they need friendly staff that they know so they can talk to them about things. It will make children anxious if they don't have any friendly staff that they know when they have to change to a new school. In Year 4 you are allowed to walk to school and this is good because it helps you to get reading for Year 5 when you start middle school and you have to start to walk to school by yourself. I think walking to Appletree would be harder as you have to cross more busy roads and it will not be safe. You spend 5 years walking to Langley and then if you move to Appletree in Year 4 you won't know how to walk there as you will not have done it very often so it will be more difficult to walk to school alone. This is not safe for children.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:27 AM

I am the parent of two children who currently attend Appletree Garden First School. [redacted] One of my children will be in year 3 when any potential merger happens. As a family we are worried that his education will be affected by his year group possibly doubling in size. This could mean that teaching standards and staff to pupil ratios could lower. Additionally, there'd be a loss of breakout space for library and IT access and 1-2-1 support, activities that would still be in place at other first schools in the borough, putting the 'merged' school at a disadvantage academically. As a local resident, I already have concerns about school-run parking and driving issues. Just a couple of years ago the local fire service described the estate as an 'accident waiting to happen'. I myself have witnessed near misses, including my own children, and regularly see poor driving from parents, residents and people using the area as a thoroughfare

including people driving along pavements because the streets are narrow, pavement parking, parking on school restriction zones and double yellow lines with parking restrictions, and speeding parents travelling from out of catchment to reach Appletree and Monkseaton Middle School. There is little to no enforcement by the council. The streets around the school were not designed to carry the level of traffic they now do. If the merge goes ahead, there needs to be a considered approach to this local issue. The council should make Appletree Gardens and surrounding streets a 'School Streets' area so that children and parents can get to school safely. The council should also consider a safe parking area for parents who might have to drive their children to school, especially Langley parents who may live further away. This could be achieved by using on-road space at Bromley Avenue alongside the field - parents could then walk their children safely to school from there.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:27 AM

Concerns About the Proposed Closure of Langley First School: [redacted] I feel deeply worried about the council's proposal to close Langley. This isn't just about buildings—it's about children, families, and the stability of their education. I see daily how decisions like this affect transition, settling and wellbeing and I believe this proposal risks undermining all of those. Langley has a reputation for being nurturing, inclusive and supportive of every child. Families, including mine, have chosen to live here because of the school's ethos and strong community ties. To remove this option is to take away not just a school, but a trusted environment where children feel safe and thrive. [redacted] the consultation feels rushed and based on inaccurate information. Langley has a well-used playing field and outdoor learning spaces, contrary to claims it does not. The school has never been in financial deficit and is already working with an independent advisor to ensure sustainability. Many families would face unsafe journeys to Appletree, crossing busy roads or relying on cars. Parents and governors have had little meaningful involvement, and there has been no proper assessment of community impact, early years provision or wraparound care. Calling this a "merger" is misleading. A genuine merger would mean creating a new school identity, with input from both communities, ensuring fairness and a fresh start. What is proposed here is effectively a closure, erasing Langley's identity and legacy. Official data shows Appletree's capacity is far lower than claimed, raising serious concerns about overcrowding, larger class sizes and the impact on learning quality and children's ability to settle. Relocating hundreds of pupils will increase car journeys and Langley's street closure for safety cannot be replicated at Appletree. Langley's 'Schools Out' provides flexible childcare that supports working families, while Appletree's provision is shorter and less

comprehensive, which could force parents to reduce hours or leave jobs. Langley also excels in supporting children with additional needs, with adapted spaces, sensory rooms, and specialist staff. There is no guarantee this level of provision will continue at Appletree, risking disruption for some of our most vulnerable learners. Birth rates are forecast to rise again after 2026, and thousands of new homes are planned nearby. Closing Langley now is short-sighted and fails to account for future demand. [redacted] I know how vital stability is for children—removing a popular, successful school undermines that stability. Surveys show most parents did not choose Appletree as their preference. Families deserve genuine choice, not forced relocation. As a parent, I want the best for my child. [redacted] I know the importance of smooth transitions, consistent care and inclusive provision. Langley provides all of this. Closing it would disrupt families, harm children's wellbeing and remove a school that is valued and trusted. If change is truly necessary, it must be done properly—with fairness, transparency and a plan that puts children first. Anything less risks damaging not only education but the fabric of our community.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:36 AM

This merger (which in my view is not a true merger, as Langley will close and be subsumed into Appletree, which will retain its DfE number) will completely disrupt my grandson's education. He is so happy and settled at Langley and this is due to the lively welcoming, family ethos of the school and its hard working, dedicated staff. My daughter and her husband moved to their house with my grandson when he was a tiny baby in order to ensure him a place at Langley, their school of choice for him. If Langley were to merge with Appletree, his journey to and from school would involve using the car which would add to the already horrendous traffic conditions around the area of Appletree Gardens. My other huge concern is how the proposed merger would be managed. I cannot see that the numbers of children at Langley can be successfully merged into the Appletree site without overcrowding and large class sizes. How many spare classrooms are there at Appletree? Surely not enough to accommodate all of the children coming from Langley? My grandsons year group (current Y 2) are at full capacity with 60 children. Could the council perhaps consider delaying the merger so that these very large year groups could stay at Langley and there could be a phased merger over several years? I feel that this would mitigate some of the damage that will inevtbr fond to the education of young children in North Tyneside.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:39 AM

The decision to close Langley (intentional use of "close" even though the word "merger" is used) affects my child, my family and is detrimental to the local area. My child has already had her education

disrupted as a result of covid. She will suffer a huge, unsettling, unnecessary additional upheaval as a result of these proposals due to having to move schools for 1 year in year 4 before moving again to middle school. Such extreme change has a negative impact on children. The report on which the decision is based contains numerous inaccuracies and is littered with mistakes. Incorrect statements are made which support the use of Appletree over Langley, so the whole premise of the decision is flawed. I feel the true negative consequences of children's well-being is not understood due to the incorrect statements in the Cabinet Supplementary Agenda document. A wider issue is the negative impact on the area's prosperity more generally. Langley is a highly performing school which is well regarded. Appletree Gardens suffers from a poorer reputation and bigger surplus. Parental choice needs considering, people regularly choose Langley over Appletree even when they live in Appletree's catchment. People are attracted to the area due to excellent schools, bringing investment, spending and competitive house prices. The area would be less prosperous with excellent schools like Langley not being available. Birth rates are currently lower, but consideration needs given to future changes in this trend and new houses being built. Whitley Bay being the only high school is a problem as we are now vulnerable to future increases in birth rates and not being able to cater for demand. More careful consideration needs giving to the wider picture and coming up with a longer term, more sustainable, well considered plan taking the whole Whitley bay school system into account. Finally the Langley staff are special. They are truly fantastic giving children the best possible start in life due to their commitment and passion. This decision has been forced on them, giving them no time to consider what they could do to help save Langley and keep it running, for example ways to raise additional funds. Given the talent of the Langley staff and associates (friends of Langley, governors etc), they are likely to be able to come up with a workable solution, better than the council could devise, that both saves the excellent schools like Langley and avoids unnecessary negative impacts on the area. Give them the opportunity to have their say.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:39 AM

[redacted] but the pressure on all local first, middle and high schools will be increased down the line when housing developments are completed, especially knowing that they are proposing to build a first school but nothing else.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:42 AM

The significant impact on families this proposal has caused is huge and since you love predictions, 95% of parents and children will be impacted in a significantly negative way over the next 5 yrs and indications show that during teenage year, the level of anxiety and

depression will increase but 65%, resulting in them seeking comfort from peers and in an unprecedented increase in birth rates in the borough. Due to cost of living and specifically council tax, families are having to work more and relying on parents more and more for childcare, causing more health issues and a reduction in life expectancy, opening up more houses for families to buy. This is projected to that over 50% of houses will have school age children. In short, this has gotten everyone demented, mental health is in decline and you have no clear plan forward.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:44 AM

As grandparents, we feel deeply saddened and concerned by the proposal to close Langley First School, it would be an irreversible error that the council should not make. We have been so impressed with everything about Langley, from the caring staff to the wonderful sense of community that surrounds it. Our granddaughter has flourished since starting nursery there in 2023; the progress she has made academically and socially has been fantastic. She has developed a real love of learning, made so many friends, and grown in confidence to the point where she proudly volunteered to be a school councillor. She is genuinely happy to go to school each day and is proud to be part of Langley. To take that away from her, and so many other children who thrive there, would be a tragic loss to the community and to the future of these young learners. We have lived in North Tyneside for 32 years, and in all that time we have never witnessed such a short-sighted and poorly thought-out proposal. We are deeply disappointed that the council appears unwilling to listen to the strong, united voice of the local community. It has genuinely made us lose faith in the council's intentions — how can we trust our local authority to act in the best interests of its residents if it ignores over 6,000 voices speaking clearly against this closure? Reading through the proposals has been both disheartening and frustrating; the number of inaccuracies and the lack of thorough research are worrying. To push this plan through regardless would be detrimental to the educational journeys of so many children. Whilst we understand that birth rates are currently decreasing, Langley First School continues to operate well within the council's own acceptable 10% surplus range, a clear sign of its strong demand and sustainability. Furthermore, the Office for National Statistics predicts that birth rates will stabilise by 2026 and begin to rise again thereafter, so it is difficult to understand the urgency behind this decision. Unless, of course, there is an ulterior motive, that this rushed closure is intended to free up space and funding for Woodlawn in a cost-saving exercise. If that is the case, then displacing 300 children to achieve it is not only unfair and unjust, but it goes directly against the Government's own SEND agenda, which calls for inclusion and fairness for all. With the closure of Monkseaton High School, we understand the need to manage pupil numbers and

cap first school places at 390, the capacity of the only remaining secondary school within NEPA. However, the real issue lies not with the children entering the system, whose numbers are naturally lower due to the recent decline in birth rates, but with those already in it. These so-called “bulge years” are temporary, yet this proposal treats them as a permanent problem. Closing schools and dramatically reducing PAN numbers in this way does not solve this issue. The council’s justification for closing Langley and relocating its children to Appletree is framed as being “driven by the need to secure a sustainable, high-quality education system for the long term.” However, this is difficult to believe, when Langley already embodies exactly that. If the council were truly guided by those principles, it would be Appletree facing closure, not Langley. Appletree currently operates with a much higher surplus of places, attracts far fewer children from within its own catchment area, is the most sensitive to falling birth rates and incurs significantly higher utility costs per square metre. Moreover, although Appletree may have more classrooms, many of these fall below the minimum size requirements set out in the ‘Government’s Area Guidelines for Mainstream Schools’. These facts make it clear that closing Langley is neither a logical nor a sustainable decision. To close Langley First School would not only break the spirit of those who work and learn there but would also fracture a community that has worked so hard to support its young families. Once lost, this wonderful school and all it stands for cannot be replaced. We urge the council to listen, truly listen, to the families, grandparents, and residents who care deeply about Langley and its future. Do not make this irreversible mistake. Protect what is good, what is working, and what is so clearly loved. Keep Langley First School open.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:46 AM

The proposal to merge schools is effecting us negatively: [redacted] The Langley community have welcomed us into the area, [redacted] Had we not been offered a place at Langley (or Wellfield) our other choice, we were unlikely to have moved at all. We had planned to move into NEPA area, so we could attend middle school in 2028, and to ensure that our youngest child who is due to start reception then, could follow his older sibling through the schools we had selected. Living slightly out of area now, means that our school drop offs and picks are difficult with our youngest attending nursery in north shields. This means our commute is roughly an hour in the morning and an hour in the evening. We are concerned about traffic and parking at the Appletree site, which we know is already a cause for local complaint - we will only be adding to this. Adding the extra distance to Appletree - a school we did not original select as a preferred option, means that we are having to rethink everything - we

want to do the best of consistency and wellbeing of our eldest, ensuring that his friendship group remains intact. We are now having to look at moving into the NEPA earlier than anticipated, and we are unsure if our finances will allow us to fasttrack this. We are concerned about the out of hours provision that might be offered at the proposed Appletree site - it is currently not as long as that offered on the Langley site, and this makes our full time work and pick up and drop offs possible. We are having to delay our youngest son starting nursery at Schools Out and eventually Langley, until we have more certainty about what will happen in the new year. Not only is this having a hugely detrimental impact on our family's wellbeing, adding huge amounts of stress, but we are so very disappointed that a Labour council is seeking to close a high performing primary school in one of the most deprived regions of the country. We strongly feel that a Labour council should be doing all it possibly can to support the educational advancement and wellbeing of our children, and we are at a loss to see how closing Langley would achieve this, and boost the educational outcomes of children in North Tyneside. As a lifelong labour voter, I'm certainly rethinking my level of the support in the future.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:47 AM

North Tyneside is a place to be proud of. By limiting parental choice in such a drastic way and removing all opportunities for growth the council are seriously risking causing economic and social harm to the community. Families from all over the UK look to relocate to our region and the council should encourage such growth and prosperity and not take a backwards step in the quality of education we offer. Local businesses are doing an amazing job at showcasing our region - please rethink the approach to education in North Tyneside, as the proposal offers no opportunity to grow our region.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:51 AM

In response to the consultation documents on the closure of Langley school please see below my comments. Overall, there are inaccuracies about Langley’s facilities and financial status that paint a skewed picture that doesn't reflect the reality of the current school environment. Moreover, the consultation process lacks transparency and does not consider the real impact on the community and the children involved. It's crucial to address these discrepancies and advocate for a more accurate representation of the school's strengths and needs. We deserve a fair decision that truly reflects our community's values and priorities and will ensure that a correct decision is made to support children who will be affected by these proposals. The methodology on birth rates underlying the argument is one-dimensional, failing to consider other relevant factors, and is therefore fundamentally flawed. Indeed, pupil project numbers used are flawed in that they appear to be based on data that does not

exist. This decision appears rushed and is clearly based on a limited evidence base. It's unsettling that decision-makers have not taken the initiative to visit Langley school. Making significant choices without a thorough understanding of our environment and needs is unacceptable. It’s imperative that those in charge engage with our community to gather the necessary insights before proceeding. Our children and educators deserve thoughtful consideration of their unique circumstances, and we must advocate for that before any final decisions are made. I am deeply worried about the lack of information regarding how the transition will take place should a decision be made to close Langley school. The uncertainty surrounding this process is alarming. I fear that if we move forward without a clear and well-structured plan, our children and the staff will be left to deal with the fallout. If a decision is made it is essential for us as a community to ensure that there is adequate support in place for everyone during any transition. Without proper communication and preparation, I believe there could be significant negative impacts on our children's education and emotional wellbeing. I urge the council to provide more clarity on the transition process and to involve parents and staff in these important discussions. We all want what is best for our children, and a thoughtful approach is vital in achieving that goal.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:54 AM

[redacted] We looked and countless schools across north tyneside for him to attend reception and beyond and without a doubt Langley was the best school to support him with his needs and so far the support he has received has been outstanding. To force another transition on the child in a few years would risk triggering him, regressing his developmental progress not to mention all of the hard work that has gone into getting him established and settled in his new community around langley would be undone. I don't feel there is a rush to do this, society can change, birth rates can change and it seems unsustainable to reduce capacity so drastically by merging the two schools when you'll be in a far bigger predicament down the line if there are more kids about and you need to set up a new school from scratch to meet additional demand. Anyway, there's a reason so many people choose langley and are advocating for langley is because it is an absolute beacon in North Tyneside and as a local authority you should be singing it's praises and supporting it rather than condemning it. Good schools bring people into the borough and therefore boost council tax revenue. This decision will only push people away, especially those who have children with additional and complex needs whether that's because they have been in the care system or they have emotional or developmental difficulties. A rich community with the school at the centre of it is far more valuable economically than it is trying to scrimp and save by making cuts.

