

Appendix D1

Free text comments received via the online consultation exercise – redacted where required

We chose our primary school based on the fact it was our catchment school and transport was provided. It was a deciding factor in our admission choices. It is not our nearest primary school by a miles difference. In the future I will have one child at secondary school and two at primary. Currently all would be able to access free transport from our rural village. The removal of free transport would impact the school run and inevitably lead to one journey running late - affecting attendance records as I would not see it financially viable to pay for school transport for one or both sets of children. I would also have two children at one school, one currently accessing transport, the other, still at pre-school would no longer be eligible. I absolutely want my youngest to attend the same school as my older children as we are part of the school family. Also, I don't understand the relevance of catchment schools going forward if the nearest school will now be the dominating factor in decision making when applying.

My daughter attends a high school in our catchment area that is not nearest by distance. Under the new proposed rules my son would not receive free transport when he goes to high school in 2 years time

1. Younger siblings will end up in different secondary schools to the ones their older siblings currently attend. This will be stressful for the younger children and will be difficult for parents to juggle the requirements and demands of different schools. 2. These proposals may result in a fall in pupil numbers in some secondary schools, meaning diminished funding - resulting in staffing cuts and a reduction of facilities and courses on offer 3. In some areas, neighbouring children will attend different secondary schools - children will be split up from their primary school classmates, making the transition to secondary school more stressful. 4. In looking purely at distance, there is no consideration of the type of roads involved and the safety for the children having to use these roads. In a rural county like ours, some of the high, moorland roads are dangerous in wintry weather and children should not have to travel on these roads twice a day.

Both my daughters wish to attend Settle College the youngest is currently in Yr 4 so if these changes go ahead she won't be able to attend Settle. We desperately want our daughters to go to Settle but if the proposed changes go ahead they won't be able to. Please don't stop my daughters from attending Settle College.

I have a year 4 child at Ingleton primary school and the current proposal regarding the nearest suitable school is detrimental to the community, multiple generations have gone on to attend Settle secondary school and a vast percentage of children and parents send their children to Settle school from Ingleton. QES in Kirkby has never been the secondary school for Ingleton children. On another note Ingleton is in Yorkshire, I chose to continue to bring my children up like many generations before me in a Yorkshire village and attend Yorkshire schools, and now you're going to force them in to Cumbria. This is after you close our middle school system and overpopulate the local schools to the detriment of children - Ingleton Primary is forced to have shared year groups as they are still a classroom short from the middle school closures. As a low income earner I'm very unhappy at the proposal that's going to try and force me to send my child to an unacceptable school. 3/4 of Ingleton and Bentham children have attended Settle for at least 4 generations. I believe a precedent has been set that Settle is the school for Ingleton children and you should not be allowed to change that.

After reading the information I think it's disgraceful to be left in a situation where I'm unsure where my children will attend secondary school. I currently have a daughter in year 6 who has just had her place accepted for secondary school which I do hope she will have school transport accepted for there, I also have a son who is year 3 and now he's made to go to a different secondary to which my daughter will go to. I would have never considered staying where I lived two years ago if I knew this situation would have happened.

I live in (Redacted). Our catchment school is Ryedale, our nearest school is Thirsk. My son is at Ryedale so a bus comes into the village (redacted). My daughter (in Yr 4) will not be eligible for this bus as our nearest school is Thirsk. So, to qualify for transport she will have to attend a different school to all the other children AND you will have to send a bus UP SUTTON BANK. This is in no way a saving (in fact it will be massively costly given that there is already a bus going to Ryedale in the village that she could hop on) and makes a mockery of the concept of catchment schools. It will also be pretty distressing and disruptive to my daughter. I am not alone in this, there are other families who will be affected. I'm really disappointed and find this quite stressful.

I wholeheartedly disagree with the nearest school change. If this change occurs my children currently in primary school will only be eligible for transport to secondary school in Thirsk when they move up. Whereas my oldest child is already attending Ryedale as that is our catchment school so they will then be attending different schools. This would therefore increase costs of transport as a bus to Ryedale and another bus to Thirsk would be coming to the same village, this would include going up and down Sutton Bank on a daily basis for the Thirsk bus. This would not be cost effective! I cannot see how this is in anyone's, let alone the children's, best interests.

ChatGPT 3.5 User Write me a haiku about beer ChatGPT Golden brew sparkles, Frothy head whispers stories, Cheers to hops and malt. User Rewrite this to sound better "The proposed changes will cause huge disruption, anxiety and financial issues in our family. We will have one child in secondary school in Richmond and one forced to go to Hummersknot in Darlington as we will not be able to afford to transport her ourselves. We will have no choice of schools. In addition, the schools in 2 different local authority areas have different holidays which will cause issues financially, will mean family holidays will be very difficult to plan and the children will not be able to attend after school activities as we will not be able to pick them up from 2 places at once. This policy will also cause numbers to drop in Richmond school, affecting its finances and risking the quality of its offering. I disagree with this proposed change so strongly on environmental grounds too, we will be taking one bus off the roads and instead putting 30 or 40 cars out instead. I believe this proposal has been made by simply considering financial benefits and has totally disregarded the needs of the young people the local authority is tasked with providing for. Once again, I strongly disagree with this policy proposal and would consider it discriminatory to my children as they are having reduced choice and forced apart from siblings. " ChatGPT The proposed changes spell disruption, anxiety, and financial strain for our family. With one child destined for secondary school in Richmond and another compelled to attend Hummersknot in Darlington due to transportation costs, our school options dwindle. The diverging holiday schedules between two local authorities compound our challenges, making family vacations and after-school activities nearly impossible to coordinate. Moreover, the imbalance in student numbers threatens the financial stability and quality of education at Richmond school. Beyond financial concerns, the environmental impact of this policy shift cannot be overlooked, trading one bus for dozens of cars on the road. It seems this proposal prioritizes financial gains over the well-being of our youth, leaving little room for the needs and choices of our children, who now face reduced options and separation from siblings.

The main change that affects my family and that of others within the Kirk Hammerton area is that, children will no longer be entitled to free travel to their catchment school. So, for us (and other local families), we will no longer qualify for free school travel to our catchment school of Boroughbridge High as there are schools that are nearer - Boroughbridge High is our fifth nearest school! There are four other secondary schools that are classed as nearer to our home address according to the (not currently publicly available - why not?) system used. Only one of these four alternative schools currently has school transport operating from our village and for two of the schools listed as nearer it would be impossible for children from Kirk Hammerton to get to them unless driven by a parent as there is no public or school transport available. We already have an older child at our catchment school of Boroughbridge High (redacted), we are happy with the school and would have liked our younger child (redacted) to also go there - if the consultation is agreed then we may either have to pay for her school transport or have children at different secondary schools. I'm also concerned that parents may make secondary school choices based on what they believe their catchment school to be, without realising the consequences if it is not their nearest school. Currently, the admissions guidance advises parents to ensure that they apply to their catchment school, however, this would then mean that they could be liable to pay for transportation costs – admissions policy and school transportation policies from the same authority should be consistent, unless of course the plan is to deceive parents in order to make money from them. Links have been made between catchment primary and their secondary schools, in order to aid children's transition to their new schools, often with the secondary school premises being used for sporting events etc. for the younger children. The proposed change to policy would erase years of hard work to make the transition smoother and mean that more children will attend unfamiliar secondary schools. It also looks like the proposed changes would affect future families choosing to send their children to our village primary school (Kirk Hammerton CofE Primary school) who would have used the current Hunsingore school bus, thus affecting the future viability of this school too. Finally, certain families are being disadvantaged due to our rural area. There is a proposal in the consultation that children who receive free school meals will not be affected in the same way - they will receive free school travel to their nearest three schools if the school is more than 2 miles but less than 6 miles (for secondary schools). For a free school meal family in Kirk Hammerton there is no secondary school within this radius (the nearest secondary school, although not our catchment one is 7.5 miles away). Therefore, such families are being discriminated against due to living in a rural area compared to similar families in less rural areas who, according to the proposed policy, would be entitled to more choice of secondary school chosen. So, in summary the proposal if approved could have a significant impact on families in Kirk Hammerton and surrounding villages and I am concerned that families are not aware of the consequences. It will also have a significant detrimental impact on school attendance, if families are unable to afford to pay for school transport themselves (I imagine there will be families who whilst they don't qualify for free school meals would still struggle to find the cost) particularly at a time when there is a real push to improve school attendance nationally.

I think it's vital that parents can choose the most suitable school for their children based on their child's needs and not which is the closest school. My children are currently being assessed for neurodivergent issues and as such may get left behind in schools less suited to this. If transport to these schools is taken away as they aren't the closest ones to where we live then that takes away our access to them, this directly effects their futures for the sake of saving money.

I am unclear if I wished to send my child to a CofE school for example that is further away than a non religious affiliated school would the child no longer be eligible for travel. Equally suitability of school may be influenced by being near a workplace rather than distance from home.

The removal of free transport to your child's nearest denominational school was wrong. I know that this has had a significant impact on pupil numbers at my child's school. A large number of families have been forced to attend other schools because of the cost involved. This is a huge shame

Religious beliefs are important to my family and I wish my children to have a Catholic education. I think it is reasonable for the cost of transport to school to be covered by the Council in lieu of not having a more local Catholic Secondary school

There are a great deal of caveats to meet to enable families to access the free transport. There is also a disparity between schools that are non-denominational whereby they receive free public transport (eg HGS and Rossett) and then the faith schools (eg SJF and St Aidan's) have to pay for their transport. The reason given is that the families have a preference for these schools over the proximity... This seems unfair when so much attention and sensitivity is given to SEND cases, families that have a faith are financially penalised. It seems fairer for NYC to cover the transport costs on all public transport for students to help all families and reduce the necessity of having to choose a school based on its closeness or the option of free transport.