Screen Name Redacted

11/13/2025 09:55 AM

Langley Reputation [redacted] We moved to Monkseaton while pregnant with my first son in 2019. One of the key factors in our decision to choose this area was the solid reputation of the schools. We viewed lots of houses and each neighbour was eager to share their recommendation for Langley. They cited Langley's reputation for being kind, nurturing, and inclusive. The recommendations continued upon moving into our home. Our neighbours told us stories of their families attending Langley, many of which had seen generations of their families move through the school and flourish. It quickly became apparent to us that Langley isn't just a school, but a huge part of this community. As predicted, when my boys began their journey into Langley it was everything I hoped it would be. [redacted] We were anxious he would struggle to adjust to the school environment. These worries were alleviated quickly upon starting at nursery. Our concerns were met with reassurance and warmth; they were quick to make suggestions on how they could help and adapt to make things easier for him. No formal care plan was needed, no jumping through hoops. Just a teacher listening, understanding, and taking the time to get to know each child individually. Thanks to the inclusive, nurturing environment they created, my son settled quickly and formed bonds with both teachers and peers. My younger son is following in his brother's footsteps and thriving in the nursery environment. He's excited to go into reception just like his big brother. [redacted] It has been said many times that Langley feels like a family. I would absolutely endorse this sentiment. No Nursery Intake / Dual Drop Offs Under the council's proposal, my younger son currently attending the nursery will not be able to move up into reception, removing the opportunity of a smooth transition in an environment which he knows and trusts. I question the morality of a proposal which preys upon the youngest year group. The confusion this situation will cause to a child as young as three or four will have a tremendous impact on their mental wellbeing. How do you explain to them they can no longer attend their school, while their sibling continues to? As a parent, how will I juggle separate parents' evenings and school events? Fundamentally, how will I manage dual drop-offs? This is not equivalent to having one child in middle school and another in first school - they are two, young vulnerable, first school children. We currently live 0.3 miles from Langley First School, meaning we are able to walk to school every day. Langley has a safe street policy, and so our children can walk, run, or cycle without the fear of traffic. Appletree is not able to offer parents this luxury. In actual fact, the road outside Appletree school has a reputation for being unruly. There have been several incidents recorded; worryingly, one of those incidents involved a child being hit by a car. The fire service also dubbed the road "an accident waiting to

happen" after they were unable to drive down it due to parked vehicles. There is very little parking, and with the implementation of double yellows, how can parents manage having to travel a farther distance, especially with dual drop-offs? Having two young children in separate schools is frankly implausible for any family to manage. Overcrowding & SEND Provision The consultation document states that all children will move onto the Appletree site in 2027. This short timescale means the largest cohorts of children would be moving over, causing the most disruption. The documentation claims Appletree school is the "larger site." Information gathered from a Freedom of Information request proves this is not the case. While Appletree does indeed have more rooms, only two of them meet government guidance for recommended class size. In contrast, 10 of Langley's 11 classrooms exceed that guidance. I question how a school which has never operated above 300 capacity can comfortably fit the proposed 400 pupils. It is not only classroom space which will pose an issue; dining areas, toilet facilities, assembly halls, corridors, and playgrounds are all at risk of being overcrowded. Both Langley and Appletree have an exemplary reputation for catering to children with SEND. [redacted] Can you confirm that adapting areas which previously hadn't been used as learning space will provide the right acoustics, space, and light to be compliant with government policy? Breakout areas are imperative. Can you confirm those vital, safe areas will not be lost in the 'merged', overcrowded, and under-resourced environment you are proposing? Wraparound & Schools Out The consultation makes no meaningful mention of Schools Out or wraparound provision. This is not a "nice to have"; it is the critical infrastructure that allows families like mine to work. Over 60% of Langley parents rely on this service. Schools Out has been a lifeline, offering flexible booking and hours (7.30am-6pm) that reflect the reality of modern working lives. Appletree's provision is not comparable. It closes earlier (5.30pm, and 4.30pm for nursery) and offers less flexibility. When parents were asked in a survey what they would do without this provision, the most common answer was panic: 52.8% had no answer. 35.6% said they would be forced to cut their hours at work. This proposal doesn't just move children; it threatens family livelihoods and financial stability. The 390-Pupil ‘Problem’ One of the council's core arguments is the "need" to align pupil numbers to 390 to prevent overcrowding at Whitley Bay High School. This is a smokescreen. This 390 "problem" relates to children already in the system, specifically the current Year 2 and Year 5 cohorts. Closing Langley does absolutely nothing to fix this. Furthermore, for all subsequent years (from the current Reception classes onwards), projections show it is unlikely the high school intake will even reach

390. You are proposing to tear our community apart to solve a problem that is not only temporary but one that this proposal doesn't even address. It is a profoundly illogical and destructive "solution." Parental Choice This consultation document is built on an assumption: that families will simply file neatly into Appletree Gardens. This is a fantasy. The council's own data shows Langley is the school of choice, with 73% of catchment children attending, versus 44% at Appletree. A recent parent survey confirms this. When asked, 88.2% of Langley parents said Appletree was not one of their preferences. If Langley closes, only 11.2% would make it their first choice, with the vast majority (38.5%) preferring South Wellfield. This isn't a merger; it's the closure of a popular, stable, and cherished school, in direct opposition to the expressed will of the parents it serves. You are not only ignoring parental choice; you are actively trampling on it. You are closing the more popular and more demographically resilient school. Deficit & Financial Misrepresentation The consultation paints a picture of Langley as a failing school on the brink of financial collapse, citing a "projected" deficit. This is a deliberate misrepresentation. Langley is not in deficit. It has, for the first time, projected a future deficit for 2026 and is already working with financial advisors to address this. The consultation document omits that Appletree, the "viable" school, is already in receipt of "Falling Rolls" funding to prop it up, funding Langley does not receive. Woodlawn & Coquet Park The logic of this proposal completely collapses when we look at the other schools in the area. The council has bundled the Langley closure with a plan for Woodlawn, effectively holding SEND provision hostage. It's a false choice, asking the community to sacrifice a thriving mainstream school to solve a logistical problem for another. Worse, the council admits it considered closing Coquet Park but didn't, purely because of a costly PFI contract. Let's be clear: Coquet Park is already in a structural deficit of £0.325m and runs a one-form entry, a model the council itself deems "not financially viable." New Homes (Murton Gap) The council has repeatedly told us that new homes don't automatically mean more children. However, the Murton Gap development will see 3,000 new homes built on Langley's doorstep. The development proposal itself estimates a need for 748 new primary school places. It is an undeniable fact that families will move in, and those families will have children. To close a beloved, high-performing school, perfectly positioned to serve this new community, is the definition of short-sightedness. It is an act of civic vandalism that future generations of Monkseaton families will pay for. Inaccuracies & A Flawed Process Finally, this whole process has been built on a foundation of inaccuracies and half-truths. The initial documents presented to the cabinet, the very documents that started this nightmare, were factually incorrect. They claimed Langley's field was "off-site" (it is not). They claimed the school was in deficit (it is not). They claimed children could access Appletree without crossing major roads (they

will likely cross Seatonville Road and/or Cauldwell Lane). This consultation has not properly considered early years provision, it has ignored wraparound care and no specific community impact assessment has been done for this closure. The entire case for closing Langley is flawed, from its flawed data to its flawed logic. It is a decision that has been made in search of a justification, and it has failed to find one. I urge you to reject this illogical, destructive, and deeply upsetting proposal.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:58 AM

Disruptive to my child's education. Having to move schools after only 2 years at Langley is incredibly disruptive. Appletree cannot accommodate all of Langley children anyway. The result would be class sizes too big which would ultimately affect my child's education and wellbeing. Grandparents live close to Langley and they drop off and pick up my child. Moving to Appletree would result in longer journeys to school. This would be a difficult walk for my then 6 year old and also my 70 year old parents. We also use schools out at Langley for wrap around care and if this was no longer available we would have to find alternative options potentially affecting my job and my partners job. (Appletree's wraparound is not suitable).

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 09:58 AM

Langley First School is a community, not just a school. They are not normal teachers, they are the best teachers. They will go above and beyond for any of our children or indeed the parents. [redacted] We would have to drive there, and as I've seen and heard from current Appletree parents the roads are horrific in the mornings. It sounds very dangerous to have so much traffic around when we have first school children trying to get into school. Langley close the road in front of the school at drop off, meaning it's a safe space for the kids to play with their friends and run off some energy before having to go in for the day. The proposal means I wouldn't be able to put my daughter in reception so would have to move her to Wellfield first school which is not what I want to do. Then do I put my son into Appletree and have to do two morning drop offs? That sounds impossible to me as the schools start at very similar times. It also means moving my daughter away from the friends she has already made in nursery. OR do I have to move my son away from all the friends he has already had for 3 years to put him into Wellfield First School Year 2? The Langley children know my son, it took a long time for him to involve himself as the anxieties of

his speech were getting him down. He's now thriving in Langley and the thought of moving him fills me with dread. I know he wouldn't cope being moved away from such a special place. I went to Langley first school and have the greatest memories, it made me who I am today. [redacted] it's absolutely crazy to think the council would close a school that means so much to eveyone that goes there. It is already affecting the mental health of so many children and parents. I thought you wanted the children to have the best start in life? Moving them around and putting them into oversubscribed classes is the opposite. They won't learn, it's all too much for such little precious people. It will break a lot of hearts to close this magical school. We have so many ideas for you, please pick one of those and keep our amazing school open. Thank you.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:02 AM

[redacted] The merger would cause severe disruption to their education. It would make school drop off and collection extremely difficult for their parents. I feel the closure of Langley first school would have a detrimental effect on the community and would have a negative effect on children's education in the area. Both my children attended Langley first school and it was the best start to their school life. It is more than a school, it's a community. I really feel the council should think carefully about this decision, children's education and wellbeing should be a priority over cost saving measures.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:03 AM

I am writing as a resident of North Tyneside to express my strong opposition to the proposed closure of Langley First School. I find it deeply concerning that the Council has described this proposal as "careful and robust," when there are numerous factual inaccuracies and omissions within the consultation documents that call the validity of the entire process into question. The documentation presented to Cabinet, on which the decision to consult was based, contains demonstrable errors. These include inaccurate claims about the school's facilities, finances, and catchment accessibility. For example, it was wrongly stated that Langley pupils have no on-site playing field, when in fact the school has a well-used field directly adjacent to the building. The claim that Langley is in deficit is also misleading, I have learned that in fact the school has only forecast a potential deficit in 2025/26 for the first time ever and is actively working with an independent financial adviser to address this. The proposal fails to consider the broader impact on the local community. Langley First is not only a highly valued educational setting, but also a vital local employer. The closure would directly result in job losses, one of which would personally affect my neighbour. Beyond the personal impact on

families, this represents yet another erosion of stable local employment at a time when communities need economic and social security more than ever. I also have friends with children who attend Langley, and I have seen first-hand how they have thrived in what can only be described as a forward-thinking, inclusive, and nurturing environment. The school's commitment to inclusion, particularly its exemplary support for children with additional needs, is widely recognised. There is also a significant lack of transparency and rigour in the data underpinning this proposal, which is alarming as a resident in the borough – it begs the question how many other proposals are pushed through without comprehensive insights and impact reports. Projections of pupil numbers appear inconsistent and extend beyond the Department for Education's published methodology, why would a Labour Council work against national strategy? In summary, this proposal is neither careful nor robust. It is based on flawed data, overlooks key community and employment impacts, and disregards the wellbeing of children who are flourishing within an inclusive and highly regarded school. The closure of Langley First would be a serious mistake, educationally, socially, and economically. I urge the Council to withdraw the current proposal and reconsider its approach in genuine consultation with the community it serves. [redacted]

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:04 AM

I feel the move will impact negatively on the development and mental health of children. Moving to a site which was never meant to accommodate the proposed number of children cannot be a good thing. I hear you have said Appletree have 'spare' classrooms. To my knowledge these are not spare but breakout spaces where interventions can take place certainly not spaces which should be used to take a whole class of more than the 30 ideal - (class sizes which will exceed this if the proposals win through). Children don't thrive in classes larger than 30!

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:05 AM

The main worry I have is the impact this will have on my sons mental health, he is already anxious about what may happen to his school and I think at 5 years old this is unacceptable, we know from research into early learning that any disruption in education will have a lasting impact on the child. He will also be losing his teachers who he has built a really special relationship with as we know that the teachers from Langley will not be transferred to Appletree gardens this all adds to the impact it will have on him. As we cycle to school everyday the added distance and major road crossings will also make his commute to school a bit harder and his collection from school be made harder as we both work full time jobs and our parents mainly collect him after school this extra distance will make it more difficult for them as they are non drivers and in the elderly years of their life. To have our

choice taken away from us is fundamentally wrong we moved to the area because of the reputation Langley has and the community that is built around it, having had our older child move through Langley with such a brilliant experience and how the school and staff have helped to shape him into a lovely young boy it would be a great loss to Monkseaton if this school closed. All in all this will have a detrimental impact on all of our family but mainly on my 5 year old child.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:06 AM

When buying our house, proximity to an excellent school was one of our top priorities even before having children, which is why we chose to purchase a home in West Monkseaton, a short 5 minute walk from Langley. Langley's reputation preceded it, I have still only ever heard positive comments and stories about the school. The same cannot be said for most other schools in our area, which is why Langley was our first (and only) choice for pre school nursery for our eldest daughter. It was also our first choice (and still is) for a reception place for her. Within a week of attending the preschool Butterflies class, we had noticed a huge shift in the confidence and demeanour of our child - having had months of emotional drop offs at private nursery we expected these issues to continue but they did not. After her first settling in session, she has happily walked into the classroom herself every day since. The importance of this cannot be understated, this is incredible for a 3 year old child in a brand new environment and speaks volumes about the culture and environment Langley's incredible staff create and foster. [redacted]

Although our daughter is only at the beginning of her career at Langley, if the school was to close this would cause huge disruption to us, both practically and emotionally. We spent months talking to our daughter to prepare her for her move to "big school", walked up to and past the site numerous times, explained she would be there for years with all her new friends she would make. To have to go back and say actually no, this isn't happening will be incredibly upsetting and confusing for our daughter, and for dozens of other young children who have just made this transition. Appletree was not, and is still not, an acceptable option for us. I am not willing to send my daughter into a school where resources and space are stripped away from children just so as many children can be squeezed into one site as possible. There will be years of upheaval and the education of the children will be negatively impacted as a direct result of this. Due to her medical needs, I would not have confidence that she would not be overlooked during so much upheaval and change, leading to her being out in unsafe situations regarding her food allergies. If Langley was to close, we will have to look further afield for a school to send

our eldest, and her younger sister to when the time comes. This will mean choosing a school not in walking distance, having to drive on the roads during peak times and rush hour, including Earsdon Road which is already incredibly busy at this time. We will have to consider changing our working patterns to fit in pick ups and drop offs - there is a huge difference time wise in popping up the road for 5 minutes than getting in the car and driving in heavy traffic, trying to park near a school and collecting a child. I have zero confidence in this proposal made by NTC - it is evident that it has been rushed and poorly thought out. This was very apparent at the consultation q&a hosted at Whitley High at the beginning of the consultation - the representatives from NTC could not answer basic questions, figures given were incorrect and misrepresented, and the lack of preparation on their behalf was insulting to the hundreds of emotional parents in attendance. I would have been embarrassed to be in their position, presenting figures and meaningless diagrams to a room full of people who were more prepared than they were. Closing a school should be an absolute last resort and I am not satisfied that NTC have attempted to put in place any other measures before opting to close a school. I do not think any school in NEPA should be closed at this current time, but this choice to close Langley out of all schools seems grossly misjudged. Langley had more parents choose it as their first choice than the number of applications for Appletree in total across first, second and third choice. More parents choose Langley within catchment (73%), the same cannot be said for Appletree (44%). An analysis of birth rates mapped against six years' of reception offers data for each school showed Appletree Gardens is ranked as the most sensitive school in the entire planning area to falling birth rates. Langley, by contrast, has a medium sensitivity, cushioned by its proven popularity and wider draw. This decision feels incredibly short sighted and the effects it will have on the local area cannot be understated. This will make the area a lot less attractive for young families, meaning houses lose value and local businesses struggle and face closure, at an already difficult time for small independent local businesses. As parents, we want the best for our children. Langley remaining open is the best option for our children; ourselves and our area.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:13 AM