We have had to pay for a school bus for our daughter to attend sfx, this school is on the same road as richmond school but because the council class richmond as the closest we had to pay, it has put a lot of financial pressure on our family trying to find the extra money every month and at nearly £70 a month it is ridiculous all because we chose a religious school and not the mainstream school on the same road. All the children get picked up at the same bus stops and are 0.2 miles apart from each other. I appealed this but it was thrown out. My youngest daughter will not be attending schools in richmond as we simply cant afford the cost of transportation. The council have let so many parents and children down with these ridiculous policies.

I agree with almost all of the proposed changes. The only area of this policy that I have an issue with is the favouritism toward people of faith. It is the parents' choice to send their children to such schools, and they should not receive favourable treatment with regard to distance to school and funded transport. Going further, if the nearest school is a faith-based one then the family must not be penalised if they choose to send their child to the nearest non-faith school if it is further away. This is discrimination on the basis of [lack of] faith - I would be interested to see this tested in court.

I understand the need for the council to save money. On transport costs but feel that these proposed changes will disproportionately affect those on a low income.

Living rurally it is important that are children are not disadvantaged by the lack of services. There is no public transport whatsoever in our village, the village school was closed down in the 1960's so we have no option other than to travel our children to school. School transport is an absolute must for us.

We live rural with no public bus we expect that our daughter will be provided transport either taxis or bus to take her to the local high school out catchments school and those outside catchment should be refused

I feel that the proposed policy changes negatively impact children living in villages whose catchment school is not geographically the closest. This will likely lead to increased cars on the road adding to congestion.

There are many times villages require buses to transport children from home to school (during strikes/bad weather etc). You would save a lot of money if collected the children in neighbouring villages all together rather than sending coaches (not even mini buses!!) to collect our children. There have been occasions when buses have been used and a coach has arrived with 2 students on it. Yet nearby villages with more children have a mini bus thats nearly packed. Total waste of money.

The walking distance criteria is too generic. Rural communities have no other option than transport. Removal of funded transport could impact on pupil attendance. This appears to be another way of shaving resources with the badge of 'equality county wide' with no consideration of the equitable needs of each area. Parents may become extremely distressed at the prospect of paying or finding alternative transport impacting on their home/work life balance. Who completes the road safety assessment? One person(a grown adult probably with no additional needs) cannot determine the ability of children to safely navigate the road system which regardless of footpaths being available may fall foul of the lack of working street lighting. Two 14 year olds could have very different approaches to and understanding of road safety or being streetwise. In order to complete exceptional circumstances assessments, surely this results in more work, employing staff to complete these assessments or delaying access to the transport in a timely manner for term.time. Please consider area specific distances for walking by area rather than county wide in a document. Please also take into account the vast rurality and definitive need for transport not only for safety but to ensure attendance for pupils

Firstly, you have no villages in Swaledale listed on your options for question 1. I had to select Hawes as nearest to home, but we are in Swaledale and would have expected Reeth to have been an option. I trust you have considered the weather conditions impact on deciding which school you think children should attend. Living at the top of Swaledale it is absolute common sense to travel down the dale to Gunnerside/Reeth school even though Hawes/Kirkby Stephen schools may be geographically closer in distance. Travelling over the high moor roads into another dale/county would not be sensible.

Personally we were affected and disappointed by the fact there was officially another school that was 0.1 miles closer (as the crow flies) than the one my children attend - although it is clearly more convenient and safer than the alternative. Additionally when we originally chose the school we were living at the same address we live now and were entitled to the school travel expenses then but, seemingly, no longer. Personally, I think where there is a living distance which is 2+ miles from a school AND there are no public transport OR safe walking OR cycling options (which is the case with us) - there should be an exception to the rule - as with any rule, there are exceptions. Disappointing in such a sparse community like Settle where, frankly, transport options are pretty much non-existent.

I think that it is crucial that the travel arrangements in place when a child accepted a place at a school are upheld. I think that it would cause significant mental health issues for young people if they found themselves in a position where they had to move schools. I think that this would not just be disruptive to their education but would be extremely damaging to their emotional health. I pay for my child to use school transport as I live outside of North Yorkshire. If this was withdrawn it would be impossible for my child to get to school. There is no way of accessing the school via public transport. The only route to school is miles down a 60 mile an hour country road with no footpaths. He would be forced to leave the school which would be utterly devastating. The schools near where I live are now all oversubscribed and so my child would be left without a school place. It is so important that children currently in schools are not displaced. I think that when school buses are withdrawn there is a huge increase in traffic congestion and parents parking outside of schools which is far more damaging to the environment. This should be taken into consideration when examining environmental concerns. I think that school buses are far less damaging to the environment than huge numbers of parents suddenly driving their children to and from school. I think that the option of walking or cycling to school is less safe in rural areas where there are long country roads often without footpaths or street lighting. Very few secondary age children are walked to school by a parent. I think that it is a huge safeguarding issue if the safety of the route travelled by a young person is assessed on whether or not it would be safe for an able bodied adult. I think that this is extremely dangerous and would likely lead to fatalities. I think that it is wrong to assume that it is possible to access rural schools by public transport or that all parents have access to a car. It would be cruel to displace children who are happily settled in their schools. I think that young people have had their lives so disrupted in recent years and it is crucial that they can stay in their schools.

School catchment areas determine admissions but I have read that these will not change. Therefore parents will find it very difficult to understand the complexities of which schools they can gain a place for their child in alongside where they can afford to transport them to. The two things must be aligned fully so that your catchment school/schools are also where you can be transported to. It seems ridiculous to have to choose a school based on transport rather than catchment. Clearly the council wishes to save money but is not willing to take on the extremely difficult task of sorting out school catchments. Parents in rural areas like mine will end up with school places that they can't afford to transport their children to. There will be mass appeals and attendance will be impacted even further. This change to policy is not workable in a widespread rural county such as North Yorkshire.

I am worried that it will impact the number of students that go to our rural secondary school as a lot of pupils come from other areas which have secondary schools nearer to them.

Whilst it is right that the policy should be regularly amended to ensure it aligns with legislation, I do not see the fact recognised that North Yorkshire is a very large, predominantly rural county and that several primary schools have been closed over the last 10 years, with children forced to travel further and further each day for their education as a result. The situation is particularly difficult for families and children situated in the north of the county where school provision is even more sparse than towards the south.

For rural children, nearest school is not the same as optimal school. There should be some margin for decision making here. Possibly... you have some choice but not more than say 25% further than the nearest school. The area is so geographically diverse that attempting to apply rules for major cities and rural areas is meaningless and loses nuance. These changes would mean our preferred school has to change despite being only fractionally further away. I think they need reviewing with this nuance adding in. Additionally, providing post-16 transport should be considered in rural circumstances. Our child is mandated to attend post-16 training but cannot do that without travelling, and we may not be able to afford the costs despite not being a low income family. I can understand that the council needs to balance the books, but there are many other areas you could start rather than impacting education.

The DfE's "statutory walking distance" may make sense in towns or cities, but in a sparsely populated rural area with poor pedestrian access and footways (narrow roads, high hedges, fast traffic) the two and three mile rule does create problems for many of our families: where both parents are working, where a single parent is working, where there is no car in the family. This is not, of course, new! The revised document is admirably clear, even if there are statutory elements which are outwith the control of the council.

I have two disabled children who are able to access main stream schooling. For the eldest this was only because he attend a smaller, more rural secondary school. This school was named in my eldest sons EHCP before he moved to post 16. I have applied to the same school for my youngest child for September. Our "Nearest" school has places, but is totally inappropriate to meet my children's needs due to their Autism and anxiety (they have demonstrated they can't cope with larger, more crowded schools). Currently my husband (who is a full time career) drives one child to one school and we pay towards post 16 transportation for our eldest. It is the only way we can meet our children educational and SEMH needs. I think that there really does need to be some kind of consideration taken into account for selecting a school (within reason) that better meets my child's needs.

We live in Malham. A place with no suitable public transport for children to reach school. We moved to Malham on the basis of catchment areas to Skipton as well as Settles schools and the provision of transport. With remote jobs we brough badly needed new families and economic activity into this rural area. From Malham Skipton is actually the more accessible location in winter weather. Settle is closer as the crow flies but as the bus (or car in winter weather) drives it is further. On the basis of this new policy our children could only attend Settle schools with transport and would be precluded from applying for a place at the Grammar schools in Skipton as we work full time and so could not drive them to and from school ourselves. There is no public transport. I think this is damaging and limits social mobility for children from rural areas and would discourage families like ours moving to the Dales. There is a 500 year history of Skipton providing education for children from the Dales. This policy rides roughshod over that.

I have paid and continue to pay for my children to use the school bus, we pay over £100 per child each month that is over £300 a month for us as a family. I work in a school where parents are paid by the council to bring their children to school as there are not enough places on the school bus, yet many parents do not take up the places they have been allocated and there are unused seats. I feel the system is unfair. We live rurally and have to drive our children to the bus as it is. Schhol transport is a nightmare!!!

School transport has been extremely valuable to our family living rurally, due to the distance to the nearest catchment school (primary and high school). We are disappointed with the provision laid on from April as we don't feel confident in a taxi service when the same company has been doing it since the beginning of our child's time at school. Get the feeling they'll be very unreliable too. Also seems extremely unviable when the current provider is actually in the area. The school our child attends would benefit massively from a bus service run from Pateley Bridge and I believe many parents would pay for it - the school is dangerous at drop off and collection due to the volume of traffic! Can NYCC look on putting on services like this to try and generate money were a high volume of non catchment children are attending a school? I wholeheartedly support NYCC in any decision about children getting priority into catchment schools based on where they live. We would not get into our current school now due to the amount of non catchment siblings coming in. This is unfair especially when for us it would mean at least 6 miles to the nearest school then!

We only have two secondary schools to choose from in our catchment area, we live in Ingleton. By changing the eligibility to the nearest school with places this would mean QES is the only school we can apply for where we would get free transport. When I have to make my choice for my children as to which secondary school they attend I do not want my child going to QES and would choose Settle. This is for many reasons but I also want my child to attend a school in North Yorkshire and not Cumbria. North Yorkshire would lose a huge amount of children from their numbers if this were to happen as parents who live in the Ingleton/Bentham area and wider areas would choose a Cumbrian school rather than North Yorkshire due to free transport being provided. It seems very unfair to penalise parents that live in rural areas and have little choice in secondary schools anyway.

The council must look at the impact changes to policy will make to the children. All children currently in a school must remain there regardless of the proposals and not be made to move simply because of transport issues. There must be more consideration for the rural areas and for the impact on village schools which are often the heart of a community. This proposal could mean siblings are split between schools. Parents should have a right to choose the school that their child attends within reason and be supported to have a choice. The council should not dictate where poorer families, who may have no income to transport, school their children.

We live in a rural area, which means that access to public transport and safe non-vehicle travel (Cycle paths, cycle lanes, lit footways) are very limited. The only justification of removing the current free travel arrangements is on cost-saving grounds, but this conflicts directly with the council's statutory duty to promote the use of sustainable travel to places of education. I cannot speak for all areas but in our village there are no suitable 'sustainable travel' options available, public transport does not connect with Selby and there are no walking or cycling routes suitable for children (it would involve walking or cycling along National Speed Limit country roads with no pavements, verges or street lighting and with numerous blind bends and dips).

I pay what I consider to be very high council tax. We picked our catchment school as it had travel support. Parents that work need travel support to get their children to school at all. In the villages we often live many miles from our school and most have recently lost public transport. Removing school transport would make living here at all unviable for many families.

NYC have a responsibility not to deny parents the opportunity to choose a school for their child due to their location. Rurality should not limit parental choice. Limited finances are no excuse for this to happen.

We currently live in North Yorkshire but close to a county boundary. Our child has attended the local village primary school, in North Yorkshire since the start of Reception. We drive him to school even though more than distance away. We are isolated from the village due to living on a farm and therefore friendships made in school are important. 3 of our older children are attending secondary school in North Yorkshire, Richmond being our closest catchment school. However, our nearest secondary school would be under the proposed changes in County Durham. I would not send our fourth child to this school, due to no other reason then it is not a school which his primary school feed into. As such we would be forced to fund and provide transport to enable him to go to the school with peers from his Primary school. I feel sending children to the nearest distance school is appropriate, if in the same catchment as the Primary that each child has been attending, but not appropriate, if like my child it is different. I feel otherwise this is detrimental to the children's social and emotional development. We chose to live in North Yorkshire in an area close to Richmond because we wanted our children to attend it- but as an Agricultural family we are unable to live in a town, so school transport has been vital for us to get our children to school. If we had to pay for 3 children to get the bus to school we would financially difficult.

Living rurally we do rely on a taxi run, I feel strongly against an outside company taking the tender for the taxi run as I would not like a complete stranger taking my children to school. Also the local taxi drivers that do take our children know the area and also the conditions that they can be faced with in the winter, where an outsider will not.

We live in a rural area and rely on home to school transport, as we are unable to walk to school. Our home address and primary school are in catchment for a few different secondary schools. Our primary school is a feeder for our preferred secondary school but our home address is nearer to another that we do not want to go to. I think that if we are in catchment for a secondary school then we should get free transport to that school, as we are in area.

You have merged our council and since have consistently provided a poorer service to Selby rural communities. There are no alternative public transport services to any secondary school in North, West or South Yorkshire, and the closest school in South Yorkshire is a several mile walk on isolated country lanes with no pavements or streetlights. The cars travel at 60 miles an hour on straight sections and there are several blind bends. The alternative is not safe. People cannot afford to pay the extortionate fees to take them to our catchment school which is 12 miles/ 25 min drive (without rush hour traffic). If you take away free access, anyone who doesn't drive AND can work flexibly to get to work on time, won't be able to live here with kids. You'll take another step towards strangling our community in favour of funnelling money into bigger towns and cities which already have significantly more resources proportionally than rural communities combined.

This policy is taking away the parental choice to send their child to a school that is the best fit. There is already limited availability re transport in our village and reducing that further to just one school is not acceptable- the choice of only providing transport to knottingly which is based in a very deprived area (even the school website highlights this as a major issue!) again is not acceptable. Our children work incredibly hard and reducing the option to only pay for transport to one school is just not fair to them. As parents we pay incredibly high council tax and since the council has merged we have been told we now have to pay for our garden waste and now this. I am so angry that this policy is a cost cutting policy- our children's education should not be part of your cost cutting! You are effectively once again expecting hard working parents to pay for something that we already pay taxes for.

This decision will take away the parents choice to choose a secondary school. Transport to secondary school is vital in rural villages around Selby where council cuts have already decimated the public transport links. The distance and road type to any school makes it impossible for children to walk. Parents who work will be unable to take the children to school by car. The council will still end up paying for transport so savings will be limited and you will be harming the excellent schools like Brayton who will have reduced numbers on role. The schools in other councils like West Yorkshire and east rising will benefit. It doesn't make any sense.

In remote areas where children have to walk significant distances to get to a bus door to door transport is essential for school attendance. This must be properly funded and continue as this can't always rely on parents transport.

Happy in the main. Safety will still need to play a major part in rural areas. Unlit roads obviously precluding and exempting villages where the distance criteria is not met.

Consideration needs to be made within areas that no other transport options are in place. In small villages that have had transport services removed it limits options and by further reducing the offering this reduces parents choices. Pupil and parents should in fact be supported to attend the school that fits their need and not just because they have no other choice due to financial impact from transport. Pupils all thrive in different settings and children can be negatively impacted if this is removed not to mention the lack of motivation to attend and participate which in turn could reduce progress levels, attainment and outcome. A child being forced into a school that they don't not wish to attend could infact negatively impact that child's future.

Based on our rural location, our nearest school would not be a viable option for our three children during the winter months. Therefore, it is important they continue to have transport available to the school within our catchment area. Their education would be severely disrupted if this was no longer the case.

It was first shared by NYC (Redacted) - Who when contacted came back quickly, now to no longer work for the council. It feels to me that there are to be big losers in this situation, where there is great competition for students, ultimately leading to impacts in schools and communities. We are rural in setting and by no way make up the average stats created for this survey, and within areas this to me needs to be taken into account. Our feeder schools, could essentially no longer by the case in communities we work in and serve - I would appreciate someone coming back to both me and the Governing body here. I have contacted (Redacted) as advised on (Redacted) email. It doesn't feel fair, nor potentially allows for sustainable planning and futures. We work hard to ensure a balanced budget, living within our means, but how can we effectively provide an education to our community, where year on year numbers could end up being far more volatile. Please do call and we can meet to discuss -My number is 01729 822451. - Kind regards, Gareth Whitaker

North Yorkshire is a large area, mostly rural with very poor rural transport links. Most people may choose to live in rural areas, so either they 1. should contribute more for their children to travel to school, 2.the council should take the public transport system back in house and 3 the government should give our council financial assistance for children's transport If I had children of school age I would take responsibility for them and not expect others to have to pay.

With regard to sustainability and the future. We live in quite a remote place so the bus for the nearest primary school only has about 8 children travelling. Some children at the same school live at the starting point or on the route of the bus but are not eligible for free transport. As a council you need to promote and advertise that parents can pay for a bus pass to travel to the school - fill the empty seats and reduce number of cars dropping off outside school.

I feel that yet again, changes disproportionately affect those living in rural areas in a negative way. Reducing choice and increasing cost.

The proposal makes a lottery of funded bus places and makes it even more confusing for parents. It makes no logical sense, I have 4 young children and using the current bus proved it would cost me over £20k in bus fees just to get them to school in their catchment areas, secondary schools are different and suit different children and decisions shouldn't be made on finances. The changes are not fair, especially for more rural people. It would make me drive my children to school this increasing pollution and congestion.

Why should we suffer because we live in a rural area. We should be able to select the school we want within a reasonable distance and just because we live in a rural area this may be a further distance than in other countries. That does not mean we should be forced into not having a choice of schools. Our local secondaries are not that dissimilar in distance from our home, but with these new proposals we would only be able to attend one - the one that we do not wish to attend due to its size, pastoral care system and ethos. We make decisions very carefully about our children's futures and it is unfair to force anyone into 7 years of education at a place where they do not wish to be. I do not understand the need for this change. I also worry about the survival of smaller secondaries when their students are limited. Is this for on the schools?

I think changing free transport to only the nearest school would be a huge mistake, for pupils, parents and schools alike, especially in rural areas. I think the current criteria of the nearest school or catchment area school is by far the correct criteria to have and the proposed change to that would be devastating to not only many families to also schools.

Current primary schools and friendship groups should be looked at when reviewing any transport policy. We live in a small village at the very edge of the North Yorkshire boundary and our preferred secondary school is a North Yorkshire school but the proposed changed mean that our child would only be eligible for free transport to 1 school in West Yorkshire and 1 school in South Yorkshire of which, none of their friends will be attending, nor do we as parents want to send out child to them. There is an absolute minimal difference in the mileage to the North Yorkshire school but it is not an option for free transport. Our village transport links have been cut to almost nothing and this is a further blow to us villagers (who already feel like second class citizens). Many of the children in our village will attend the North Yorkshire School at the huge cost to the parents but this shouldn't be the case.

If I live in North Yorkshire then I would expect that North Yorkshire would support my children to travel to a North Yorkshire school each day. We live in a rural area on the outskirts of the county and the nearest school with places available is in another LA area to which we have no connection. The policy in 2019 already stripped back provisions (catchment school or nearer school originally) and this measure takes it too far. I believe that the equality impact assessment is also flawed as it does not take into account the effect of the changes on those living in rural communities that are more likely to be those with protected characteristics and hence this is indirectly discriminatory. The consultation does not provide any evidence of the calculations of potential lost per capita school funding for the schools and academies that may be caused by a loss of students to other areas

outside of the district and whether this off sets any savings when viewed together. This is very much a penny pinching measure that will affect the North Yorkshire communities that elected members and officials are here to serve.

I like that the policy is being refreshed. It is very difficult to compare areas such as Scarborough to more rural villages such as Leyburn and hopefully the new criteria will allow for personal judgement calls to be made based on the areas current state not its historical features,.this is particularly in refernce to suitable walking distance where footpaths are no longer available/street lighting is not used due to financial constraints and roads that are used more now by large vehicles that were 10+years ago. Im excited to see the new policy ideas and feel the new phrase 'nearest suitable school' is much more relevant than 'catchment school'.