Why Langley First School Should Not Be Closed 1. Flawed and Inaccurate Process The council's decision to consult on closing Langley is based on incorrect and misleading information. Errors include false claims about Langley's playing fields, financial position, catchment accessibility, and pupil projections. There has been no community impact assessment, and early years and wraparound care were not considered. Key stakeholders such as governors and childcare providers have not been properly consulted. 2. Lack of Fairness – This Is a Closure, Not a True Merger The process being

proposed is a closure, not a merger. A true merger would allow both schools to contribute equally to a new identity, ethos, and structure, ensuring fairness and minimising community division. It would also bring greater scrutiny and transparency through Department for Education approval – a stronger, fairer route for local children. 3. Inaccurate Capacity and Building Data Council documents wrongly claim Appletree Gardens can accommodate both schools' pupils. Government data lists its capacity as 293 pupils, far below what's required. There are no guarantees on class sizes, safety, or special educational provision, and Appletree's building is more expensive to run (£29/m² vs. Langley's £4/m²). 4. Traffic and Safety Concerns No traffic impact study has been done. Langley's road closures and nearby car park keep children safe; Appletree's location on a bus route prevents similar measures. Surveys show the change would dramatically increase car use, worsening congestion and pollution. 5. Misleading Financial Narrative Langley is not in deficit—it only forecasts a shortfall in 2025–26 and is working proactively with independent advisors. Appletree already receives additional "Falling Rolls" funding that Langley does not. The council has never met Langley's leaders to discuss solutions. 6. Strong SEN and Inclusion Provision Langley offers exceptional, purpose-built facilities for children with SEND, including sensory rooms, specialist spaces, and a neurodiversity-affirming culture. Its close partnership with Woodlawn Special School provides an inclusive model praised in national policy —something that would be lost in closure. 7. Weak Birth Rate Argument While birth rates have fallen, ONS forecasts show recovery from 2026, and migration trends bring more young families to the coast. The North Tyneside Local Plan (2025) itself contradicts the council's argument, noting inward migration will sustain child numbers. 8. Pupil Projections Are Unreliable The council's pupil data is inconsistent and projects beyond the national forecasting period (2030) without explanation. Correcting errors shows Langley's surplus would be only 14% by 2030 (within acceptable limits), while Appletree's would remain much higher at 34%. 9. Parental Choice Ignored Langley is the more popular and resilient school. 88% of parents did not list Appletree as a preferred choice. Many said they would seek places elsewhere or even homeschool if Langley closed. Closing the more in-demand, stable school undermines parental preference and community trust. 10. Early Years & Wraparound Provision Overlooked Langley's "School's Out" offers longer hours, holiday care, and services for ages 9 months–9 years—vital for working families. Appletree's "Little Pips" offers shorter hours and limited age range, with many parents saying they would need to cut work hours or quit jobs if Langley's childcare ended. 11. Future Growth Ignored The Murton Gap development (3,000 homes) will create demand for at least 748 extra primary places. Langley is ideally located to serve this new population, yet the council's plan reduces capacity in the area just as demand is expected to rise. 12.

Disruption to Current Pupils Current Year 2 pupils would face large class sizes and disruption in 2027—the largest cohort in the system. Waiting until smaller cohorts move through would make far more educational sense. 13. Wider System Impact This proposal benefits 32 post-16 SEND pupils at Woodlawn at the cost of displacing 300 primary children. It also ignores financial instability at Coquet Park, which the council admits is not viable after its PFI contract ends. In Summary Langley First School should remain open because: The consultation is factually flawed and procedurally unfair. Langley is financially stable, inclusive, and high-performing. The community, data, and future growth all support its retention. Closure would damage provision, increase inequality, and remove a school that embodies the council's own goals of inclusive, community-based education. This decision should be paused and independently reviewed to ensure a fair, transparent, and evidence-based outcome for our children and community.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:13 AM

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:15 AM

I am deeply concerned regarding the proposed 'merger' of Langley First School with Appletree. I chose Langley for its reputation for nurturing every child. It's heartbreaking and distressing to think that the school I planned for my daughter to attend might not exist when she is ready to start. [redacted] selected a nursery that offered hours of 7.30am to 6pm to accomodate mine and my husband's working hours. My daughter has not dealt well with moving rooms in her nursery as she has progressed and I made a decision to move her to Langley School nursery from September 2026 so that she would be settled at a local school, where her local friends already attend. She would then be used to the environment, would see her friends and feel secure by the time she started reception in September 2027 with minimal disruption. It took me a long time and a lot of thought to make this decision about what was best for my daughter and my family and the Council's proposal, which is completely flawed, is nothing but insulting to the families of North Tyneside and the staff at the schools involved. Out of Hours Provision Langley's "Schools Out" offers flexible childcare from 7:30am–6pm, including holidays which would allow me and my husband to continue to work my current hours. Appletree's Little Pips has shorter hours and less holiday cover. Many parents rely on this care to work—losing it could mean cutting hours or leaving jobs. I also worry about whether we'll even be able to get a wrap around place for our daughter with all of the additional children in one location. If we are unable to secure a wrap around place I am unsure what we will do. Class Sizes Some time ago I had wanted to send my daughter to a private school, as I had,

but since the Government's change to tax on school fees, this is no longer an option for us financially. I was mainly worried about class sizes public schools could offer in comparison to private but having done my research I felt that Langley was an excellent option. The school feels like an excellent community and every child has a voice and time to be seen and heard. I do not understand how the proposed 'merger' can possibly achieve reasonable class sizes of under 30 per class which is already a lot of children. My worry is that my daughter is going to be lost and struggle in an enviroment when, whilst there is no suggestion of any SEN, she is sensitive. I have already taken her to see the school and she loved it. The council says Appletree can take 432 pupils, but official data shows its capacity is 293. No one has explained how our children will fit or what class sizes will look like. Traffic [redacted] Moving hundreds of children will increase car journeys. Langley currently closes its street for safety; Appletree can't because it's on a bus route. The traffic around Seatonville Road and Foxhunters roundabout is already horrendous with people already using the back residential roads around Appletree to cut traffic and focussing all these additional children to one location is going to make this even worse. Parental Choice Surveys show most parents did not choose Appletree as a preference. Many would rather move schools or even home-school than send their children there. Langley is popular and resilient—why close the school families actually want? If Langley closes or 'merges' with Appletree I will likely wish to keep my daughter in her current nursery for an additional year and then select an entirely different school as I have absolutely no faith that the proposed merger will be orchestrated to work well without many teething issues which will directly impact my daughter. I am not prepared to accept this. SEND Langley is exceptional for children with SEND. It has adapted spaces, sensory rooms, outdoor learning areas, and trained staff who truly understand neurodiversity. As explained, whilst I do not believe my daughter in neurodiverse, she is emotionally sensitive and I believe she will be able to get the additional support she needs at Langley. There's no guarantee this level of support will exist at Appletree. Closing Langley risks losing a safe, inclusive environment that many families depend on. Looking Ahead The council says falling birth rates justify closure, but official forecasts show rates will stabilize and rise after 2026. Plus, thousands of new homes are planned nearby. Homes are being built everywhere in North Tyneside. It is a highly desirable area which is evident by the rising house prices. Losing Langley now feels short-sighted when the cost to create a new school when, inevitably it is then needed, will be huge. Flaws in the Process The consultation process feels rushed and based on inaccurate information: The council claimed Langley has no playing fields and that children cross a road for PE. This is simply false. Langley has a well-used playing field right next to the school, plus outdoor spaces like a forest school

garden and potting area. They said the school is in financial deficit. It isn't. Langley has never been in deficit before and is already working with an independent advisor to prevent future issues. They suggested most families could walk to Appletree without crossing major roads. Many of us would have to cross busy roads like Seatonville and Cauldwell Lane. Parents and governors have had little chance to be involved. There's been no proper community impact assessment, and early years or wraparound care haven't even been considered. Merger or Closure? The council calls this a "merger," but it's really a closure. A true merger would mean creating a new school with input from both communities—new name, new ethos, and a fair start for all children. That would be the right thing to do. Instead, this proposal feels like Langley is being erased. In Summary As a parent, I want the best for my child, and it is up to me to make that choice, which I have done. Langley offers that—a nurturing, inclusive environment with strong community ties. Closing it would take away choice, disrupt families, and harm children's wellbeing. If change is needed, let's do it properly—with fairness, transparency, and a plan that puts children first. I would suggest educational specialists actually spend some time visiting the schools in the local area. Clearly North Tyneside are unsure what they are doing, as with the closure of Monkseaton High, all of these proposed school closures, my worry is what on Earth is the situation going to be like when my daughter is ready to attend High School?

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:21 AM

The closure directly impacts our family as both nephews are currently attending Langley. The closure of this wonderful school would not only impact the children's learning (one of our Nephews has autism) and disrupt their routine significantly but would also impact their mother who is unable to drive and therefore would mean a long commute to and from school on foot. We as a family are not willing to sacrifice the boys excellent current education to send them to an underperforming school with issues.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:23 AM

I want my future children to attend Langley and always have

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:26 AM

I am deeply concerned about the proposed merger of Langley First School and feel compelled to outline the serious impact this would have on my child, my family, and the wider community. This is not merely a matter of preference or convenience but one of educational quality, emotional wellbeing, and community stability. The proposal threatens to disrupt the secure, consistent environment that has enabled my child to thrive. Loss of safe, traffic-free walking routes One of the most immediate and tangible impacts of this proposal would be the loss of a traffic-free walking route to school. At present,

my child can walk safely to school, gaining a sense of autonomy, confidence, and daily exercise that is crucial for their development. Walking to school is more than just a commute; it teaches children about road safety, spatial awareness, and responsibility. The proposed merger would eliminate this opportunity, forcing reliance on car travel and significantly increasing local congestion. Many nearby roads already experience high traffic volumes during peak hours; diverting hundreds of families to a single alternative site would intensify this pressure, reduce safety for pedestrians and cyclists, and worsen air quality. This issue extends beyond education and must be recognised as part of the broader infrastructure strain the proposal would create across North Tyneside. Beyond safety, this would remove a daily opportunity for my child to engage with the environment, develop independence, and establish healthy routines. Studies consistently show that children who walk to school have improved concentration, better physical health, and greater emotional resilience, all of which would be compromised by a change in school location. Disruption to Family Life and Sibling Arrangements A merger could result in siblings attending different schools, causing practical and emotional difficulties for families. Coordinating drop-offs, collections, and after-school activities would become far more complex, placing additional pressure on working parents. Moreover, separating siblings would deprive them of shared experiences that foster support, familiarity, and emotional security. With my younger child due to start school in 2027, I am particularly concerned about the potential for my children to be split between different sites, undermining the stability and sense of continuity that families value. Loss of Identity and Belonging Langley First is not merely a place of learning; it is a close-knit community where children, parents, and staff share a strong sense of identity. My child benefits enormously from the consistency, ethos, and relationships built within this environment. As a parent, I have actively engaged with the school, contributing to events, supporting activities, and forming relationships with staff and other families. This involvement has been an essential part of my life and has helped me build a sense of pride in my child’s education. For my child, being a pupil at Langley First is central to their sense of identity. They know the teachers, the routines, the ethos of the school, and the values that are consistently reinforced. A merger risks erasing this identity and replacing it with unfamiliar surroundings and practices. The emotional impact of losing a familiar and supportive environment is significant. Langley's community would be impossible to replicate elsewhere. Children develop confidence and resilience when they feel secure, understood and valued within their school; removing that foundation risks anxiety, uncertainty, and disengagement, and a disruption to the positive self-concept built by Langley. Such changes would not only affect individual children but also weaken the collective spirit that has long defined the local community. Break-Up of a Community Langley First represents a

thriving network of families and professionals who collaborate to support children's learning and wellbeing. The strength of this community lies in its stability and shared purpose. These bonds foster mutual support, trust, and collaboration, which in turn enhance children's educational experiences and social development. Disrupting it would dismantle vital social bonds, leaving families without the informal support networks that contribute to resilience and engagement. Children benefit most when parents and teachers work together in a stable and trusted environment. The proposed merger would fragment this cohesion and diminish the broader community fabric that underpins educational success across North Tyneside. Children benefit not just from excellent teaching, but also from being part of a community where they are known and valued. Parents benefit from connections that provide advice, friendship, and a shared sense of purpose. Breaking up this community will remove these support systems, leaving families and children without the social and emotional scaffolding that is essential for early development. Educational Disruption and Inequality Perhaps the most profound impact would be on my child's education. Langley First is recognised for excellence in phonics, oracy, and mathematics, amongst other areas, underpinned by structured, evidence-based teaching to maximise learning outcomes. This consistent approach builds solid foundations for lifelong learning. Research consistently demonstrates that early interventions in phonics and numeracy are critical to later academic achievement. A merger would expose children to different teaching styles and curricula, risking inconsistencies that could impede progress and confidence. Even brief interruptions to established learning routines can have lasting effects on attainment and motivation. For children in their formative years, such disruption cannot easily be undone. Langley First's consistent and well-structured approach is already ahead of the curve, transitioning to a school with different priorities and methods would risk our child falling behind, not due to any lack of ability or motivation. My child would, through no fault of their own, be placed at a disadvantage simply because of administrative decisions beyond their control. Loss of Faith and Trust in Local Governance The proposed closure also risks damaging our trust in North Tyneside Council and, by extension, in the Labour Party, which currently governs the council. Decisions such as these, made without adequate consideration of the community's voice, undermine confidence in the local government's commitment to education and community welfare. Trust is foundational to effective governance, and when families feel unheard or disregarded, it erodes civic engagement and faith in the decision-making process. Families invest time, energy, and emotional labor into schools, expecting that their children's needs and the community's well-being will be prioritized. This proposal, if implemented, signals that these contributions are undervalued and that the council may not fully appreciate the long-term consequences of such actions. Impact on

Social and Emotional Development Relationships with teachers and peers are central to a child's wellbeing. Langley First provides an environment where children are known personally, feel secure, and are encouraged to flourish. Moving to a new and unfamiliar setting would unsettle these relationships and could lead to anxiety and a loss of confidence. For younger pupils in particular, emotional stability and trusted relationships are critical to learning. The merger threatens to compromise this balance, to the detriment of pupils' overall development. Long-Term Consequences and Infrastructure Pressures Beyond the immediate educational impact, the proposal risks lasting harm to community cohesion and local infrastructure. Increased traffic volumes, parking pressures, and longer commutes would affect all residents, not just those with school-aged children. The removal of a well-placed local school will inevitably generate higher car dependency, undermining sustainability goals and creating daily congestion around remaining schools. These long-term effects cannot be dismissed as secondary concerns; they are intrinsic to assessing the proposal's viability for North Tyneside. Conclusion The proposed merger of Langley First School would have profound and far-reaching consequences for children, families, and the wider community. It would remove safe walking routes, exacerbate traffic and congestion, separate siblings, erode identity and belonging, and diminish educational continuity. It would break apart a cohesive community, reduce parental confidence in local governance, and compromise the quality of education for current and future generations. I worry that the merger prioritises short-term administrative goals over the long-term educational and social development of children. Langley First embodies educational excellence and a nurturing ethos that cannot simply be replicated elsewhere. I therefore urge North Tyneside Council to reconsider the proposal in full, to listen to the voices of families who depend on this school, and to prioritise children's needs, community wellbeing, and local sustainability above short-term administrative convenience. Langley First is not just a school—it is an essential part of the fabric of North Tyneside. Its closure would be a loss felt deeply and widely, with repercussions for years to come.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:39 AM

I am a parent of a child currently attending Langley First School, and I wish to outline the profound impact that the proposed merger with Appletree Gardens First School would have on my family, my child, and the wider community. The closure or merger of Langley First is not a matter of buildings or administrative convenience; it affects every aspect of a child's learning, wellbeing, and sense of belonging. My child has established strong attachments to teachers, classmates, and the familiar school environment. Removing this stability would be highly disruptive, particularly for younger pupils who rely on consistency to thrive academically, socially, and emotionally. Langley First provides a nurturing environment that cannot be easily replicated

in a larger, merged school. The three-tier system enables smaller, focused classrooms where teachers provide individualised attention and pastoral care. My child benefits greatly from this, and a merger risks diluting these advantages, reducing opportunities for personalised teaching and support. Beyond academics, the school fosters strong social bonds and community identity. For children, these connections are vital for confidence, resilience, and social development. For families, the school acts as a hub for collective engagement. Its loss would have a profound emotional and social impact. The timing of the merger is particularly concerning given anticipated population growth from Murton Gap. Hundreds of new families will require school places, and Langley First is ideally located to meet this demand. Its closure would increase pressure on other local schools, force longer travel times, and disrupt daily routines. My child's day would be affected, with longer journeys, earlier departures, and reduced time for homework and extracurricular activities. The stress of adapting to a new school, new classmates, and unfamiliar staff would exacerbate these practical challenges. Parental choice and trust would also be undermined. Families have deliberately chosen Langley First for its ethos, small class sizes, and strong pastoral care. Closing the school removes that choice and signals that the community's voice is secondary to administrative convenience. Langley could instead serve as the central hub in a federated system, sharing best practice, managing SEND provision, and providing stability across the area. This approach would preserve community identity, maintain parental confidence, and support continuity for children during demographic change. SEND provision is another concern. Many of my child's peers benefit from the inclusive support at Langley First, which fosters personalised learning and pastoral care. A merger into a larger setting may compromise this support. Retaining Langley and investing in mainstream SEND provision would align with national policy, meet local demand, and reduce pressure on specialist units. Closing the school would eliminate this opportunity, with detrimental effects on children with SEND and the wider community. The merger would also disrupt social cohesion. Langley First is more than a school; it is a community hub where parents connect, children participate in events, and local identity is reinforced. My family has developed strong relationships through school activities, which support both children's development and our sense of belonging. Closure would fracture these connections, leaving families isolated and reducing opportunities for mutual support. Social cohesion, while hard to quantify, is crucial for the wellbeing of children and adults alike. Practical issues include increased travel, transport costs, and disrupted daily routines. Young children are particularly vulnerable to stress from longer journeys and new environments, and the benefits of walking to and from school are priceless. For working parents, additional travel complicates schedules and childcare arrangements. Increased traffic from families

commuting to a more distant school would exacerbate congestion, reduce safety, and create broader infrastructure pressures in North Tyneside. Financially, the merger may impose hidden costs: travel, potential loss of local wraparound care leading to parents havjng to change jobs, working patterns and likely decrease their working hours, Langley has a high amount of parents working in public services such as the NHS- this could have hige detrimental impacts, and additional uniforms or equipment. Community investment in Langley's facilities and staff expertise would be lost, reducing educational quality. Retaining Langley as the leading school in any partnership would deliver better outcomes without imposing undue burdens on families. The effect on children's mental health and sense of security must not be underestimated. Familiar routines and trusted adults are fundamental to early learning. The merger would introduce uncertainty and anxiety, potentially affecting confidence, behaviour, and academic progress. Conversely, keeping Langley open, enhancing SEND provision, and establishing it as a central hub would provide stability, reassurance, and a clear plan for the future, benefiting all pupils. Long-term, closing the school undermines parental trust and engagement. Families have chosen Langley for its nurturing environment and proven track record. Removing this choice diminishes confidence in the Council and reduces meaningful parental involvement. Population growth, particularly from Murton Gap, reinforces the need to retain and strengthen Langley, ensuring sufficient, high-quality school places. In conclusion, the proposed merger would cause substantial disruption to my child, my family, and the wider community. The impacts include loss of continuity, increased travel, weakened community ties, and reduced opportunities for inclusive education. As an alternative to a closure, I respectfully urge the Council to: delay the consultation to allow thorough consideration; integrate Murton Gap and other housing developments into pupil forecasts; explore Langley First as the leading school in any future partnership; and invest in SEND provision within the school to meet both current and future needs. Taking these steps would protect children's education, support families, preserve community identity, and ensure North Tyneside is prepared for the growth and challenges ahead. Langley First School is not just a building; it is a community, a centre of learning, and a place where children thrive academically, socially, and emotionally. The merger proposal, if implemented without delay and reconsideration, threatens all of these benefits. My family's experience demonstrates that the potential consequences are both real and far-reaching. Retaining Langley First, while allowing it to take a leading role in collaboration and inclusive provision, represents the most responsible, forward-looking, and child-focused solution. It would safeguard the wellbeing and education of current and future pupils, support families, preserve community identity, and prepare North Tyneside for future growth. My younger child, due to start school in 2027, must also benefit from this

careful, forward-looking planning.

Screen Name Redacted

11/13/2025 10:44 AM

[redacted] My dreams came true when she got a place firstly in the nursery and then in reception. I felt so lucky for my child to be starting off her education in such a safe and nurturing environment, as I had all of those years before. It is testament to the school ethos and community that this feeling hasn't changed all of those years later. So imagine my devastation when I learned of the councils plans to destroy this for us as a family, my sensitive and anxious firstborn child who had settled in so amazingly to her school is now having this torn away from her, inciting anxiety in us all. Her brother is due to start the nursery in September 2026. We now are faced with the decision of where he will go if Langley is to close, but I cannot think about that because we only have one school that would ever be our true choice. We did not choose Appletree First School, it was not in our 3 school choices. In a recent survey conducted by Langley First School, 88% of parents had not put Appletree First School as ANY of their 3 preferences when choosing a school space. The council preaches that they wish to preserve parental preference. How can that be the case when so many parents are having that choice removed from them. Another reason this was not a choice for us is the walk to school, we currently walk to and from school every day, If we are forced to go to Appletree we will have to drive initially in order to get my son to a different school site and then on days where we start work early. If we walk we will have to cross major roads. Traffic is already known to be horrendous in the streets surrounding Appletree First School, I know this as my brother lives in the estate across from Appletree and most mornings struggles to get his car off his drive and leave his own street. My child is due to start nursery in september 2026 which will result in my children being on two separate sites; whether this is appletree or another school. [redacted] and we will struggle massively to get our children to school on time with this configuration. My child's education will inevitably be affected by this proposal. Appletree gardens is a school that has always allowed for approx 290 pupils and only recently changed their numbers to above 400. The site is clearly not going to be fit for purpose if the proposal goes ahead. Pupil numbers have not been that high for a reason. The classrooms are smaller at Appletree than at Langley First School. I am concerned as to how they will fit all of the children in, at the proposed capacity. Even if the council were to put interim buildings in place this would not be sufficient, and could be done on the Langley site. Which again poses the question of why Langley? This brings me back to why we moved here in the first place, the pull to Whitley Bay is the school

choice and the allowance for preference. I am contemplating moving back to Gosforth as a result of this proposal, if it is to go ahead, and I feel that many other families will feel the same. It is inciting panic in the area and I feel the council would be very wise to reassess their proposal immediately.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:46 AM

I am the grandmother of two children who attend Langley First School. I am writing to express my deep concern and opposition to the proposal to close Langley First School and merge it with Appletree Gardens. Langley is not just a school; it is a community. It has caring staff, a nurturing environment, and a culture of belonging that allows every child to thrive. My grandchildren run into school happy and confident each morning, and that is because they feel safe, known, and valued there. Taking that away from them, and from so many local families, would be devastating. I am particularly worried about the emotional impact this change would have. Research consistently shows that children learn best when they feel secure and connected to their school community. When that sense of belonging is broken, it affects not only their learning but their confidence and wellbeing. To uproot young children from the relationships and routines that give them stability is, in my view, deeply wrong. The Council's proposal appears to be based on flawed and incomplete information. Langley is not in financial deficit, it has safe and well-used outdoor space, and it plays a vital role in the community. No proper assessment has been done on the impact to families, traffic, or childcare. The proposal is not a true merger, it is the closure of a much-loved, high-performing school. Families like ours will face enormous disruption. My son and daughter-in-law work full-time and depend on a careful balance of childcare and family support. For many others, Langley's wraparound care is essential, yet there are no guarantees that equivalent provision would be available at Appletree. Beyond the statistics and reports, this decision is about people, about children who feel they belong, parents who depend on their school for support, and a community that has built something special. Closing Langley would be a terrible mistake. I urge the Council to reconsider this proposal and to listen to the families and grandparents who see every day the difference this school makes to our children's lives.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:47 AM

The proposed merger of the schools will impact two of my family units (hardworking parents / residents with two children in each unit). Three of the four children love learning at Langley First School - they are well settled and happy. The fourth child will go to school in two years time. The affect of a merger on both families (and the grandparents who collect the children from school) is as follows: 1. The school is in easy walking distance - there's an environmental impact to be considered - more cars on the road! 2. There are children (like my

grandson) who have additional learning needs and he is supported by his big sister and highly professional teaching staff. To disrupt his learning will great a major setback. 3. We cannot provide the wrap around support as grandparents if as a result of this proposed merger the children end up in different schools. Not all grandparents are retired due to a cost of living crisis. 5. If this proposal goes ahead, you may find some working parents simply give up work because of the location/ distance to AppleTree Gardens. This will increase reliance on state benefits and detrimental to the local economy and the fundamental aims of achieving a growth economy. Langley First has created a community of support, families greatly value and connect with the leadership and dynamism of the teaching staff and support staff. In summary, Here are reasons from a family perspective on why the school should remain open: Walking distance matters for young children and working parents - families can safely walk their children to school, avoiding long journeys that are exhausting for primary-age pupils and create childcare difficulties for parents juggling work schedules. High-performing schools are precious community assets - when a school is delivering excellent outcomes, disrupting this proven success harms the very children it's meant to serve, and finding equivalent quality elsewhere isn't guaranteed. Children with additional learning needs have established support - moving these vulnerable pupils means breaking trusted relationships with staff who understand their specific requirements, potentially setting back their progress significantly. Experienced staff teams can't be replicated - the school's great teachers and support staff represent years of relationship-building with local families and deep knowledge of the community they serve. School closure fractures friendship groups and community bonds - primary school friendships are formative, and forcing children to separate and start again elsewhere can be deeply unsettling during crucial developmental years. Alternative schools may lack capacity - closure assumes nearby schools have space to absorb pupils, but families could face longer commutes to unfamiliar areas, undermining the local school community model In essence, PLEASE keep this school open for everyone's sake!

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:48 AM

If this proposal was made, we would be impact by the following. 1. Our daughter's mental health would be affected as she saw a reduction in pupils attending Langley School in 2026/27 academic year. This would increase her worry about an institution and teaching staff that means a great deal to her. 2. it is likely the proposal would cause teaching staff to look elsewhere for employment, so there is a strong likelihood that our daughter's academic teaching would suffer from multiple teachers covering her lessons. This further disruption is likely to reduce the standard of her education, something Langley excels at. 3. I expect this would have a large impact on local

businesses that benefit from Langley School. This would cause greater traffic in the area as people went further for those goods or services. 4. This would have an impact on house prices in the area if Langley was closed, as school choices play a big part in moving house. We moved to the area from Blaydon and diligently looked at the school catchment areas when viewing properties.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:52 AM

As a member of staff at Langley First School, I care deeply about the children and families we serve. I see every day how much the children value the stability, relationships, and sense of belonging they experience at Langley. For many of them, school is a place where they feel safe, understood, and supported — particularly those with additional needs or vulnerabilities. I am extremely concerned that closing or merging Langley First School will have a significant negative impact on the mental health and emotional wellbeing of our pupils and their families. Many children find change and transition very difficult, and the loss of their familiar environment, trusted staff, and close-knit school community could cause anxiety, confusion, and distress. Our parents repeatedly tell us how much they value the nurturing atmosphere and personal care that Langley provides. Losing this would not only affect individual pupils but could contribute to a wider rise in poor mental health and emotional difficulties across the local area. As staff, we have built strong, supportive relationships with our children over time. These relationships are crucial for their confidence, happiness, and learning. A merger would disrupt these bonds and could undo years of progress for some pupils, especially those who rely on consistent support to thrive. For these reasons, I believe the proposed merger would have deep and lasting emotional consequences for the children and families connected to Langley First School.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:55 AM

If this proposal proceeds in its current form, many families — including ours — will face significant disruption. For example, children currently in Year 2 would be required to move schools for Year 4 and then again for Year 5, creating two major transitions in consecutive years. This would be highly unsettling for pupils who are thriving in a stable, familiar environment. There are also serious unanswered practical questions about how the plan would be delivered: • Capacity: How will Appletree accommodate 118 children in a single year group? • Facilities: Will temporary ‘portacabin’ classrooms be used, and if so, how will this affect inclusion and learning? • Class sizes: Will these exceed the recommended limit of 30 pupils? • Resources: How will PE lessons, lunchtime arrangements, school trips, and extracurricular activities be managed without reducing opportunities for existing pupils? • Wraparound care: How will after-school provision expand to support significantly higher demand from

working families who depend on care until 6 p.m.? • Safety: How will traffic and parking challenges around Appletree Gardens be addressed to ensure safe drop-offs and pick-ups? • Logistics for families: How will parents manage the transition phase if they have one child at Langley and another at a different school? • Fairness: What about families who deliberately chose to live in Monkseaton so their children could attend Langley First School — a school with an excellent local and regional reputation? Children deserve stability, continuity, and a sense of belonging. At Langley, pupils are known personally by teachers, staff, and peers. They are confident and settled within a nurturing environment where they understand routines, relationships, and the physical space of the school. Disrupting this at such a formative stage risks undoing years of progress. Children should be allowed to complete their time at Langley with their friends and trusted staff, enjoying key milestones such as the Year 4 residential trip, leavers' assembly, and celebration events. These are formative experiences that build confidence, connection, and lifelong memories. Moving pupils to a school that was not chosen by families — one that may not have the capacity or resources to accommodate them properly — is not a fair or child-centred solution. Parents should not be forced into accepting Appletree Gardens simply because no other spaces are available. In summary: • The merger should be delayed for at least two years. • Langley should be the permanent site for the merged school. • The decision must prioritise pupil well-being, educational continuity, and the clear preferences of the community. Langley First School has built a strong, inclusive, and successful community. Any changes to its future should protect that stability and ensure that children can continue to thrive in the environment they know and love.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:56 AM