My daughter's been offered a place at Settle College and we live in Ingleton. A bus has always been provided as this school is within the same County. It would be devastating to the local children and also Settle College if transport was removed. Please do it take this transport away.

Whilst I understand that Home to School Travel is a large proportion of a shrinking budget for the Council, I do feel that efficiencies could be gained by allowing more children to use the service and this would also improve safety, congestion and air pollution around schools. Having witnessed a child being hit by a car outside our local school last year I feel that the fewer cars travelling to schools would be a good thing. Particularly in rural areas where cars are travelling at higher speeds near to the school. We chose for our daughter (and son in due course) to attend a school that is not our nearest, although we don't have a school within safe walking distance anyway. We would welcome the ability to drop our children at a point along the bus route to our chosen school to avoid congestion etc in the village and ensure that the buses are at maximum capacity. Depending on cost we would possibly be willing to contribute.

The number of pupils eligible may have been affected by school closures, forcing pupils to travel longer distances. Low pupil numbers are an issue in my area, putting schools at risk of closure. I think this factor should be considered when making changes to policy. I think the environmental impact of changes should also be considered. For each pupil that is no longer eligible because of policy changes this will be replaced by a car journey, often with only 1 pupil per car. School drop off areas are already congested with a lack of available parking, this will add to the problem. On a separate point, where a pupil loses eligibility at age 8 because they live over 2 but below 3 miles away from school, this is too far to be expected to walk twice a day at that age, on dark roads that are often unsafe in rural areas. It will inevitably be replaced by a car journey, further adding to the environmental points above.

I feel it is a money making exercise with no thought or consideration about rural communities that are already struggling to afford to live in the Dales. I work here and live here, I moved my children to school here in Reeth from (Redacted), knowing (from the policy) that they would attend Richmond school at secondary age. The road to Wensleydale school is not safe and it is not a priority road that is gritted, & it is a dangerous suggestions. A coach is also not allowed to travel on the road to Leyburn above Grinton Moor due to the size of the vehicle. It would mean that mini buses would need to be provided-how does this save the council money as you would need more? In our large area but small communities our children have built friendships at Reeth and Gunnerside school - why should this be broken up in secondary school? I would suggest someone from NYCC come to Gunnerside and drive the proposed new routes in a coach and then tell us if they believe it is safe for our children to travel on these roads. Wensleydale school is over subscribed- you are ruining communities and our childrens future of these by splitting them up when going to secondary school.

I think the amendment to change to the nearest school for us in the far west of the county is absolutely ludicrous!! We live on the Cumbrian border so our closest school would be Kirkby Stephen! Have any of you actually driven this road! Even in a car this road is very scary and quite life threatening in my eyes if you were to send a bus full of school children over this top to the nearest school!! We also have 2 if not 3 rather narrow bridges in which the buses could struggle to get over (these have been knocked down the past and having to be closed due to the severity of the road condition once knocked down and open hole dropping straight to the river) there is also a part of the road which is subsiding on the moor heading over to Kirkby Stephen, and again to send a bus of all that weight is just damn right stupid!! The road which we'd have to travel over sits at a height of 1740ft which obviously for a road in the Dales is rather high!! This road never ever gets gritted so this would have to be changed to a category 1 for the school access! I believe as a dale we have been told by Westmorland council this road has not been deemed safe to grit due to the height and severity of the hill!! So I'd love to know how this is going to change the gritting priority?! We are hill farmers here in the Dales and (Redacted), my husband has had to go and rescue an incredible number of people from this road in winter due to getting stuck! I would love to know how many days of school in winter they would miss, this isn't just because of snow but ice! And like this winter ice and cold weather has paid a massive impact on the road this year! I seriously think this part of the new policy needs looking at whether it be as a whole or whether it can change for certain areas within North Yorkshire!! I don't think it's very fair that if we have to apply to Kirkby Stephen school still and we chose to apply down the dale (Richmond or leyburn) for our own safety of our children and then have to try and find our own transport for getting our children to school just sounds very very unfair and in really does feel like you are punishing us for the area of the Dale we live in!! We are a farming family living in the Dales and wanting to access the schools in which all others members of the primary school would be attending!! And it's just not possible for us to move house as I said we farm and our livelihood is all in this area!!

I have ticked Richmond as our nearest town although Richmond is still an hours drive from where we / my family with children live therefore I feel this survey is flawed from the start as it doesn't give participants the opportunity to stress how very rural our homes are. I am very concerned about the council's proposal to drop 'the catchment' aspect of home to school transport and the introduction of the possibility of offering transport to schools in other local authorities. If this was the case for my family's children they would miss an awful lot of school during winter as the road rises to 1800 feet above sea level. It is a single track moorland road with standing water / running water in many places. Not to mention the very steep, long hill down into the next county. It is doubtful a bus or minibus could safely get here never mind the perilous return journey required to get the children to school. The safest route is always down dale on a road that is conscientiously gritted by the council for which we are very grateful as it means the school bus can get to the top of the dale safely without incident. I implore the consultation committee to consider geographical locations such as ours as an important safety issue alongside the attendance implications that transporting children to school/s in bad weather would create.

Living in Ingleton, we are right between two secondary schools, but slightly nearer to one. Those schools are very different, and I would want to send my child to the best school for their needs, rather than being forced to attend the 'nearest school' because of financial reasons. Furthermore, secondary schools with smaller feeder primary schools/few feeder primary schools will suffer - redundancies due to not enough students, funding cuts because of fewer PP/SEND pupils attending,

Whilst I appreciate that savings may need to be found there needs to be some exceptions to this proposal. One size does not fit all. Children in upper Swaledale cannot travel to Kirkby Stephen for the following reasons: 1 Safety. This is a moor road, 1700 + feet above sea level . B road and no winter gritting provision by Cumbria council. It has a 1/4 hill which is treacherous with only minimal ice on it I travel this route for work, missing many days in winter due to bad weather. On many days my husband grits the hill for me to descend which if in a 2 wheel drive or bus would be unsafe. I think the proposals are not considering the hostile environment this route travels through. Also weather conditions change rapidly on this route. The weather may be fine going to school then change and the children cannot or struggle to get home. I can assure you this is can be a frightening experience 2 Disruption to education As several / many days will be lost due to the inability to provide safe transport the children's education will be impacted. The argument they can be set work at home is detrimental to both education and socialisation and establishes inequality I hope you will reconsider this part of the proposal for the children in upper Swaledale. They currently have to travel to Richmond which is accepted as it is a safe journey. Your proposal would not be. I will be raising my concerns with Muker Parish council and Rishi Sunak Thank you

The closest secondary school to our home would be Kirkby Stephen. I am sure that when assessed, it will be decided that the route is unsafe and not a ressonable route. The alternative diversion in poor weather would be 50 miles+ so completely impractical. The second closest option would be Wensleydale School. Again, this route poses challenges due to lower gritting priorities. I believe a large majority of families have chosen to send their children to schools in Richmond from this area due to it being the best and safest route in the winter months. I appreciate other counties do not have a choice of catchment schools but due to the rural nature of our area, I can't see how it can work any other way.

I appreciate why you are looking to change to this. however, it affects student and parental choice of where they wish to go. While you can argue, that they can make alternative arrangements to go to their school of choice, not every household is logistically or financially capable, therefore the policy changes discriminate against those with lower income. Settle College is further away from more populated areas. We have a good portion of students who choose to come to us from areas like Skipton. By removing their eligibility for free travel. We will see a drop in student numbers which means less money to run the school effectively. I do not agree with the changes at all.

Having been involved in the fight to keep a school open in my local area in the past (Ingleton middle)I am again feeling disappointed that there is a real ulterior motive for this decision to change the agenda on how families will have to pay for school transport to the chosen school in the county they live in. Being in North Yorkshire but on the boundary of Lancashire and Cumbria the new criteria seems to me to be a good method of moving pupils away from Settle College to schools nearer to many pupils in Skipton and Kirkby Lonsdale by the means of removing the free school transport, thus removing much needed pupils (and the funding that goes with it). We all know how councils all over the country are struggling to cope financially, but living at the extreme furthest boundaries of the councils jurisdiction I feel again funding will be removed from this area. The bureaucracy and poor management of councils/ governments in the past few years as per normal will ultimately have a detrimental impact on the local community. There is a lot more to discuss on this matter and many,many local people will find this new transport infrastructure on schools utterly despicable and financially driven. Waiting with interest on how this progresses.

You haven't considered Ingleton in this policy review. A village sat between a North Yorkshire secondary and a Cumbrian secondary. The proposed changes in policy will significantly affect admissions to Settle College. Children who already have siblings in Settle College will have to apply to a different school with different holidays etc unless parents can afford transport. Transport to the nearest county school should absolutely be funded by the county !!! This change in policy could have devastating consequences for schools such as Settle College. Transport links within North Yorkshire are already difficult for post 16 education. Please reconsider this proposed change in policy and consult with your local primary and secondary schools!

I appreciate that the Council want to align themselves with Government policy and save money, but the Council must recognise that it has many rural areas where the nearest school is not always the catchment school/suitable school. In rural areas the nearest school in time taken to get there is not always the same as nearest school in distance. If the policy was to change as suggested then this would have significant impacts on those families that reside in the deepest rural areas of the County. Unless the Council are going to upgrade the roads and significantly improve gritting and snow plough services in winter then these pupils will miss out on schooling. A discretionary and common sense approach must be taken.

Please think carefully about any changes to the services provided to very rural areas. It has been hard enough managing with extremely limited services. We need more not less!