I wish to object to the proposal to merge Langley First School and Appletree Gardens First School for the following reasons: 1. The labelling of this as a 'merger' is incorrect and needs to be addressed, ideally with a better understanding of what is involved in a merger. I understand that the official wording for this is 'merger', but that doesn't mean it is the correct term to use in this context and has set the expectations of parents of both schools in the entirely opposite direction to the proposal. Whether this was done intentionally or not it is a mistake. If the schools are 'merged' then the following must apply: a. The schools must be formed under a new name, with a new governing body and leadership drawn from the best of both schools b. A new school uniform must be instated, separate from the existing uniforms of both schools c. The staff must be treated equally, taking staff from both settings to fill the gaps that will certainly arise from such pupil numbers in a new setting d. Out-of-school provision must be made to accommodate the existing setup from both schools i.e. a new out-of-school provision must have opening times equal to the

earliest and latest that exists currently at both schools Doing this will help ease the children into a new setting without causing unnecessary detriment to both mental wellbeing and education, both of which would be very much affected by simply transplanting children to an existing setting (prompting an us-and-them attitude that benefits no-one). 2. The intention to reuse the existing Langley site as an expansion to Woodlawn is both near-sighted and impractical, and misses opportunities that could be leveraged to better help with SEN inclusion in mainstream Firstly, there is no mention of the cost associated with re-fitting Langley to act as a suitable extension to Woodlawn. This would be expansive, and of course the cost to do this to a build that has no facilities would be the same no matter where the building was located. Rather, there is an opportunity to integrate Langley and Woodlawn further via dual registration, allowing access to facilities in both sites for all pupils via targeted interventions and therapies whilst still allowing participation in mainstream settings. It should be noted that this approach, in contrast to the Council's proposal, supports the Government's key priority in education of inclusivity, keeping children in mainstream with support rather than pushing them aside. 3. Being attached to Woodlawn, Langley First School prides itself on accommodating SEN children. There are several SEN pupils currently at Langley, with another group that are receiving additional support following early identification of SEN, which means that 24% of pupils have some amount of SEN support. Langley provides a lot of support in this area, including: a. All entrances have ramp access where required, and accessible toilets throughout the building. b. There is a dedicated sensory room to aid children, not only those in crisis but all children, as well as other adapted spaces including an outdoor classroom. c. Lunchtime clubs available to pupils away from the main dining hall. d. A dedicated 'reset' area in every classroom to aid children to regulate. e. 'Neurodiversity affirming' aesthetics such as soft lighting, clear visual aids for navigation, adapted seating arrangements, strategies for emotional regulation As far as can be seen in the current proposal, there is no provision set aside for this at Appletree Gardens, and in fact with the need to move hundreds of new pupils into Appletree should the proposed 'merger' take place, then there will functionally be no SEN support at Appletree. This is negligent and will severely affect a sizable portion of the children who are supposed to feel safe and secure at the school.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 10:56 AM

Impact of Langley First School's Closure on My Children's Learning Firstly I would like to state my children love Langley First School. They have thrived at this school becoming, confident, responsible, resilient children with a love of learning. This is all due to the Langley ethos and highly supportive educational standards. My children always say they feel safe at Langley and this school has helped them

to develop as individuals as well as being part of the Langley team and local community. Langley First School provides an inclusive, high-quality learning environment fully aligned with the government's revised curriculum priorities in early reading, literacy, and oracy. Its teachers know pupils deeply, apply targeted interventions, and maintain a culture that fosters curiosity, confidence, and wellbeing. Closure of this setting would interrupt essential stages of my child's educational development, disrupt continuity of teaching and relationships, and risk regression in learning progress — particularly in the core areas the national curriculum now prioritises. 1. Alignment with the New Curriculum The Department for Education's current curriculum and Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) KS1 and KS2 reforms place increased emphasis on: • Early reading and systematic phonics • Language development and oracy • Knowledge sequencing and curriculum coherence • Character education and resilience Langley First School's ethos — promoting reading, literacy, and oracy as central pillars of learning — already meets and exceeds these expectations. The staff's consistent focus on spoken language, storytelling, and reading for pleasure is entirely consistent with the new curriculum's vision for early literacy excellence. Langley's closure would therefore represent not only the loss of a well-performing local institution but the removal of a school that already exemplifies government educational priorities. 2. Teaching Quality and Individualised Support Langley's teachers are described by parents and pupils as knowing each child "really well." This deep teacher–pupil knowledge allows for differentiated instruction and early identification of gaps — a cornerstone of quality-first teaching. This relational understanding cannot be replicated quickly elsewhere. If pupils were transferred to a new school (such as Appletree Gardens), teachers unfamiliar with individual learning styles, strengths, and support needs would require time to reassess each child, inevitably causing interruption to progress. The first term following a school move is typically dominated by: • Baseline re-assessment • Adjustment to new teaching styles and expectations • Social adaptation and environmental change For a child currently thriving in Langley's stable and nurturing environment, this proposal (moving schools, losing teachers, unfamiliar environment, larger classes) would likely result in a significant dip in attainment — particularly in reading fluency, writing stamina, and oral confidence. 3. Curriculum Continuity and Pedagogical Impact Langley delivers a sequential, well-structured curriculum that builds knowledge cumulatively from Early Years upwards. If the school closes, this sequencing will be broken. Disruption of curricular continuity often causes: • Re-teaching of previously learned material, reducing efficiency of instruction • Missed knowledge connections, leading to gaps in conceptual understanding • Reduced mastery, especially in reading comprehension, spelling, and mathematical fluency These effects are amplified under the new national framework, where curriculum

coherence and cumulative progression are essential to achieving mastery standards by Key Stage 2. 4. Learning Environment and Ethos Langley's environment — inclusive, safe, and aspirational — is itself a learning asset. The school's "Safe to Be Me" approach and mental-health strategies underpin academic success by fostering resilience and emotional readiness to learn. For many children, the sense of belonging and predictability of familiar routines is key to engagement. A sudden shift to a larger or unfamiliar environment may increase anxiety, reduce concentration, and decrease participation in class discussions — directly undermining the curriculum's emphasis on confidence, communication, and oracy. 5. Resources and Opportunities That Support Learning Langley provides specific resources that enhance academic progress: • Small class sizes promoting one-to-one attention • Strong literacy resources and reading culture • Outdoor learning and Forest School experiences that develop problem-solving and teamwork skills • Specialist areas such as The Haven and sensory rooms supporting regulation and readiness to learn • Excellent teachers who support all children to be their best and thrive Better persistent absence scores at Langley First school than Appletree Gardens with Langley only at 5.9% persistent absence (3rd out of the 8 NEPA first schools) and Appletree at 15% (worst coming 8th out of 8 NEPA first schools) If these facilities are lost, children's access to high-quality, multi-sensory learning opportunities would diminish. No evidence has been provided that equivalent resources or class sizes would be guaranteed at the receiving school. 6. Long-Term Educational Impact If Langley closes without full continuity planning: • Pupils risk losing momentum in literacy, numeracy, and personal development • Confidence and enthusiasm for learning may decline • Attainment gaps could widen, particularly for children with additional needs or those thriving under Langley's structured, nurturing ethos • Families' trust in the council and the local education system will erode, reducing engagement in community and school life — a factor strongly correlated with pupil progress These effects contradict the government's stated aims to "raise attainment and close the gap" in early education. 7. Conclusion The proposed closure of Langley First School would have a detrimental and measurable impact on my child's learning. Langley embodies the principles that the modern curriculum seeks to promote — excellence in early literacy, inclusive pedagogy, emotional wellbeing, and community engagement. Displacing children from this environment would jeopardise: • Curriculum continuity • Reading and oracy development • Emotional readiness to learn • The stability required for sustained academic progress The Council should therefore: • Recognise Langley's existing success in already delivering the Government's new suggested curriculum • Acknowledge the significant educational risk posed by its closure • Require full, evidence-based guarantees for curriculum, staffing, and environmental continuity before any transition is approved In the

absence of such guarantees, the closure should not proceed.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:04 AM

What's most upsetting is the lack of any clear plan for how this closure will actually work. Moving an entire school into another building that's already under pressure will inevitably lead to overcrowded classrooms and a strained environment—undoing everything that makes my child thrive in the nurturing, carefully chosen school she attends now. This isn't just inconvenient; it will severely affect the standard of her education. That is unacceptable when she is flourishing in a long-established, successful school with a proud history that's being discarded without clear reasoning. On top of that, the logistics are alarming—how can anyone justify moving hundreds of children into a school in the middle of a housing estate that already struggles with traffic chaos at school run times? I urge you to rethink this decision and consider the real impact it will have on our children's education and wellbeing.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:05 AM

First of all I would like to bring your attention to the following information: The initial documentation given to the council's cabinet, which the decision to move to consultation was based upon, contained several inaccuracies, including: ● Langley has a field separated by a public highway, meaning groups of children are escorted 'off site' for each PE/sporting activity and have no access to playing fields for lunch and dinner breaks (This isn't true. The school does in fact have a well-used playing field immediately adjacent to the building, with a separate field across a minor road which is used once a year for sports day. Langley also has an outdoor space in the reception garden, which follows a forest school ethos and is also used for children with SEND as well as a potting garden and an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming) ● The school is in financial deficit (This is incorrect. The school has only predicted a deficit for the year 25/26, for the first time ever and is working with an independent financial advisor to see where the budget can be improved) ● The majority of dwellings [currently in Langley catchment] can access [Appletree]without crossing major roads (This is incorrect. Many of our children would need to cross Seatonville Road and/or Cauldwell Lane) ● There were briefings and reports with headteachers (Whilst there have been meetings, this has been very brief and Headteachers could not include Governors which meant there was little options for them to act or come up with solutions) ● There were also several inaccuracies published in the consultation documents, including (but not limited to): ● Projected pupil numbers ● Deficit forecasting ● Inaccuracies in pupil data at other schools ● There has been no community impact assessment done in relation to the closure of Langley First School. A community impact assessment was done in December 2024 but this was in

relation to the Monkseaton High School closure. ● Neither early years provision nor wraparound provision have been considered as part of this consultation ● No governing body or senior manager of 'School's Out' (out of hours provision) at Langley has been contacted as part of external communication. [redacted] in fact we walk past the school every day (trying to avoid the vast amounts of traffic parked on the road and pavements surrounding the school). The reason for this is that Langley offers my children the kind of environment to thrive in that I don't believe can be obtained for any other school in North Tyneside. This is not an oppinion that I alone hold, as many families from within Appletree Gardens catchment travel to Langley for schooling. More children in Appletree Gardens catchment don't attend that school and attend a school outside of catchment. As far as the 'merger' is concerned: The council's consultation document says Appletree "can accommodate 432 pupils, which is more than the amount of both schools combined when future birth rates and admission numbers are adjusted". However, when we checked on the gov.uk website for the capacity of Appletree, the capacity is stated as being 293. ● As yet, the council has offered no assurance about how the Langley children could be safely accommodated on the site ● Nor has it given us any assurance on class sizes. In early years provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. Without any guarantees from the council or Appletree, there is a concern amongst us that our children will be placed in larger class sizes, which could have an adverse affect on their education and wellbeing. ● According to the government's school spending comparison tool Appletree is a more expensive building to run. Appletree spends £29 per square metre on utilities, compared to Langley which spends £4 per square metre. No evidence has been provided in the supporting documents in relation to traffic impact as a result of these proposals ● Langley currently closes the street outside school every morning to make it safer for the children. Appletree cannot close the street to cars in the mornings or at collection times due to it being on a bus route. ● Langley also has a free public car park very close by, which Appletree Gardens does not have. ● The assumption appears to be that children will walk to school. ● The parent survey carried out by Friends of Langley asked parents how they currently travel to school: ● 78% (150) said they walk ● 18.3% (35) said they drive ● When asked how they they would travel is their children attended Appletree: ● 55% (104) said they would drive ● 37.6% (71) said they would walk The parking around Appletree is already dangerous for pedestrians, as cars are normally parked fully on the pavement, therefore blocking areas where people can walk, this means that children have to walk in the roads to get to school, this is highly dangerous as with the heavy amounts of (sometimes speeding) cars and on an active bus route children are constently put at risk. Add another 100+ cars to this and

it is a serious accident waiting to happen. This can also be seen as the school themselves (NOT the council) have had to put cones out to stop parents parking around the junction between Appletree Gardens and Springfield Grove, as its too dangerous. This consultation relies heavily on the argument that birth rates are falling. ● Whilst there is no denying the downward trend in birthrates throughout North Tyneside upto 2023, the Office for National Statistics predicts that birth rates will level off from 2026 and then begin to increase again. ● Birth rates within the NEPA have been declining since 2008. However, despite this, the numbers within NEPA schools have been resilient to this downward trend, with the majority of schools being within the council's 10% acceptable surplus range on average since 2020. Appletree Gardens has had a 23% surplus level on average over the last five years. ● Internal migration has also not been taken into account for this consultation. Aside from a decline in 2022, the Office for National Statistics shows more young children move into North Tyneside than out of it. Although these statistics don't go down to NEPA level, we do know many families move specifically to the coast to take advantage of the three-tier system. ● The parenting survey conducted by the Friends of Langley showed 58% of respondents (out of 185 responses) moved to this area specifically to send their children to Langley First School, with a further 3% who had been planning to move to the area to send their children to Langley. ● The North Tyneside Local Plan 2025 also contradicts the rationale for closing Langley due to falling birth rates as it states: "Net inward migration from neighbouring areas, primarily Newcastle, helps to sustain the overall working age population and limits the fall in the number of children in the borough" The 'pupil projection methodology' was cited in the supporting documents provided in the Council proposals but there is no link to this methodology provided. Looking online we assume they must have used the National Pupil Projection Model since this is the only published methodology. However, the National Pupil Projection methodology only publishes projections up to 2030. Somehow, the council has forecast pupil numbers well beyond 2030. The council's projection figures also appear to be inaccurate: ● It projects 59 pupils starting in 2025 in Reception in Langley, which drops by six students to 53 in Year 1. There is no explanation of this and no indication from parents in this year group of their intention to leave ● In comparison, Appletree appears to gain 18 students between Reception to Year 1, again with no explanation as to where these additional students have come from and not in line with the school's admission records ● When these figures are corrected, we see that in 2030 (the acceptable time frame for pupil projections) Langley surplus is projected to be 14% surplus - only 4% away from the council's acceptable level - whereas Appletree's surplus is projected to be almost double at 34%. One of the main factors in the council's decision-making is the concern that the capacity at Whitley Bay High School (WBHS) is 390 pupils, and the

proposed first school and middle school changes are aimed at preventing the high school from going over capacity. However, our research group has found: ● Based on the council's methodology, from the current reception onwards, it is unlikely the numbers of pupils at WBHS will reach 390. Therefore the council's focus on ensuring numbers don't exceed this figure are misguided ● This issue the council is trying to fix relates to children already in the system, rather than future pupil projections, particularly the current year 2 and year 5 year groups. Closing Langley will not tackle this issue. This consultation assumes parents will choose to send their children to Appletree Gardens if Langley First School is closed. This would certainly be true for the current year 2 group, where there are no spaces across the whole of Whitley Bay to house these children other than at Appletree (where we understand there are currently two spaces). However, with a surplus at many of the other schools in the area, it cannot be assumed that Appletree would be the school of choice. ● The council's consultation document shows 44% of catchment children attend Appletree compared to 73% at Langley; 12% of Langley pupils attend from the Appletree Gardens catchment area ● In the most recent 2 previous years of higher birth rates, 2020 reception and 2023 reception intakes, Appletree was the only NEPA first school with surplus spaces in admissions, 14 and 6 respectively. For the 2 lowest birth rate years, 2024 and 2025 intake, Appletree had the largest portion of surplus places in admissions against PAN, 32% and 45% respectively ● When looking at the 2025 admissions data, the distance of the last place offered at Langley was nearly 6 miles, compared to 3.6 miles for Appletree, demonstrating a far wider geographic draw and a greater ability to attract families from further afield. ● Of the 187 parents who responded to the survey carried out by Friends of Langley, 88.2% said Appletree Gardens was not one of their school preferences when they applied for their school places. ● That same survey also asked which school would be their first choice of school for their children if Langley were to close. Of the 187 responses to this question: ● 38.5% chose South Wellfield (72 parents) ● 20.3% chose Southridge (38 parents) ● 11.2% chose Marine Park (21 parents) ● 11.2% chose Appletree (21 parents) ● 3.2% chose Whitley Lodge (6 parents) ● 3.2% chose Coquet Park (6 parents) ● When asked if they would take a place at Appletree Gardens if offered, 43 parents said no. ● A further 62 parents said they would potentially consider home-schooling their children if Langley closed. ● An analysis of birth rates mapped against six years' of reception offers data for each school showed Appletree Gardens is ranked as the most sensitive school in the entire planning area to falling birth rates. Langley, by contrast, has a medium sensitivity, cushioned by its proven popularity and wider draw. ● The council's proposal is therefore not just to close the more popular school, thereby ignoring parental choice, but also to close the more demographically stable and resilient one, leading to a longer-term risk

Although the proposal focuses on Langley First School and Appletree Gardens, there is a wider impact on all schools within the NEPA area and long-term implications which are not covered in the council's consultation documents. 1. Woodlawn ● The consultation outlines the intention for the council to repurpose the Langley site and move the post-16 provision from Marden High School (32 children in total according to Ofsted), thereby displacing 300 children for the benefit of 32 children ● By bundling the two issues - the alleged need to close a school with the need to expand Woodlawn - the council is effectively creating a false choice: asking the community to accept a suboptimal and unstable mainstream solution in exchange for a desirable SEND solution. ● The long-term health of the mainstream school system should not be compromised to solve a logistical problem for SEND provision, however important that provisionmay be. 2. Coquet Park First School ● Within the consultation documents, the council makes reference to considering the closure of Coquet Park but that this was not deemed financially viable. This is due to a private finance initiative (PFI) school, which the council is contractually obligated to until 2032. ● According to the council's cabinet paper, 2022/23 was the first financial year that the school ended with a deficit balance, and it ended 2024/25 with a cumulative deficit of £0.325m. The school has been unable to submit a budget plan which shows it coming back into financial balance within three years. In line with Scheme for Financing Schools, the school is classified as being in a structural deficit, which means there is a long-term financial problem that requires significant, strategic changes to resolve. ● The school currently also has a one-form entry, something the council says is not financially viable ● As well as being poor value for money for the taxpayer, due to the high interest charges the PFI contract is costing the council, this school is not financially viable bythe council's own recognition. In the absence of any proposed solutions being made available, it is difficult to understand how the council proposes to stop this school from being forced to close once the PFI contract ends in 2032. As a parent of children currently in year 1 and year 4 at Langley, I am worried for the educational well-being of my youngest child in Year 1. With no actual space in the current schools and the total lack of planning and foresight that the council are currently showing I worry what is to happen to them if the council simply ignore the parents. Homeschooling is a real possibility at this moment, this is something I can do [redacted], however the detrimental aspects of not being able to interact with their peers is another issue that worries me. The council seem to be making ridiculous decisions without any real thought or communication with the people being affected. There are schools in the area that are far worse off than Langley and Appletree Gardens, there is also a soon to be empty high school that could be put to use instead of (I assume) being left to rot before being sold off to a developer (ironically building more houses there would bring more families in to the catchment of

Langley therefore increasing pupil numbers!). I hope the council take this all on board before they ignore a complete community and close a school, later to realise they need a school in that area due to children numbers being brought in from increased building of family homes.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:06 AM

I have children which go to/will go to another school in the Monkseaton area and I am concerned that they will not be able to attend their chosen school due to spaces being needed for children from the closed schools

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:12 AM

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposal to close Langley First School and merge it with Appletree Gardens First School. As a parent of two children – [redacted] – I am deeply disappointed, frustrated, and angry about these plans. If they go ahead, they will cause serious disruption and emotional distress to many families, including my own. Our family specifically chose to move to this area because of Langley First School. We made that decision after careful research and visits, and we took on significant financial burdens to make it happen. The school's nurturing ethos, outstanding reputation, and strong community spirit were the deciding factors in uprooting our family. We have absorbed higher mortgage costs and other living expenses to live within Langley's catchment. If this proposal goes ahead and the school is closed, it will undermine that entire decision – a decision that could ultimately cost us tens of thousands of pounds for a benefit that is now being taken away. The council has failed to acknowledge or assess the financial and emotional impact on families who have invested heavily in this community because of Langley's success. If the process to close Langley goes ahead and the school does not accept a reception class next year, we and many other families will face major logistical and financial challenges that the consultation completely overlooks. We would have to manage two separate drop-offs and collections every day, which would be almost impossible alongside full-time work. We would have to pay for more wraparound care and new uniforms because siblings would no longer be able to share Langley-branded clothing. We would also have to cope with conflicting school schedules, such as training days, sports days and parents' evenings, which would make family life chaotic. The consultation process itself is dishonest, evasive, and cowardly. It describes this plan as a "merger" when in reality it is the closure of Langley First School. That wording feels deliberately misleading. The information provided is vague and incomplete, leaving parents unable to make an informed response. There is no clarity on what will happen to the Woodlawn site – how long changes will take, how much they will cost, or what adaptations are needed. While I would

regard the potential expansion of Woodlawn to be the single silver lining to this proposal, the lack of detail regarding this gives me little confidence in the process. It would be doubly heart-breaking if Langley were to close and then the site sit idle for an extended period of time. There is also no explanation of how the Appletree site will cope with extra pupils or what will happen to staff and class sizes. The whole process gives the impression that decisions have already been made and that public feedback is a formality rather than a genuine consultation. There are also clear inaccuracies in the documents, as highlighted by the Save Langley First School campaign. No traffic assessment has been published, despite the obvious increase in congestion and parking pressure that will come from merging two large school populations on one constrained site. There is no mention of the environmental impact of this extra traffic or how it will be managed. Langley First School is a thriving, high-performing, and much-loved part of our community. Its staff and leadership team create an environment where children feel known, supported, and inspired to succeed. I do not doubt that Appletree is also a good school - i've visited it and found it a warm, creative and welcoming environment. However, I am extremely dubious about how these qualities can be maintained with the extra burden of hundreds more pupils using the space of the course of several years. The Save Langley First School campaign, supported by hundreds of families and community members, has made it clear that this proposal is being driven by administrative convenience rather than the best interests of our children. This proposal is poorly evidenced, misleading, and unfair. It fails to provide key details, contains factual inaccuracies, and shows no understanding of the real human, financial, and emotional impact on families. The consultation process has been opaque and disingenuous, eroding trust between the council and the community it serves. I urge the council to withdraw or fundamentally rethink this proposal. Instead of dismantling a successful and thriving school, North Tyneside Council should be investing in Langley First School and preserving the high standards and community spirit that make it so special. Our family, and many others, made life-changing decisions to live here because of Langley. Closing it now would not just destroy a great school – it would betray the trust and investment of an entire community. Please do the right thing: keep Langley First School open.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:15 AM

Apple tree doesn't have the good reputation that Langley has. It doesn't have space for all of the children. The merger will cause major disruption for our family, with children being in different schools and parents expected to drop them both off at the same time. Similar problems will occur at pickup and will involve one child being in after school club, extra, unnecessary expense for the family. In particular the children will be unhappy and negatively impacted by the

unnecessary disruption

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:17 AM

Grandchild will have to move from a high achieving happy school to a school apparently under achieving. There isn't room for the extra classes that would be needed. The Langley staff are not going with the pupils. Very unsettling!! The office for national statistics have said the population is rising by millions each year. We need more schools not less. Especially good schools like Langley. How many councillors have actually visited Langley?

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:19 AM

My daughter is currently in Reception at Appletree Gardens First School. She is thriving there. She has settled into routines, built relationships with staff and classmates, and has begun to see school as a safe and predictable part of her life. Any proposal to merge schools and reduce places in the local three-tier system risks undermining that sense of safety and continuity for her and for us as a family. We live outside the formal catchment area but were offered a place at Appletree and chose it very deliberately because of the three-tier Whitley Bay pathway and the school’s ethos. We did so in good faith, on the understanding that she would be able to move on with her peers into the linked middle school and continue through the three-tier system. The proposed merger, reduction of places and wider changes create a real fear that she will be forced either to move to a two-tier primary after Year 4 or that we would feel pressured to move house into Whitley Bay simply to try to protect her access to the pathway she has already started. Both options feel unreasonable and harmful. Changing school or system part way through her primary years would be extremely destabilising. At this age, friendships are just forming, trust in adults is still fragile, and even small changes can feel enormous to a child. The idea that she might have to leave the classmates and teachers she has bonded with, purely because numbers and budgets no longer line up neatly on a spreadsheet, is distressing. It would mean asking a young child to cope with a major transition that is not educationally necessary, but driven by administrative and financial considerations. There is also the day to day impact of potentially larger class sizes and a more crowded school environment if the merger goes ahead. Part of why my daughter is enjoying Appletree is that, at present, there is space - physically and emotionally - for staff to know her, notice her, and support her as an individual. If Langley is closed and Appletree absorbs many more children, with no clear upper limit on Key Stage 2 class sizes, I worry that she will become just one of many in a much larger cohort. That loss of individual attention could affect her confidence, her willingness to contribute, and her ability to get help when she is worried or confused. There are classrooms at Appletree claimed to be 'empty' when in actuality they are SEND rooms,

support spaces, and a library - all of which are drastically improving the wellbeing and function of the school. Taking these away will have a profound impact on the children and ability for the school to operate as successfully, efficiently, and safely. On a practical level, our family already organises work, transport and caring responsibilities around the current school arrangement. We do not have the option simply to move closer to Whitley Bay to stay inside a shrinking catchment. If the merger and associated changes effectively push us out of the three-tier system, we will be forced into a choice between an unwanted school move for our daughter or significant disruption to our housing and support networks. Neither of these options is realistic or in her best interests. There is also the emotional toll of the uncertainty itself. Living through consultations, reading about closures and mergers, and not knowing whether your child will be able to stay in their school or move on with their friends creates ongoing anxiety. My daughter does not understand the details of the consultation, but she will pick up on the worry and on the possibility that “my school might close” or “I might have to go somewhere else”. For a young child, that kind of vague but persistent threat can be deeply unsettling and can show up as sleep problems, reluctance to go to school, or clinginess. For me as a parent, the stress of trying to plan around shifting proposals is significant. I want to be able to give my daughter honest, reassuring answers when she asks questions about her school and her friends: Will I still be here? Will my friends still be here? Will I be going to Middle School with everyone else? At the moment, I cannot do that, because the proposed changes are not framed around protecting the children who are already in the system. That lack of clarity is impacting my own mental health and my ability to plan for our family’s future. The proposal, as it stands, feels as if it treats current Reception and early year groups as transitional cohorts that can be moved around to solve a projected financial problem, rather than as young children whose wellbeing should be the starting point. It would affect us by: creating a real risk that our daughter will not be able to continue in the three-tier pathway we chose for her, unless we move house or move school; increasing the likelihood that she will face larger classes and a more crowded environment at an early and sensitive stage in her schooling; adding significant uncertainty and anxiety to her first years of education; and placing additional emotional and practical strain on us as a family as we try to work out where she will be educated in the medium term. If the council were to guarantee that all children currently in Reception and above at Appletree and Langley will be able to complete their three-tier journey through to high school, and if any structural changes were applied only to future intakes, a great deal of this impact would be mitigated. As it stands, however, the merger proposal makes our daughter’s educational path feel precarious and conditional, and that affects our family every day. It is personally affecting my own day-to-day ability to function as I try to navigate this jarring and sudden

change. It is already proving to have a severe impact on my own mental health.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:23 AM

I am writing to you as a parent and member of the Langley First School community, I would like to state that I am strongly against the proposal to close Langley First School to merge with Appletree Gardens. This plan is not in the best interests of our children or community and I have serious concerns about its impact. The current proposal has a plethora of inaccuracies, misleading and missing information all of which has made it very difficult to gather all of the information we need to put together an effective alternative proposal in the given time frame. Therefore I would like to request that an extension is granted in order to give us a fair opportunity to do so. We have been given the bare minimum amount of time deliberately so that we do not have the time to compete against it. The proposal states that this will be a ‘merge’ of the two schools but at our consultation meeting at Whitley Bay High School, the council confirmed that it is in fact a closure of Langley and a takeover from Appletree. So not at all a true ‘merge’ as advertised. The current consultation has already created divides within our community which is unhelpful. Both schools are good schools but a true merger would mean both schools and most importantly the children could have an input into the new school’s name, ethos, uniform etc and would mean we could keep the best parts of both schools including staff. This is not the case with this proposal, Appletree are retaining everything while Langley which is the stronger school, would close and lose exceptional teachers, a fantastic reputation and most importantly severely disrupt our students. Langley First School is at the heart of our community and is currently thriving this is not the school you should be choosing for closure. Langley has shown a stronger parental preference and greater resilience to fluctuating birth rates. This ensures better long term sustainability. This should be about doing the right thing for our children and their education, not the easier thing. Given that Langley isn’t in deficit yet, a point which has been inaccurately advertised by the current proposal, why is this being rushed? If we want to get this right for our children and you truly care for our children’s education, health and wellbeing then what does it matter if it takes longer. Langley first school is more likely to succeed following the merger so clearly it makes more sense for Langley to remain open. 73% of Langley catchment parents chose Langley compared to 44% of Appletree clearly showing that Langley is the preferred school of choice. A recent school survey also highlighted that 73% respondents in the catchment area, including my family, moved to the area so that they were in catchment for Langley. Surely this must be taken into account and considered when predicting future school numbers. Clearly people are moving to the area purely for the schools even though the council are constantly

stating that new homes do not necessarily bring new children. However there has been no evidence presented to back this up and the nearby Murton Gap development will see up to 3000 houses being built from now to 2032, which the council themselves have predicted will generate approximately 72 additional students per year group. Langley is perfectly situated to accommodate additional children from this area. The development also has plans to build a new school but closing existing well located schools in anticipation of building new ones is an inefficient and a disruptive use of resources. If this proposal goes ahead, Appletree would also need to be extended and modified in order to accommodate the Langley children. However the additional space created would only be needed temporarily and would become redundant within a few years. This is not cost effective. Appletree is also the more expensive building to run spending £29 per square metre on utilities, compared to Langley which spends £4 per square metre. Appletree is also statistically shown to be the NEPA first school most sensitive to falling birth rates thus they will be the most at risk of being undersubscribed and susceptible to falling further into deficit. There is also a risk to the financial stability of the middle schools and Whitley Bay high school if the first places aren't filled and the location of Langley at the edge of the NEPA catchment and its ease of accessibility by car along with nearby parking provides a strong advantage over Appletree. Appletree Gardens as it stands is not big enough to accommodate all of the Langley children, which would have been evident if anyone had taken the time to perform site visits prior to putting this proposal together. While Appletree may have more classrooms than Langley, the overall footprint of the building is actually smaller than Langley. Also only 2 out of the proposed 13 classrooms meet the government guidance of 62m2 for 30 reception children and 55m2 for KS1+, whereas 10 out of the 11 classrooms at Langley exceed the guidance. So it would appear that our children if merged are going to be in larger class sizes but in smaller rooms. The consultation document states that Appletree can accommodate 432 pupils in total, enough to cover both school's children yet the information recorded on the government website disputes this and states a capacity of only 293. Langley has only around 10% surplus places (an acceptable level), while Appletree Gardens has 25% but this equates to only about 15 spare spaces per year group. The council have offered no assurance about how the Langley children could be accommodated onsite nor has it given us any assurance on class sizes. We know in early year's provision, class sizes cannot exceed 30 children but there is no legislation for class sizes aged seven and older. As a parent I am extremely worried about this as this merge would mean there would be almost 120 pupils in a single year group which would inevitably increase class sizes, reduce teacher-pupil ratios and have a negative impact on the wellbeing, attention and educational outcomes of all children involved. Not only would the classrooms be