I think it not fair you should be able to send your children to what school they would better themselves at how can we afford two children at such a costly price to pay for school transport and if we worked we wouldn't have an option i for one will not be sending my kids to school at Leyburn as I don't feel it has the education I want for my kids or the background for them to see past the rural community having grown up in the countryside it a struggle to get to school as it is especially with the snow I've been bullied in small schools as a little girl and I do not want the same for my children it will affect us massively especially when my kids get to secondary I just can't afford that money and I will not be sending them to Leyburn instead of Richmond ! I also think Reeth is a lovely school and a lot of little ones will not have the opportunity to send them there I don't agree with the changes being a mum of two in the rural area I always think it us that has everything much harder as it is living in the middle of nowhere so no close facilities we need that transport to get to a to b when we are busy mums ourselves

I feel that providing transport to our nearest secondary school, which is outside of our local authority is ridiculous. My choice would be for my child to attend our local authority secondary school in Settle but QES in Kirkby is closer. How can removing the number of children accessing your own school be beneficial to the school. Personally, my child would not cope with the size and number of students at QES but Settle College would provide the appropriate support and needs for my child. You will reduce the number of children attending your own school with this new policy which could lead to the school closing. The new policy is a money saving agenda and is not taking the needs of children in a rural area into account. I believe there would be better ways of saving money than reducing who you can provide transport to, it is despicable!

Our 'closet school' would be QES.... I do not want my children to go hear. The amount of friends with problems here and have moved to other schools is countless. I want my children to go to settle, a smaller school where my children will not just be a number to the teachers. Somewhere they will know their individual personalities, in Yorkshire. It's not fair if we can't afford it we should be punished by send out our children out of the county to a worse school. We live in a rural community where this amendment could ruin countless children's education. Work harder on driving down the cost of the busses. From what I hear they are been paid a fortune for the school runs. Drive down these prices to save money where it won't affect hundreds of parents/children's mental health. There are other things to be looking at before this, why attack children's choices who can't defend themselves

This policy unfortunately will have an extremely negative impact on community schools, as well as removing all element of parental choice of which school their child should attend when reaching secondary age. While I appreciate there are financial constraints which may be alleviated by these changes, we are already hugely disadvantaged as a community by lack of access to services (as an example a 4 hour round trip for nail surgery for one of my sons just this week). We are underfunded in the west of the county and have the minimum access to services across public transport, health and education- special educational settings for SEND students, autism support, Early help are all focused to the east leaving the bare bones of a service for this side of the county. A change such as this will be devastating- meaning parents have no choice but to send their children elsewhere and in a catchment with low numbers of young people, schools are left struggling to recruit enough students to remain viable. Schools such as Settle College are a welcome and popular choice for parents and children across the area, which allows them to provide an excellent quality of education despite funding issues. Should numbers decline due to a policy which discriminates against parental choice (fast becoming a luxury which is available only to urban dwellers) schools like Settle College will suffer enormously. I ask the council to consider what it wants for its population- a hugely discriminatory east/west divide already appears to exist and these changes will make an already unacceptable situation even worse. While there are many challenges to balance within the council I feel that we deserve better, as do our children.

Whilst I agree in principle with nearest school equates to free transport it should also include and account nearest safest route especially in the winter months on high ground on roads that are not gritted. It amounts to discrimination of the Dales communities and puts lives at risk or at the very least restricting education to those living in the Dales. Safety of children should be a priority.

Some comments about the questionnaire: Not sure why Q1 has been included. Will responses be reliable? Does it matter if a respondent has read or hasn't read a text? How will that influence the overall decision making process? Q2 asks respondents' where they live. There is no radar button for Swaledale nor the larger village of Reeth nor any of the Upper Swaledale villages. Richmond is the option for people in Reeth, or is it Leyburn that is nearer but in a different valley. Again, how will this affect decision making when its validity and reliability is questionable? Essentially Q3 asks, who / what are you? Yet again, what bearing will the outcomes have on the overall decision making? Q4 asks about the respondents perception of question clarity. Ditto above comments. At last in Q5 we have a question that relates to the amendment that is of most concern. Yet it uses a Likert scale of 'agreement to disagreement' for each response. Q6 ? Q7 may be useful. Not sure why 'Not Mandatory' is used against these last two questions.

Buckden Parish Council has very real concerns about the amendment to the main eligibility criterion to: 'nearest school (with places available)'. We appreciate that this is to match the statutory requirement, however, given the potential specific implications for our parish, we believe what is proposed is both impractical and unreasonable. This relates to the specific topography of this part of the Dales. Specifically, there are three hamlets within the parish of Buckden – Oughtershaw, Greenfield and Beckermonds - where children have always gone to Kettlewell School, even though Hawes school is marginally closer – in distance, if not in time. This is because the single-track road over Fleet Moss which stands between these locations and Hawes rises to a height of some 1900 feet; it is the highest road in Yorkshire and is the 13th highest in the UK. It is a single-track road, is frequently blocked by snow and even when not blocked can be dangerously icy as the gritters often can't get up the 1 in 4 gradient section. The parish council strongly believe it is not acceptable for NYC to put our children in danger by requiring them to travel to school on such a road; a secondary consideration is that it would inevitably have a negative impact on their attendance record in winter. We propose that a better way of amending the policy to meet the regulations would be to define a specific catchment area for each school based on the "nearest school" criterion but adjusted to take into account such special factors as roads which are completely unsuitable for school transport. We trust that you will give our proposal serious consideration in your consultation process.

Our chief concerns relate to the impact on our local secondary school provider, Settle College. Speaking with the Headteacher of Settle College we are concerned that the proposed changes would see a significant reduction in roll and in effect discriminate against those families who wish their children to travel to Settle College from places such as Bentham and Ingleton. The policy therefore potentially impacts on parental choice in North Craven. A significant fall in roll, as calculated by the Head of Settle College and as attested to by other local Primary headteachers, would negatively affect provision at the College and impact on the life chances of pupils at Settle Primary School, who in the main attend Settle College. We fear that County's proposed Policy as it stands would negatively impact on provision in North Craven though it may bring savings in less rural areas. The North Craven area seems to frequently overlooked when it comes to policy decisions - the recent decision to reject the application of Settle Primary School to be a targeted mainstream provision for high needs, vulnerable pupils was made in part because of transport decisions (ie it was felt a TMP would be better nearer to Skipton and thus save on transport costs). The proposed transport policy likewise discriminates against schools in North Craven with potentially a devastating impact on Settle College - making us wonder, when we consider all the school closures we have had in our area recent years (Low Bentham, Clapham, Rathmell, Horton, Langcliffe, Richard Thornton, Settle Middle, Ingleton Middle) if the Local Authority truly understands and values the fragile educational infrastructure we have in our rural area.

Our chief concerns relate to the impact on accessibility to our remote local school and to our secondary school provider, Settle College. Pupils who attend Kirkby Malham Primary come from a very wide area - anything that compromises eligibility for parents coming from areas such as Bell Busk, Otterburn / Hellifield will not help the viability of our small school. The majority of children attending our school are out of the Malhamdale area - we live in a remote location and are concerned as to the impact of any policy that may affect the roll of our small school community and would need further reassurance that we would not be detrimentally affected. We are also concerned that transport policy changes will reduce eligibility for those families who wish their children to travel to Settle College from places such as Kirkby Malham, Bentham and Ingleton. The policy potentially impacts on parental choice. A significant fall in roll at our school or at Settle College would negatively affect the life chances of pupils in our area.

We live in a deeply rural area, with bus travel the only option for secondary school, without driving almost 80 miles a day if no school transport. There will be no choice for the children in which school to go to or subjects to take

This would be absolutely catastrophic for myself and many other families. As a single parent the cost associated with getting (redacted) to settle school (she starts in September) would have a massive negative impact. I also have (redacted) so this would eventually affect both. This is a terrible change for myself and so many other families. (Redacted) has chosen her school already and that choice shouldn't have to be made based on whether or not (redacted) can get a free school bus. Please don't implement this change.

We live in Ingleton and are both working parents who will be reliant on school transport to and from school. Providing transport is a must for our rural communities and to revoke or reduce that will massively impact ALL children. Especially vulnerable. Reducing it will remove choices for our children and future generations.

This proposal may be fine for large towns, but in a rural area this could be catastrophic for local schools. In Bentham this would entirely cut off 1 of the local high school as an option, having a huge impact on staffing and potentially leading to a closure. The modelling does not utilise projected student numbers so is entirely flawed. Settle College receives a quarter of its pupils from this area that would now be sent to another school. The primary school will lose families to Ingleton (and already has too few numbers for its size) which again will lead to redundancies. This is ill thought out and based on weak modelling. The impact of this consultation if implemented will decimate the local schools, to the benefit of schools outside of North Yorkshire.

The proposal may save money in parts of Craven but for the areas of Ingleton and Bentham this will create issue. Our children will no longer have their nearest county school as an option. Parents do not need to be left to pay for transport to their nearest county school. The proposal has not been thought through. Schools like Settle College will be massively impacted. Schools like Settle College are few and far between. Why take this choice away from our children? The people making these proposals should get out of offices and go and speak to schools, pupils and parents. Hear and understand why they choose schools within their county. Please do not make this proposal policy.

With our nearest 2 schools been Settle college and QES, this will have a huge impact on both schools. More people will choose QeS due to the free transport, even though there is very little difference in distance (we live in Bentham). It also takes away free choice from parents, when children may benefit from Settle college as it is smaller. It will negatively impact on the college too, as numbers will drop dramatically. As a parent with one child already at Settle and another currently at Primary. we have already discussed moving our child to QES. This is not something we want to do as Settle supports the needs of our child. But we also cannot take the extra financial burden of school transport. We moved to this area from the city on the understanding our children would have equal access to schooling through provided transport to their chosen, nearest school (There is very little difference in distance between QES and Settle from our location-10 miles and 11 miles) Living in rural areas can be challenging enough when it comes to equality of access to services, without this extra pressure. Many people struggle with the cost of living crisis, and Bentham is known to be one of the poorest towns in North Yorkshire. This will put more pressure on families and cause more stress/poverty/mental health issues, when it could easily be avoided. Currently Bentham is undergoing regeneration and has proposed the Bentham master plan to NYCC. A major part of this is supporting children and families. I would expect NYCC to be supporting families in this area, not penalising them and causing more financial stress and poverty. Living in North Yorkshire, we would expect our children to be able to go to school in North Yorkshire and not have to attend a school in a different county-QES is in Cumbria. Our nearest school in the NYCC catchment area is Settle and therefore free transport SHOULD be provided.

It is ridiculous to think sending children to school in Cumbria from Upper Swaledale is a sensible option. The road down Swaledale to Richmond can be treacherous at times in winter but to then think it is safe to send children on untreated roads over a hill to Kirkby Stephen is lunacy. The weather can change in minutes at that altitude. Have any of the people making this decision ever travelled this road and if so would they want their children to on a cold frosty snowy day. The alternative route is by the A66 which can also be closed to vehicles when bad weather hits so then what happens, children stuck miles away from home and no way of getting them home. Why should children in remote areas be the ones to suffer when cuts have to be made they get little enough as it is. Yorkshire children should go to school in Yorkshire not shunted off elsewhere to save money.

Yet again rural communities suffer and the choices removed.

The proposal is most likely made with care, but there is a lack of understanding of the infrastructure of some rural areas. The proposed closer school for one area is reached by using a minor road (winter maintenance shared by two counties) due to the altitude it is often affected by ice and snow. To take and collect the pupils would entail passing the school they are at present attending, plus another 20 min drive. This is not ideal for working families, the pupils, the environment, or the health of a rural community.

Ripley Parish Council wish to note a concern that provision for home to school travel could disadvantage rural children attending a school within their catchment area if not the closest.

Rural secondaries need to be considered, how are the council supporting the schools that this will affect to ensure they remain open? Surely 'nearest school' should be 'nearest NYCC' school? Seems short sighted in relation to the Craven area in particular.

Moving to a "nearest school" policy means that my child will be sent to a school outside of North Yorkshire, moving away from all their friends and in isolation as the sole student in the year group. The costs will not be reduced by changing the policy - there are currently two buses from our area (one coach, one mini bus) travelling from Swaledale/Arkengarthdale to Richmond School - this will have to be changed to at least one coach and two mini buses travelling to Leyburn, Kirkby Stephen and Barnard Castle. Accessibility in winter has not been considered - travel to our nearest school will involve a journey from Arkengarthdale to Barnard Castle, crossing the Stang. This road over the highest moors is not gritted in winter and is often impassable in a 4x4 truck. Children from upper Swaledale will be sent to Kirkby Stephen - a similarly ungritted and dangerous road. Children from Reeth will be sent to Leyburn over Grinton Moor, another ungritted route over the high moors. Unless the Council plans to extend both their gritting responsibilities, and insist that Cumbria and Co Durham also adopt their parts of the routes as priority one, you are putting lives unnecessarily at risk. These changes will cause divisions in rural communities. Children in Swaledale are a tight-knit group, having gone through primary school together, and these policy changes will highlight those who can afford to pay for transport/drive their children to school and those who cannot, and whose children are forced to move school.

The policy does not account for a rural community and the distances that pupils have to travel for school. It is important that primary schools feed into secondary school that is considered part of their community. This policy does not recognise the importance of feeder schools and their relationships with the secondary schools that they feed in to. A one size fits all approach is not going to work for some schools and it will see the numbers decimated, making the future of the secondary school precarious.

Being brought up and continuing to live in this rural community we are challenged with our Authorities Financial Cuts. Our taxes and particularly Council Tax continues to rise and we are receiving significantly less services. A significant cut has been in winter gritting and snow ploughing. We struggle to commute from our rural community, and cannot imagine how you envisage our child to be expected to use a proposed transport system that will cross high altitude county / parish borders to alternative schools in potentially dangerous winter weather conditions. Clearly in our region the school catchments have aligned with sensible road networks to local schools, maybe this is already a financial saying not considered. I have taken a copy of this note allowing it to be referenced in the future as we experience your investment cuts to our rural community, where our children are put at risk.

Pupils that live in Swaledale mainly go to Richmond School. This makes sense because it is the safest and most reliable route to a secondary school. All other routes to secondary schools other than Richmond involve travelling over high passes that are much more likely to be closed due to snow than the main road to Richmond. It does not seem fair that parents choosing a secondary school should be financially impacted for choosing a school that is safer for their children to travel to and that they will be able to attend more regularly. Further to this, there are good links between primary schools in Swaledale and Richmond School, yet under the new policy none of the children that have attended primary school in Swaledale will have free transport to the secondary school in their catchment. Pupils that attend primary school in Reeth or Gunnerside usually go to secondary school together, supporting community cohesion, and pupil friendships and pupil wellbeing. Some families will have siblings in two different schools if they attend the school associated with free transport. We understand that the policy is intended to save money, but its implementation will have an unfair impact on this community. It seems that, at least, there needs to be special consideration for some communities to mitigate the negative impact of this policy.

All policies require exceptions. This points to someone looking at a map with no concept or understanding of rural communities. The routes to nearest schools in Upper Swaledale are all over high ground much ungritted and not safe in Winter. For example the road to Kirkby Stephen is poor. It requires substantial remedial work to restore it to its original state, for it to be safe. It needs more passing places and the introduction of reflective way marker posts so if ploughed or gritted it is known where the road is. It is been unmaintained for many years the shoulders of the road have collapsed in many places caused by vehicles trying to pass each other on a primarily single track road. You cannot have siblings going to different schools. This survey is restrictive and channeled to the benefit of the Council a very biased document to minimise opposition. A blanket urban style policy cannot fit fairly remote rural communities. The key question is why for well over 50 years have pupils attended their current schools. Because our elders used common sense and knew what was best. This is a money saving exercise at the expense of children's education and mental well being.

We don't need transport to primary school so I am looking at this in relation to the time our daughter moves to secondary school. We live in (Redacted) so our nearest secondary school is QES in Kirkby Lonsdale, Cumbria and our nearest North Yorkshire school is Settle High School. I worry that under this proposed policy more Bentham children will feel forced to apply to QES on transport grounds and therefore Settle will lose out on pupils which would lead to a spiral of decline as fewer children = less funding = fewer subject options and resources and so children will stop applying to this school and it will eventually close. This would have a terrible impact on our communities and I think it would lead to fewer families living in our communities ending up with them becoming towns full of second homes and an aged population. I already feel that our area (North Craven) often gets the short end of the stick when it comes to county matters and this just adds to that feeling. We pay over (Redacted) in council tax yet feel like we don't get much in return. There are already quite a few challenges to raising a family in this area, please don't make it harder. As I read it the policy doesn't make clear if we would be able to pay for transport should we not meet the nearest school criteria. This needs to be clearer so that parents & children can make informed decisions.

Whilst I understand that costs have gone up and need lowering I'm baffled by your suggestion over the 'nearest suitable school'. I live in a rural area that has a very close knit community. This proposal will have a truly devastating effect on our area for a number of reasons. My main concern is safety. Whilst your proposal covers a safe journey for students walking to school it does not cover a safe bus journey and the roads that would have to be used under the new proposal. In our area the roads that would have to be used are simply unsuitable as a school route. They are high altitude and are impassable in winter due to snow. Also one route would mean crossing a dual carriageway which is deeply concerning and unsafe, this road is also routinely closed in winter due to high winds. The alternative route would go past our preferred and sensible choice of school in Richmond or miss an unacceptable amount of days of school. Another point to consider is that currently we have 2 school buses for secondary school in the area, your new proposal would mean that 4 buses would be needed which surely costs more and adds to your carbon footprint?! As mentioned before, we have a very close community and that involves our children who would be split apart from lifelong friends to go to a school where they don't know anyone. This will cause serious social issues and anxiety in our children which means their education will be negatively effected. Another detrimental effect on our community would be that parents like myself who work in the area would have to seek employment out of the area so we could transport our children ourselves as we cannot afford the extortionate bus pass fees. This will undoubtedly negatively effect our local economy. Another point I have been made aware of is the devastating effect this would have on Richmond School and Sixth Form. We have been notified that if your proposal passes as it is then Richmond School would have to offer a vastly reduced curriculum and that the sixth form would cease to exist. This would not only upset people in the area but put unnecessary strain on other schools and sixth forms in neighboring areas that would have to take students that would have preferred to go to Richmond school and sixth form. I strongly urge you to take my points into consideration because your proposal puts finances above the safety of our children and that is simply wrong! One final thought, I pay council tax in North Yorkshire. Why should other councils be expected to educate our children?! Our council tax is eye watering, put it to better and more sensible use like safely getting our children to a truly suitable school that doesn't put them at risk!

Re free travel restricted to 'nearest school': Richmond School has a broader range of facilities and better academic results than Leyburn School; however Leyburn is smaller and more vocationally-focused, offering a different set of strengths. The children of Reeth currently benefit from free transport to either, based on which their parents deem to be the most fitting environment for them to flourish; NOT an agonising decision based on what they can afford. In Swaledale, we already face higher living across a whole host of areas; including a 20 mile round trip to the nearest childcare provider until kids turn 3. It would be catastrophic for the community to have more essential services cut, and the secondary education of their children become an agonising cost-return analysis. Winter conditions in rural areas such as ours must be taken into serious consideration too. Routes quickly become impassable in inclement weather; and the nearest 'suitable school' should take into account the 6 months each year where travel on ungritted, non priority roads can become extremely precarious. In our case, Richmond Road (the road between Reeth and Richmond) winds through the bottom of a valley, at a lower altitude than the road to Leyburn, and is often the only route passable and well gritted in frosty conditions. We have already suffered numerous instances of thoughtless roadworks this winter from NYCC who obviously haven't thought through the repercussions of cutting off the most reliable thoroughfares during periods of bad weather; and it has been up to the parish councils to remind them. This change in policy seems another case of a complete lack of understanding of the specific geography and needs of our rural Swaledale community; and the drawback of a one size for all proposal for such a huge and diverse county. I urge you to reconsider.