overcrowded, but corridors, dinner halls, toilet facilities etc. will all be overcrowded. If Appletree is extended to accommodate the Langley children as suggested by the council, this would also greatly reduce the outside space at Appletree which is so important to the children's wellbeing. The proposal document misled people about the outdoor space at Langley stating that the school field was separated by a public highway meaning children had to be escorted offsite for each PE lesson or sporting activity and had no access to playing fields during lunch or breaks. This is untrue, Langley has a large school field onsite, has a separate great outdoor space in the reception garden, which follows a forest school ethos and is also used for children with SEND as well as a potting garden and an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming. The field the council are referring to is an additional field belonging to Langley across a minor quiet road which is only used once a year for sports day. Our priority must be the wellbeing and the education of our children and this merge will cause so much disruption and will harm children’s sense of belonging. My child is extremely nervous and uneasy amongst large crowds. I fear that the numbers of children that would be forced into the one school if Langley where to close would be too much for him to deal with. This creates such worry for us as parents as we do not want our child to feel scared when at school amongst peers, especially when there will be no familiar teachers present either to offer comfort and support. We also do not want his education to suffer as a result. We do not want huge class numbers or temporary makeshift classrooms for our child to learn in. This is not what we chose for our child. We chose Langley because of its reputation and we moved to the area so that we were within catchment for Langley First School. This is the school I want my children to grow, learn and thrive in. I also have a second child currently in private nursery who I have every intention of sending to Langley First School. These proposals, if they go ahead, may mean that he would potentially have to go to a different school, which would further add to our stress and disruption. How are we supposed to manage two different school drop offs and pickups, still work and navigate two different sets of school meetings, parent’s evenings, school activities etc. This is not feasible and again would have significant financial impact as it would mean two different school uniforms that we would have to purchase. This proposal would also greatly impact all of the SEND children at both schools. By merging the schools the council admitted that this would mean using the classrooms at Appletree which are currently used as sensory/breakout rooms, rooms which are pivotal to supporting children with SEND in mainstream. By removing these rooms we are failing our children with SEND and the SEND children in Langley will be disrupted the most, losing familiar teachers, friends and routines. This is a immense worry for parents as this will set children back when they have been thriving at Langley. Langley currently offers

amazing support for children with additional need and no guarantees have been given about what, if any, adapted provision, SEN specific places or breakout spaces would be available at Appletree following the closure of Langley. Langley have three specially adapted spaces to allow for breathing space, one of which offers an outdoor classroom for those who find the playground overwhelming. As well as targeted intervention for children who struggle with the demands of the classroom. Every classroom also has a 'haven' area which children can use to regulate and re-set and there are many other adaptations available to support children. Which if merged to Appletree, none of which would be available or accessible due to being overcrowded and having no space for these important areas to be created. Thus negatively impacting the positive direction the council were trying to take regarding inclusivity in our mainstream settings. It is evident from the consultation meeting and proposal that one of the driving factors for this to go ahead is the intention that Woodlawn will take over the Langley site and move the post-16 provision from Marden High School (32 children in total according to Ofsted), thereby displacing 300 children for the benefit of 32 children. Asking the community to accept a suboptimal and unstable mainstream solution in exchange for a desirable SEND solution. The long-term health of the mainstream school system should not be compromised to solve a logistical problem for SEND provision, however important that provision may be. If this proposal goes ahead the assumption from the council appears to be that children will walk to school and that the majority of dwellings in the Langley catchment area can access Appletree without crossing major roads. This is incorrect, many Langley children would need to cross the extremely busy Seatonville Road, Cauldwell Lane and then Bromley Avenue too. And a recent parent survey highlighted that there would be a 37% increase on the numbers of parents who would have to drive to school as a result of the merger. We are included in that figure, if moved to Appletree the difference in distance would mean we would have to drive to school instead of walking. This would significantly impact our family as we would need to buy a second car in order to do this. Adding huge financial stress. Our working hours would also need to be looked at in order to make it work which would also impact us financially and there is no guarantee that our workplace could accommodate any changes. If we are unable to adjust working hours we would need to look into increasing wrap around sessions which again will have additional cost implications and we are unsure on where this provision will even be as this has not been taken into account in the proposal. The supporting documents have also provided no evidence in relation to traffic impact. The area is already very congested around school times and adding at least another 37% of cars on top of this will make it even more dangerous for those who are able to walk to school. The road outside Langley currently closes every morning to make it safer for the children. Something Appletree

is unable to do due to being on a bus route. Langley also has a free public car park very close by and Appletree has no access to a car park. It is situated within a residential estate and I assume the local residents will not be best pleased with the potential increase of traffic and congestion this proposal will create. Not to mention the impact this increase will have on the environment. The government have also just announced that they are recognising the importance of improving school attendance. Absence data is a critical indicator of pupil engagement and school effectiveness. Langley First School has one of the best attendance records in the area, with a persistent absence rate of just 5.9%. This is well below the North Tyneside average of 13.7%. The persistent absence rate at Appletree is 15% yet Langley is the one facing closure. It is counterproductive to target a school that is clearly succeeding in an area the Government is prioritising. Supporting schools like Langley should be a key part of any strategy to boost attendance and engagement across the region. The government are also revitalising the national curriculum to ensure children and young people leave school fully equipped to thrive in the modern world of work. Including publication of a new Oracy framework to ensure that young people are confident and effective speakers. Langley has had a huge head start on this having already been working with the Voice North of Tyne Project for three years. Oracy is used across all areas from lessons and performances to lunchtime chats and school council meetings. Why would you would choose to close a school that's already ahead of the game when it comes to the national education agenda? Each school develops its own curriculum focus, values, and ways of working with children and this merger would also result in the loss of teaching staff of exceptional quality which is detrimental to our children. Merging into Appletree Gardens does not guarantee that the strengths and traditions of Langley will continue and I don't believe Langley is the right school to choose for closure. I simply cannot understand how a flourishing school, delivering excellent outcomes and nurturing, confident, happy young people can be marked for closure. This proposal appears to represent a short term financial reaction rather than a sustainable education strategy and I urge the council to reconsider and make decisions based on long-term value, not convenience. For these reasons, I strongly urge you to reconsider these proposals and protect Langley First School's future. Our children deserve stability, belonging, and the high-quality education they are already receiving in their own community school. I hope that all responses will be acknowledged and taken seriously. I would like to add that updating the FAQ's with less than 24 hours to go though is very upsetting. This appears to be a deliberate delaying tactic and has given us no time to do anything with the updated information. Thank you for your time and for listening to our concerns

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:24 AM

The biggest consequence of the closure of Langley First School will be the standard of education provided in the short and long term. This will be to the hundreds of children in the area including my child. I can't see one positive to the children and this closure is setting them up to fail. I can only see over crowded classroom in portacabins. My son is in the process of looking at additional support for speech and emotional development and the teachers and support staff cannot do enough. Closing Langley will delay or more likely stop this. I am not from the North East but quickly realised the community at Langley was the exact place i wanted to send my son. The word community didn't mean much to me until we found Langley, and this will broken if the closure of Langley goes ahead.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:24 AM

My son is currently in Year 2 at Langley First School, having attended since nursery. If this proposal goes ahead, my son will have to move school for Year 4 and then again in Year 5 to move up to Middle School. I cannot even imagine the disruption this will cause for him. He is a very bright, happy, thriving, settled little boy who adores his school, his teachers and all his friends. Langley is all he has known since he was three years old (and even before this as he went to Langley daily in his pram and trike taking his older sibling to school). To take that away from him would be devastating. I don’t understand how North Tyneside Council can expect parents to support this proposal, if we haven’t been given basic facts on how it will work in practice for our children: • How will Appletree Gardens accommodate 118 children in one year group? • Does this mean temporary ‘portacabin’ classrooms which will cost money to implement? These children will feel excluded from the main school and find it harder to integrate. • What will those class sizes look like? 30 children is a big enough class size; it should not even be considered that this will increase. • How will Appletree be able to cope with the extra children for PE lessons, lunchtime in the dinner hall, extra-curricular clubs and sports, school trips? Will our children miss out on these fundamental area’s? • How will the Appletree out of hours provision be able to cope with the extra children? Will there even be enough space for all the children that require wraparound care? We are working parents who need to utilise after-school care until 6pm. • How will I be able to drop my child to school safely on my working days, as I need to drive straight to work afterwards? Parking a car safely in and around Appletree Gardens is notorious for how unsafe it is. • How will parents of nursery age children be able to take one child to Langley during the transition phase, and one younger child to a different school? It is an impossible situation. • What about the children SEN? How can Appletree Garden accommodate the needs of these children who are thriving at Langley First School? • What about all the parents who chose to move to Monkseaton specifically so their children can attend Langley First School? It has an outstanding reputation for being an

excellent school both in the local area and outside of the local area. My son deserves to go to a school where the teachers and head teacher know his name. Where the dinner hall staff know his name and his likes and dislikes. Where he knows where each classroom is and who it belongs to. Where he knows where the toilets are, and the library is, and the school office is. Where he knows the play yard and the trim trail, where the 'hub' is, and the outdoor classroom. Where he knows the children in the other year groups. Where he knows the extra-curricular club staff, and the wraparound care staff, and they know him. Where he knows the route to school, and where to park his scooter or bike. He deserves to have his final year at Langley First School, to have his 'Leavers Assembly' where we will laugh and cry at clips of him and his friends together over their five years at Langley First School. He deserves to go on his Year 4 residential trip to Robin Wood with his friends and teachers that he knows and to create those special memories. He deserves to have his Leavers Party, and to wear his 'Langley Leavers 2028' hoodie with pride. He does not deserve to have to move to a school that we did not choose for our family, where there isn't space for all the children that would have to move. Where absolutely everything would be unfamiliar. We did not choose Appletree Gardens, it was not our first, second, or even third choice of school for our children. We should not be forced to 'choose' Appletree because there are no spaces anywhere else. North Tyneside Council, you need to reconsider your proposal to close a successful, thriving, inclusive, safe and happy school because the 'numbers' don't add up. Our children are not a number, they are little people who deserve the very best education and start in life, because they are the future of this region.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:27 AM

As a former parent at Langley, I can talk about the fantastic school, fantastic teachers and all the amazing things about Langley that I hope you have taken time to listen to during this consultation. And if not, shame on you. This hasn't been a meaningful consultation if not. But I am going to speak about this proposal as a local resident and member of this community. The place Langley plays in this community cannot and should not be ignored. The school is at the heart of this community and dearly loved and respected by local people. The children are so proud to wear their red sweatshirts and represent the school at so many local events - supporting the elderly by visiting them at Christmas, inviting the community into the school, I could go on. You will be ripping the heart out of this community if this school is closed. And it will be a closure and not a merger in the eyes of the Department of Education. But I do wonder whether the local authority has considered or even cares about what the local community want or feel. Langley may just be a building in your eyes, but to local people it is the cornerstone of our community. If you don't understand that, you are completely out touch. And as a local

resident who lives close to Langley and Woodlawn, I would like to put on record, we currently already experience the inconvenience of the taxis, minibuses etc that bring pupils to Woodlawn, and this will only get worse if Woodlawn increases its numbers. The drivers of these vehicles are also incredibly inconsiderate, driving at speeds up the nearby residential streets, and idling at drop off, having a negative effect on the local air quality. It is far more preferable from a local resident's perspective, for the children to walk, cycle or scoot to school, as the majority of Langley pupils currently do, or use the local free carpark near to the doctors surgery, and not inconvenience local people, as these taxis and mini buses currently do. Please don't rip the heart out of this community by closing Langley, and instead look at ways you can keep it open.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:27 AM

My grandson especially will be affected in a major way. Closing an excellent school to allow for juggling for example of SEND pupils is not a good idea at all. I enclose below some main points including the increased risk of children being killed or injured in crossing busy roads as a direct result of closure of Langley FS. NT Council should rethink the strategy in relation to this school and others. It is wrong to impose a closure and relocation of children when the facts and projections suggest otherwise and the need to find a different solution. It is wrong to close Langley FS because of issues associated with SEND problems [for example at Woodlawn]. It is wrong to close Langley FS when it is clearly not only the nearest school to a large proportion of the Murton Gap development- this development is going to include a good sized number of families with school-age children; whilst the overall forecast for the North Tyneside population up until 2042 is for a small net increase, comprising increases in all age groups aged over 65 and decreases in all other age groups, the Murton Gap development is clearly not aimed at older people but families, including children, so it can be said that this proposal of a high-quality school so close to this development must surely mean Langley has to be retained. Landing parents with the issue of crossing main roads to get to Appletree will have the knock-on effect of many more people driving their children to school, thereby creating bottle-necks all around Appletree. There will be other knock-on effects too, as there will be a scramble to get into other schools for current parents and those of future pupils, more home-schooling for NTC to monitor, etc etc. Actions have consequences and wrong actions have negative consequences. In terms of road-crossing, the first child to be injured due to this because of crossing Seatonville Road or Cauldwell Lane [both busy roads] will create massive amounts of negative publicity heaping the blame onto the decision NTC took to make this more likely. The projected pupil numbers provided in relation to Langle, Appletree and others are wrong. Making decisions based on known wrong data is not the way to

proceed. It affects any community impact assessment which will also be wrong if based on wrong data. Examples of wrong data include: how many Appletree can accommodate, issues of support for SEND pupils- not only neurodiverse but those with physical disabilities, outdoor space and fields, birth rates taking into account the Murton Gap development, projections unexplained for Appletree and Langley for 2025-2030 and projected numbers versus capacity for Whitley Bay High School. There are better solutions than this. I hope this is not a “done deed” and that consultation really does mean that the issue will be rethought following corrections of all the misleading and wrong information given out already and considering the wishes of those living in the area and with children affected. Otherwise if this is a ‘done deed’, which I am worried it might be, then it is not remotely democratic as a process, doesn’t meet the needs of the population and smacks of autocracy and will reap terrible consequences in the next few years. I would like to think NTC is not an autocracy doing exactly what a few people want but really does care about residents.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:36 AM

At the crux of the 3 tier system is parental choice. North Tyneside Council are talking that choice away from me as a parent. I chose to send my children to Langley and I cannot praise this school enough for what it has done in the education and pastoral care of my children. Nothing is too much trouble for the staff and they genuinely care for the pupils. I am incredibly disappointed that of all the schools to be chosen, you are choosing to close the school that is clearly the parental choice in our community. The fact that it has more pupils than Appletree Gardens surely demonstrates this already? When the new houses are built behind the school/opposite Rake Lane - where are those families going to send their children? Are you not just creating issues for yourselves longer term?