I am struggling to understand how the council think that this “ one size fits all “ solution with transport is the correct way. It may well be feasible in an urban area but in the rural communities where I and my family live this plan is completely unworkable and dangerous. Our roads are narrow and susceptible to weather related issues especially in the winter. Many of the roads are not deemed as a priority for gritting etc so I fail to see how expecting children to be transported on unsuitable roads or even diverted, increasing travel time can even be a consideration. As a council you will be forcing a parent to take the decision that it is unsafe for their child to travel due to the weather and therefore preventing that child the right to a full education. Also putting lives of children in jeopardy expecting them to travel on unsuitable roads in treacherous conditions. I also fail to see how this is going to be cost effective when adverse weather conditions will require longer journey times. How will this work in reality when the schools such as Wensleydale are full? I am also very disappointed that as a council you have seen fit to organise a few meetings at unsuitable times and places and have made very little effort in advertising it and therefore prevented a lot of parents, families and residents the opportunity to question and seek answers. Not a very democratic way to propose a change of policy by attempting to bring it in via the back door. The whole thing is completely ridiculous and unrealistic. To try and change something that is so important and not allow a full and open discussion with the people who this will affect the most is disgraceful. I hope that this will be fully reviewed and not instigated in the rural areas. This is going to split communities families and friends.

Settle College is a small but brilliant high school with catchment areas that include Ingleton and Bentham your proposal means that people won't choose Settle College but go for QES in Cumbria not because they want to but because it is nearer and therefore is eligible for free school transport. Settle College will reduce in numbers and fall into demise - so many primary schools in North Craven area have had to close due to falling pupil numbers. How can we keep Settle College alive and thriving? -by offering parents a choice . A choice not based on whether they get a free bus to school during these financially difficult times but a choice based on what's best for their children and their needs. Settle College has a great sense of community, offers a good range of opportunities and needs supporting as a North Yorkshire School. Okay so some parents will choose QES in Cumbria over Settle College but it is their choice. The distances travelled and time taken to get to either schools are very similar it would be ridiculous to make QES in Cumbria an oversubscribed mega school whilst forcing the decline of a very good North Yorkshire high school. Don't apply town and city rules of 'nearest' school to an area so close to other counties. We live in a rural area and this needs to be taken into account . We pay council tax to North Yorkshire for services in our county not the neighbouring one.

I have just attended a meeting which showed the planned proposal for school transport would effect the area more than I originally thought. The owner of the coach company providing the transport service to both high schools in the area confirmed that it costs the same amount of money to transport children to high school in either direction with one being in a different county so even though the school in a different county is closer it will not make a difference to the financial aspect of the proposal which is what North Yorkshire is intending. Yet many families will be impacted with this change. We have (Redacted) at a school in our local area which is North Yorkshire and we will then have to send our (Redacted) children to a school in Cumbria which we personally see as a school with only numbers and grades as their main purpose. When the North Yorkshire school sees pupils as people and aim to find ways of them personally developing and finding themselves in a safe community so in short I see it as doing this to our rural community a huge strain on the wellbeing of students having to attend a non preferred school. It will also effect the wider community as the different council have different school holidays meaning work loads of parents during different school holidays will be greatly troubled. For us personally with our jobs it will then put a strain on other aspects of expenditure for the council as I, along with the majority of the company I work for, have the capability to provide myself for work in health and social care during school hours. If this is done and my children along with all my colleagues families in the same position are put in this situation it will put a bigger strain on the already struggling budget to provide these services. Then childcare needs from the government will be forced to pay more. Other businesses in the area will have a drop in staffing for the same reason too. Making the ongoing effect on the finances of the whole area a disruption. We are a community where generations of families have all attended the same high school yet this generation is going to be split. What then happens when the intake at the North Yorkshire school is so low that it can not stay open and children from the area then have to travel over an hour to get to their closest high school. The costs for this will be even higher. A child living close to that school would then be left to travel a greater distance to a school. Rural communities are put to the side constantly and we don't get the respect deserved. The council have taken away our local police. They are not paying attention to the struggles of local doctors surgeries. The roads are more holes than road. Public bins overflow and public toilets becoming non-existent. Yet our council tax % is one of the highest in North Yorkshire as our recent bill has just stated we are paying the same for a band B as the rest of North Yorkshire will for band D yet despite this we can not send our children to the local high school because the school 2 counties away is 2 miles closer. This is ridiculous.

I attended the meeting in Ingleton today 21.03.24 which was very well attended by concerned parents, local bus companies, local school governors, local Headteachers and councillors. It was clear from the views in the room that this proposed change would have a very negative impact on a lot of rural families. My main points are; * the cost of providing a school bus for a child to QES from Ingleton/Bentham/Burton would be the same as sending them to Settle college therefore no saving is being made by the council in this rural area. People living in this area will be penalised to make savings for other areas of North Yorkshire, meaning we lose out again due to where we live. *parents could have siblings that may attend Settle college already and get free transport, they will now have to pay for their second child to attend the same school or choose free transport to QES and have siblings in two different schools. Cumbria and North Yorkshire have different term dates, this means having children off school at different times and means families have to pay for more childcare. *North Yorkshire will lose school places in their own North Yorkshire school by changing the policy to the nearest school as parents will choose QES (an academy school in Cumbria!) this then doesn't become a cost saving as you've lost potential pupils attending your own schools. *why should someone who pays council tax's and rates as a North Yorkshire resident not get free transport to a North Yorkshire school. *Settle college is a much smaller school than QES and would suit my child much better than QES, I don't see

why I should have that free transport right taken away when Settle would be more suitable for his mental health and wellbeing. I suggest that an amendment is made and rural areas are considered separately to urban areas as there is a big difference between the two. Thank you

I just think the proposed policy for the nearest school will just not work for our area! We are one of the most rural communities who don't even have mobile phone signal when at home or even for the journey you are proposing to send our children over! Here where we live you are saying the nearest school, well for us it would be going over to a neighbouring county. This would mean going over the most dangerous roads and for a bus or even a car at that matter, I think there could end up been devastating outcomes whether it be full of school children or just the driver!! The road at the moment is starting to subside in places and this is even before you start sending over more traffic! With the subsidence comes very high drops off the side of the carriage way, this then drops onto open moorland running down to a beck in the bottom on the valley! I would hate to think that a bus had to stop to let traffic past in some of these places and it would get stuck! With no mobile phones signal for a matter of 6 miles is just absolutely crazy! We then come onto the winter period! For a lot of people winter doesn't affect them in the way it affects us! Normally when it can be even raining 4 miles down the road, you starting travelling further west and start to realise very quickly that it is starting to snow very heavy and the road start to become very challenging! Our farm sits at 1200ft which is high enough for all the snow fall when forecasted and given that you have to climb to 1740ft to reach the summit of the road, and this is before you drop down a rather steep hill in the Cumbrian border! From the Cumbrian border this road does not get gritted what so ever! Over the years they have lost several gritter over the edge of the barrier and into the grassland below due to the severity of the gradient! Because of this, when us a community ask for the hill to gritted due to having to get to vets, garage etc. The council have told us that that the hill is not deemed safe! And yet you're trying to send my children over this road! Also another example could be the children have got to the neighbouring council school ok at 9am but by 12pm the weather takes a sudden turn for the worse, the bus sets off back and gets stuck! There is no mobile phone signal to contact anyone , some as young as 11 year olds are on that bus absolutely petrified what impact is this going to have on the children, they'll never want to go to school again! You then probably say right we will find an alternative route! So this would be going up to scotch corner and accessing the A66, this is a 67 miles journey would take easily 1 hour 30 minutes! In this journey you are passing our 'catchment' school! This new route certainly for our area will not save any amount of money! There is already 2 buses running to a locals schools and yet you're wanting to add and extra bus to the journey to go the opposite direction! Crazy!! You talk a lot about safe travel when walking to school, surely there could be a change int he policy in stating if the transport provided whether is be bus/taxi/car is not safe to travel you then go to your catchment school! At one of the meetings you were saying about if transport wouldn't take the tender due to the road parents would then have to take the responsibility in getting the children to school, you still face the same challenges in getting there in a car! But also parents in the community work, how is this going to affect families if they have to leave their job purely to take children to school, they won't be able to put food on tables or even purchase the school uniform which is needed! They also work in the opposite direction due to knowing they don't have access over this road in many months of the year! Please please please could you consider making an exception for the swaledale community within the policy for us due to these points listed above!

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers on roll and therefore risk the schools' future viability. The transport cost savings would be negligible in this area because the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. The proposed change is of huge concern to our community and to parents, not just because families will no longer have a choice for where their child is educated, but because of the potential impact on the College caused by such a drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the effect this decline will have on the local area. The line drawn between Settle College and Cumbria's QES places the Ingleton and Bentham cohorts clearly under the "ownership" of QES, when roughly half the students from these towns choose Settle College currently. Whilst QES can absorb these whilst shedding numbers from their Morecambe side, Settle College will only lose. The change feels like closure of this community school by stealth, because it has not been made clear to parents that the change will have such an impact on Settle College it will inevitably decline, becoming vulnerable to closure. Unless all catchment parents are made aware of the North Craven/border impacts, they will be unaware of the risk to the school and therefore unlikely to object to the change during this consultation purely due to unsuspecting ignorance. In this way North Yorkshire Council are effectively concealing / fudging the issue. Indeed I am not convinced NYC even understand, since Settle College's Headteacher himself had to point out the glaring errors in their data, which has resulted in a hastily republished dataset and extension to the consultation period. Our own councillor David Staveley in conversation was unaware of the potential impact on Settle College, another illustration of this issue not being understood locally even by the council itself. Being largely a rural county we expect North Yorkshire Council to protect the interests of rural people, who by the nature of where they live and the outcome of this change will have all choice removed as to which local school their child attends. The town of Settle risks further degeneration into a ghetto of holiday homes and retirement properties, with young families driven away. Settle College is a small rural community school which is lauded for its excellent pastoral care for children from the rural community; many parents choose it for this reason as other schools are felt to be too big or too urban. It is so disappointing that the council are considering sacrificing this investment in sustaining the rural character of the children of the county. The council have a responsibility to be transparent to parents about the long-term effects of this change if they intend to pursue it. However, it is the strong hope of parents, staff and governors of Settle College that the Council, having been misled by the erroneous data first provided to it by its own data team, will now realise the risks, listen to our concerns, and take steps to adjust the home-to-school transport policy to protect children in this area by maintaining home-to-school transport for all students in our catchment should they wish to attend Settle College.