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:36 AM

Standard at appletree or nowhere near that of Langley

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:38 AM

The closure of Langley will be hugely damaging to the education of my child, who is currently in Year 2. Covid occurred while he was 1-2 years old and he missed crucial opportunities for early socialisation and development. He feels very secure and supported in Langley and is stressed by the potential loss of his school and his teachers. If the decision to close Langley goes ahead teachers will inevitably start to leave Langley to secure long-term roles, disrupting my childs education, and he will be required to move to a new school for one year before moving again to middle school. As a family it will be hugely disruptive. Moving to a new school which is further away and does not offer the same wraparound timings, with no guarantee they could accept so many additional children, will disrupt our work and

	family lives. The area surrounding Langley is an amazing please with a strong sense of community, and the loss of Langley under the current proposal will cause real damage and generate significant and lasting ill feeling towards the council. Combined with the proposed closure of Monkseaton Middle School and previous closure of Monkseaton High School it will also mean that all of the catchment schools for us will have closed in a period of 3 years.
Screen Name Redacted 11/13/2025 11:46 AM	It affects choice. It affects the community, suggestions of this would make class sizes from KS2 unmanageable.
Screen Name Redacted 11/13/2025 11:47 AM	This is not a merge. It will be a closure of Langley which is at the heart of the community, and one of the reasons we moved to this area. Langley was our choice of school (due to the ethos and the reputation), and our sensitive child is flourishing within it. Other local schools are already full to capacity for certain year groups which leaves parents with no choice- something the council states they align with. Appletree DO NOT HAVE CAPACITY The proposed capacity of Appletree changed to fit the councils narrative. Existing Appletree children will also suffer due to capacity. Having a child in reception and another in a nursery elsewhere will be unfeasible due to drop off and pick up times. Parking is also already known to be difficult at Appletree. Langley's capacity is fully subscribed, other schools aren't. Langley is not in as much financial deficit as other schools. I appreciate finance is at the bottom of this. I do not understand why the decision has been made to move this volume of children to one school, and a school that does not have capacity. It is also the school that people in the local area are not choosing. Rethink your decision. This is not the right decision for Langley or Appletree children and families.
Screen Name Redacted 11/13/2025 11:48 AM	The best and most convenient school for my two girls to attend is being closed. Despite Appletree being the next closest we have no intention of sending our girls there. See sense, reconsider your dreadful proposal.
Screen Name Redacted 11/13/2025 11:51 AM	My child is currently in Year 4 but has undiagnosed neuro divergence. Langley First School have been incredible in their help and support for his emotional wellbeing. His application for assessment has been rejected by CAMHS twice, however the third time has been accepted only to go on a two year waiting list. Change affects my child and even though he is due to leave in July 26 the disruption this will cause if this closure goes ahead - friends and staff members leaving prematurely - will be detrimental to his mental health. The closure of a

middle school will also create overcrowding in the remaining middle schools which I'm already starting to feel anxious about myself. It will create mental health issues which will be another crisis for other areas of public services to deal with.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:52 AM

My daughter is currently in reception at Appletree Gardens and she struggles a lot with transitions, this is something that Appletree Gardens staff have been amazing at helping her get through, but I worry that if this merger goes through with the sheer amount of students they will then have the students who do need more help and support may not get the attention they need due to the staff being stretched between so many people. As well as this, due to us living out of area if this merger does go through then our child runs the risk of no longer getting a place at a middle school in year 5, the transition of then having to move to a primary school in year 5 would be extremely difficult for her and would greatly affect her education. I'm sure my child is not the only one potentially facing this and I do not believe that any child's education should have to suffer. I think that if this is going to happen then all children who currently go to either Langley or Appletree Garden should have a protected place at a middle and high school for minimal interruptions to their education. I also would like to understand the statistics behind this merger and how all of these children will fit into one school building, as you are currently stating that both schools have so many surplus yet the government website states differently. According to gov.uk Appletree Gardens has the capacity for 293 students yet it currently has 345? And similarly with Langley it states they have capacity for 300 students yet they currently have 310? These statistics were updated on the 8th October 2025 and 11th November 2025. I'd appreciate if someone could explain how these school both have surplus places but are also over capacity at the same time? Finally I'd like to understand how reducing the places overall for middle and high schools works as looking at the schools statistics that were posted by North Tyneside council for 2025 all middle schools offered places to 495 students and 61 students were rejected. If these statistics are correct then reducing the places at middle and high schools means that many more children are going to be left either without a school place or having to apply to places they don't want to be such as potentially primary/secondary schools instead of first, middle, and high schools.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:54 AM

Langley First School's closure would be materially disruptive to children's curricular continuity, wellbeing, special educational needs support, and your family's childcare and employment arrangements. The harm would be greater for children who currently rely on Langley's specific SEND adaptations, its outdoor space and sensory

provision, and the flexible wraparound care. Given the national curriculum's renewed focus on early reading, oracy and well-sequenced learning, transferring to a new setting without explicit guarantees for continuity of practice and small class sizes risks learning setbacks and increased stress for pupils and families. 1. Curriculum continuity, standards and learning progress What matters legally and practically: • The national curriculum and related DfE guidance place renewed emphasis on strong foundations in spoken language (oracy), systematic reading instruction and sequential learning across key stages. Early years provision (EYFS) remains statutory and sets expectations for language, literacy and personal development. How Langley's strengths interact with that: • Langley has a strong ethos promoting reading, literacy and oracy, plus experienced teachers who "know the pupils really well" and use targeted strategies to support mental health and engagement. This combination is exactly the sort of environment national guidance now identifies as essential for early success. Langley First school is actually the larger school with a bigger footprint and bigger hall (192m2) compared to Appletree hall (130m2) Also Langley has bigger classroom size. Appletree have a total of 14 classrooms of which 4 exceed 55m2 (recommended classroom size for KS1 and KS2 with 30 kids). Langley have a total of 11 classrooms, 10 of which exceed 55m2 Hall size suitable for use by KS2 children recommended 140m2 Impact if Langley closes: • Interruption to highly-targeted reading/oracy programmes. Even short interruptions to consistent, expert-led reading programmes (phonics, reading practice, oracy routines) can slow progress in early years and KS1; children who have made steady gains at Langley may regress or plateau while new teachers assess and re-establish baselines. • Loss of teacher knowledge and tailored approaches. Langley teachers' detailed knowledge of individual pupils supports precise scaffolding (adjusted tasks, 'Now and Next', soft landings). Moving schools often means that detailed, tacit knowledge is lost or takes months to rebuild. • Risk from larger class sizes / mixed practice. If children move to Appletree (or elsewhere) and are placed into larger classes, differentiated instruction that underpins national expectations may be diluted, reducing the effectiveness of interventions designed to meet the new curriculum's higher expectations. (You reported no guarantees on class sizes; this is a direct risk to curriculum outcomes.) Smaller spaces for children to learn (smaller sized classrooms) and potential disruption to 'break out spaces' 'thrive rooms' loss of outdoor space, learning resource space to accommodate for more classroom space with the significant increase in children to Appletree school. 2. Social-emotional wellbeing, belonging and behaviour What matters: • The updated curriculum and EYFS emphasise holistic development (language, resilience, mental health and social skills) as foundational to learning. Langley is described as "supportive, inclusive" with well-embedded mental-health strategies and 'safe to be me' practices.

Impact if Langley closes: • Loss of community and belonging. Pupils who feel they “belong” at Langley will face loss of identity and peer networks; this can manifest as increased anxiety, regulation issues and lower engagement with schoolwork. • Disruption to routines that support regulation. Langley’s sensory rooms, havens and small breakout spaces are part of everyday regulation strategies. If equivalent spaces or routines are not available immediately at the receiving school, children who rely on them will be more likely to have dysregulated days, which reduces learning time and increases need for staff intervention. • Increased transitional anxiety for younger children. EYFS and KS1 children are particularly sensitive to changes in environment and adult relationships; moving them risks temporary increases in clinginess, refusal, sleep disturbance and behavioural escalation. 3. Special educational needs (SEN) and neurodiversity-affirming practice What matters: • National guidance stresses adaptation and inclusive practice: early intervention, carefully sequenced curriculum access and staff training. • Langley offers a sensory room, The Nest in nursery, The Hive an outdoor sensory room classroom space, outdoor space in reception which follows a ‘forest school’ ethos, a potting garden, ramp access, adapted toilets, and specialist staff (SENCO, Thrive specialists). You also note the school’s neurodiversity affirming environment and staff expertise. Impact if Langley closes: • Risk of loss of specialist spaces and staff continuity. Those physical rooms and staff relationships are not easily replicated — and no guarantees have been given about equivalent provision at Appletree. Even temporary loss increases the likelihood of unmet needs, behavioural incidents and slower progress. • Potential delay in ARP development. You noted Appletree’s ARP plans are on hold; if that remains the case, there may be insufficient capacity or specialist provision to absorb Langley’s pupils with higher needs. • Increased travel and reduced access to therapies. If children must travel to different sites for therapies or specialist interventions, that increases the logistical burden on families and children’s ability to access regular sessions. 4. Childcare, wraparound provision and parental employment What matters: • Langley’s “Schools Out Northern” offers flexible care (7.30–18:00), holiday provision and day care for 9 months–9 years. Appletree’s Little Pips operates shorter hours and narrower age range. Survey data shows large reliance on Langley wraparound: 60.5% use Schools Out; many parents reported they would have to cut hours or had no alternative. (Parent survey figures 190 parents: 60.5% use Schools Out; 35.6% would cut hours; 52.8% had no answer if it were unavailable.) Impact if Langley closes: • Immediate childcare gap for working families. Loss of long-day, flexible wraparound provision will force many parents to change work patterns, reduce hours, accept less stable childcare, or leave employment entirely. • Financial stress and reduced family income. Reduced hours or job loss will have direct economic impact on households. • Increased childminder demand and thin market. Local

childminders may not be available to meet sudden increased demand for full-day care, particularly for very young children (Langley took children from 9 months). • Holiday care shortfall. Parents who rely on holiday provision may face inability to work during school holidays, disproportionately affecting lower-income families. 5. Travel, safety and daily logistics What matters: • You reported that many families walk to Langley (78%) and 18% drive; that if moved to Appletree parents estimate 55% would drive; Langley can close its road for drop-off whereas Appletree is on a bus route; Langley has close free public parking, Appletree does not. Impact if Langley closes: • Increased car journeys, congestion and risk. The projected rise in driving would increase traffic during drop-off/pick-up times, extend commuting time for families, and increase road-safety risk for pupils. • Longer travel times and cost. You may face longer journeys, additional fuel/public transport costs and reduced flexibility (especially if working hours overlap). • Accessibility for families with limited mobility. Crossing busy roads (Seatonville Road, Cauldwell Lane, Bromwell Ave) will be required for many pupils; this disproportionately affects families with pushchairs, young siblings or accessibility needs. 6. Peer group, friendships and parental choice Impact if Langley closes: • Disruption to peer networks. Children's friendship groups, important for social learning and wellbeing, will break or be dispersed. Potential to increase school absenteeism rates • Parental choice eroded. A family's decision to live in the area and send children to Langley (many families moved for the school) will be undermined; this affects long-term community stability and could motivate some families to leave the area or home-school.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:54 AM

I am a grand parent of two boys, one in Langley reception and one in Langley nursery. My daughter and son in law moved to Monkseaton a number of years ago after saving hard to start their family in the assurance of the best educational start for their growing family. Exceptional schools and three tier system, the driving force behind their decision to move to the area. They bought a well loved family home owned by a elderly couple and so started the cycle of new blood fed into the veins of the area. Elderly residents in the 1930s properties will continue to sell onto families needing first schools. Appletree gardens school will require portacabin classrooms, I would imagine if this nonsense goes ahead. It is a fallacy to suggest there is room to merge these schools. The books have been cooked to suggest there is room. Langley school is not in a deficit. There are grey areas around local schools and monetary issues I won't go into here. My youngest grandson will not be able to join Langley in this proposal, one child in Langley and another forced into Appletree, against wishes. I am led to believe my grandchildren will have no middle/high school provision either as middle school closure and high school closure is also threatened. What are you doing here? I could

go on, but it appears to me, as an outsider, you will receive funding from new housing developments to build infrastructure, so will be putting eggs in this basket instead. Possibly building new provision there, it would appear from a layman. This process has caused huge distress to hundreds of families. Insufficient time to address and consider alternatives and the manner in which it has been done was shocking. It would suggest three tier schooling is being forced out of option with these proposals. More time is required to address some very difficult issues here.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:55 AM

I am a grandparent of a child in reception at Langley. I have 2 other grandchildren who have been through Langley & thrived there. [redacted] I have a 24 year connection with Langley & have found it to be a consistently excellent School. I am strongly opposed to the proposed closure. I think the proposal is not a well considered strategy as it doesn't look a the big picture & the long term implications. It is a short term financial fix that does not put the education & interests of Langley's pupils first; nor does it serve the best interests of our wider community. It does not have the backing of the Local community. I do NOT believe Langley is a valid choice for closure. There are less viable schools which have been funded by PFI. Looking at SEND & The situation of Woodlawn campus extension, I believe that being next to Langley offers Woodlawn children a great opportunity to experience time in a safe & supportive mainstream setting which provides inclusion opportunities - a well established & important government strategy. In the unhappy event that closure gies ahead then this should involve a true merger - one new school with a shared ethos & governing body. Otherwise the ethos of Langley & it's excellent teaching staff will be lost to us. This would grossly unfair & unacceptable. The plan to accommodate Langley children on the Appletree site if hopelessly vague. This helps no-one. Clarity is essential re future specific plans. You have not engaged with the wraparound provider Schools out at Langley. This is a serious omission. Adequate wraparound provision is essential. There are may other points I could mention. The Friends of Langley campaign have done their research which highlights all of these. I wholly support their findings and believe that aswell as the huge strength of feeling, there is a solid body of factual evidence which exists to support this community campaign to save Langley School.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:56 AM

[redacted] I know how special Langley is to the community of West Monkseaton. I have the joy of hearing the children laughing and playing at break-times and outdoor lessons, making use of the

playing field and outdoor classroom all located on the school site (the consultation wrongly states that access to a playing field is across a main road). I know that when my children were younger (especially from year 4 when children want to start building independence in preparation for middleschool) I would not have been comfortable with them crossing Seatonville Road on their own. This is an incredibly busy road, whihc is highly congested in and around school drop off/pick up times. The closure of Langley will only add to this with more parents needing to take cars to drop off/pick up. I also worry about the impact on the wrap around provision at Langley. Both my children attended Schools Out at Langley, without which i would not have been able to return to work. I fail to see how a young family can manage to drop children off at separate sites at the same time and still make it into work. Parents may be forced to withdraw children from Schools Out - leading to its closure and loss of jobs. Appletree gardens will not have sufficient wrap around provision for the proposed increase in pupils, meaning families having to make difficult decisions to reduce working hours, and/or relying more heavily on already stretched carers. I am also extremely concerned about the impact of all the housebuilding in and around Rake Lane and Murton Gap - these are going to be family homes, with children who need school places! This will lead to more traffic, pollution and congestion if these families have no choice but to travel further to get their children to school. I think this proposal is a disgrace - poorly thought through, factually inaccurate and disingenuous.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:59 AM

My grandchildren currently attend Langley First School, my daughter moved back to the area in order for her children to attend. I sent my children to Langley and the ethos and community has not changed or wavered in 30 years. To close this school would be a travesty as well as the fact that it just doesn't make sense to do so when the facts and figures are fully considered. To close Langley First School is short sighted and will not save money in the long run as parents preference is not being considered and at least 44% of children who attend appletree are not from within catchment meaning that in the long run the new Appletree school will remain under subscribed. Langley is a school where my grandchildren thrive, feel safe and secure and is a main reason people move to the area! Do not remove this choice!

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:59 AM

We currently reside outside the catchment area for this school and plan to relocate near the school in the coming year. We have chosen this school due to its warm and nurturing nature, as well as its outstanding approach to learning. We feel it was the best fit for our son, [redacted] Since joining the school in 2022, each one of the school staff has been nothing short of phenomenal in supporting my sons to

reach their potential and enjoy their time at school. Should the school be closed as proposed my children would be placed in a state of freefall, as we currently live within the catchment area for a two-tier school. Should there be no available place in the new "merged" schools I can only assume my children will be offered a place at our nearest catchment school. If this were to happen, this would completely derail their social and emotional well-being as they would be plunged into a new school midway through their formative years, forcing them to make new friends and adapt to a new school environment. This would be highly distressing, particularly to my eldest son, [redacted] In the event of my children being offered a place at our catchment 2-tier school, I will make the decision to remove my children from mainstream education, choosing to homeschool until I am able to find a suitable school. Moreover, the proposal of this so-called "merger" has placed my family under extreme distress, whereby we have been forced to investigate moving from the area in order to obtain more stable educational opportunities for our children. In light of this I urge the council to reconsider their proposal to close Langley First School, as a contributing member of North Tyneside I hope the council will respect the wishes of it's citizens, valuing democracy and the communities who make it a wonderful place to live.

Screen Name Redacted
11/13/2025 11:59 AM

I currently have two children attending Langley School, [redacted] In recent years we move closer to Whitley Bay, to have a better chance of our children attending a three-tier school. We still have plans to move into the catchment in the next few years. If the proposal goes ahead my children will be massively disrupted as they are not currently in the catchment for Langley. This would mean they would automatically default to a two-tier school in my local catchment. [redacted] it would be mean starting a new school when the majority of children at the school would have already made friends and built relationships with school staff. [redacted]

Optional question (457 response(s), 42 skipped)
Question type: Essay Question