As a school in rural area that is fed by small local schools the number of students from the wider North Yorkshire area has a positive impact on my child's experience of Settle College in a personal and pastoral capacity and in the range of subjects and extra curricular activities. Removal of school transport will reduce student numbers which will have a negative impact on the school and in businesses and groups in the Settle area. The area is already challenged with the risk to the swimming pool and Victoria Hall, village schools closing and the cost of family homes, and the number of retirees that move to the area. The impact to Settle College and risk to school provisions will further deter people from moving to the area and local services will suffer.

It would be detrimental to the local area not just in terms of the schools, pupils, parents and staff but to the wider community. It would be the beginning of a knock on effect of decline to standards of education, decline for business, jobs and economy. Another blow to the rural communities who already struggle with disadvantages of rural poverty. Schools are hugely important, taking away choices of education impacts communities negatively. Loss of local schools in recent years has already proved this. 'Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.' I would urge all involved to seriously consider the impact of the proposed changes especially to Settle as it does not fit into the general demographic of your facts and figures. Throughout this valley the negative impact of changes to schools, transport decisions and loss of schools has been of significant and detrimental impact.

After speaking to a friend from a neighbouring village it comes to my attention that the transport to the school beyond the county boundaries has no space on the current school busses provided for the intake of septembers new students. This means that if more children from the area are to attend the school 2 miles further than the preferred school in north yorkshire this will cost north yorkshire more overall as they still have to provide transport for more children to attend the school out of the county along with the school within the county which coaches are also full. Even if there is no further intake for the north yorkshire school thus transport will still need to be provided. And the company that provide this service will still be providing the service to pupils attending the north yorkshire school which leaves from the village that is no longer eligable for the service for children that live in this village. This makes no sense financially to run extra transport for children to attend a school they and their families dont want them to attend in a different county. This is indeed putting a bigger financial burden on north yorkshire to provide the service in our area. So not only will it upset the local children families and ability for them to go to the school that previously was not even a question to do so. It will not generate the financial resources to make this a reasonable proposition. The owner of the coach company even agreed that going to either school is financially the same even though it is further to the school in north yorkshire the school route to collect children is more direct so they end up doing the same miles. This really needs cocideration not just because of this financial non viability but because of the mental health of our children. Many children have support from sibilings at the school they are. How can all children from 1 family go to same school without having to transfer children already at secondry school? Ourselves have to concider this option yet we dont want to transfer our older child for the benefi of our younger children we nay have to yet we will still feel QES is not the school fitting for any of our children. School bus for both depart from the opposite side of main road it makes no sense in any way. Is this how north yorkshire want to make a generation of children not have any trust in their council? Is it because we are a little village that can be bullied? How can this be justified in any way? It is upsetting not just children and parents now but for the future. And many in any generation of the community are outraged for this to be even suggested for our rural area.

If transport is no longer provided to schools within catchment, rural schools such as Settle College will suffer from huge drops in pupil numbers, which will have a devastating impact on the local community. Also, whoever decided that an 8 year old child can walk 3 miles to school and back each day has never tried it. My children walked 1.8 miles to school and back from 5 years old, in rain or shine. They are now at secondary school and still walk. Obviously this is fine, they are a suitable age for this. We had no car, and in rural North Yorkshire, there are no buses! Ridiculously, there are 3 buses a day here. The first one arrives in Settle at 9.50am, and the last one leaves Settle at 2.40pm. Why wouldn't you just change the times slightly to allow for school (and work!) commuting?? It isn't cost that stops families like mine using buses to get to school. It is the fact there are no buses to school!!! You can't remove school buses, you don't even run public buses! It's an absolute disgrace.

A blanket policy for a huge area such as NYCC just will not work for rural communities on county lines. Settle College will struggle and leave the older children and their families with the potential of the school closing. QES is too big for a lot of children leaving a rural primary school. They do not know each child or care. They are just a source of funding. There would be no cost saving to NYCC to send children out of county, and in fact could potentially cost more. Loss of tax money paid to NYCC would go to Cumbria, to a school which is already oversubscribed. Choice of school is being taken away, as a lot of parents will have to send their child to a school that they don't want to as they can't afford school transport. You could end up with older siblings at Settle and younger siblings at QES. Different term dates, extra stress and cost for parents to find (expensive) child care. Increased risk of unauthorised absence trying to accommodate holidays out of term time across two different sets of holidays.

As usual this policy will affect the forgotten rural west of this county and have a significant impact on the viability of our local secondary schools future. It feels like a tactic to eventually force the closure of smaller schools as they will struggle to maintain student numbers. Many local primary schools have been lost over recent years, don't let this happen to secondaries as well. Constantly cutting services, but council tax only ever goes up!

Children of Gunnerside Estate's employees, residing in Upper Swaledale will face difficulty attending their closest secondary school due to adverse winter weather conditions in this area and the road conditions on these higher levels. The route to Kirkby Stephen (350m above sea level) would certainly not be a reasonable route to school. It is unlikely a suitable bus company would tender for the work and the alternative diversion is 50+ miles. The second option for these children would be Wensleydale School. Again, the travel routes would be difficult in the winter months, hence, this explains why the greater majority of children attending Reeth and Gunnerside School have historically chosen Richmond School as their first choice for secondary education (priority one gritting route down Swaledale). The Estate are concerned that a change in the policy will adversely affect their ability to retain and recruit good employees. Education for families is an extremely important factor and one that they will consider when looking at a career choice. In addition, if transport to school for children of existing employees is not suitable, there is the risk that these employees will miss valuable work time when they have no choice but to collect their stranded children. This can be for a period of 4 months + during a hard winter. Equally, we do not believe implementing the change for this area will save the Council's funding, as additional bus routes will be required rather than economising the system. Living, working and being an employer in this rural area already involves many challenges and expenses. Please consider this change carefully before adding to these challenges.

In my understanding, the 'nearest suitable school' criteria would be very problematic for secondary school children in the rural areas surrounding Skipton but who may be nearer to a different school. The grammar school system in Skipton but not, for example, Settle means that a child living in Malhamdale could be attending his or her catchment school in Skipton such as Ermysted's or Skipton Girls High, but could lose eligibility to this catchment school as Settle High is closer. This in principle would be understandable if the school systems operated were the same, but because the grammar school system in Skipton sits alongside the comprehensive system in other local towns, the school offering cannot be considered like for like. This is therefore a big penalty on the students who attend their local, in catchment grammar school who will have their transport taken away from them

It is ridiculous that your catchment school is not the one to which you provide free transport. Home choices may well have been made on the basis of catchment schools! If we are in a selective school system how can we possibly send one child to the selective school and one to the catchment school that won't necessarily be the nearest school. Rural areas are significantly affected by the suggested changes.

We live in a rural area sometimes the catchment school is further away. All transport to the catchment school should be provided as it has been for years. All the little villages have to have a school to send their children too. This would ruin the whole "dales schools" if you don't provide it and provide to the closest one with places. Upper wharfedale school would be heavily affected by these changes. I do not agree with it at all.

"Difficult to predict with any certainty" the cost saving of transporting to the nearest school. The difference in mileage from the catchment school of Settle and the nearest school of QES to Ingleton or Bentham is very small. N. Yorkshire residents pay Council Tax to N. Yorkshire for schooling. I fear a dreadful impact on Settle if this is implemented. My grandson starts there in September, with other grandchildren due to follow in (Redacted). Will the range of courses on offer diminish? Will teachers lose their jobs? If anything, the new policy should state that transport should be provided to their nearest NY school, rather than to any out of county one. Has the impact on numbers for Settle been looked at? If this policy goes ahead, as the cohorts provided with transport to Settle each year reduce over the next 6 to 8 years, will extra buses be needed to transport to QES? And if QES is full, transport will still be needed to Settle, saving no money at all? Parental choice is the deciding factor now, but in future will friends be split up just because one school is full? As a general policy I agree that transport should be to the nearest school, but in this rural area I believe most strongly that an exception should be made. I would like to know about the other side of Settle catchment. Will children now have to go to Skipton instead of coming up to Settle? How will these numbers impact the school? There is a lot that needs thinking about in this very rural part of North Yorkshire. Please think about it carefully Maybe this area needs to be an exception and have its own rules. Do you really want the impact this could have on one of your own schools, Settle, to be disastrous? I'm sure just this consultation will make parents think that they should opt for QES for 2025, even if they had not planned to. There will need to be a positive campaign for Settle to overcome this uncertainty. Thank you.

We live in a rural area and the difference between our schools (only 2 in our area) is 3 miles and 3 mins drive. The closest is in a different county and council remit. The further is in the same county and council remit. Our children attend the further due to having family in that area that can help out if needed. If we are forced to use the closer school we would lose that help and in turn would affect our working lives. This policy change does not take into consideration the bigger picture of people's lives and the impacts it may cause.

This policy consultation was discussed at length at a recent Mickleby Parish Council meeting. The parish council has significant concerns about the implications of the proposed changes for families in our area. The implications of this policy seem to us to discriminate against families living in rural areas and the ability they have to choose a school for their children. Families in our local town (Whitby) have a choice of 4 primary schools, 3 of which are in easy walking distance of each other. Families living in our rural parish on the other hand, which lies between two primary schools, have a choice which is already very limited. The proposed changes to this policy will limit that choice further by designating one school as the closest and therefore the only one to which free home school transport will be funded. Whilst parents with the financial capacity to do so may decide to pay for transport to their preferred school or may have the capacity to drive their children to school, lower income families and families without access to their own transport will be unfairly disadvantaged. Our parish council has similar concerns as regards the removal of support for low income families to send their children to a faith school of their choice. We would ask North Yorkshire Council to reconsider these aspects of the proposed policy changes given the adverse effect they will have on rural families and in particular on low income families in our villages. It is clear that the main driver behind the proposed changes is financial. Whilst we fully understand the constraints that local government finds itself under, we feel strongly that it should not be low income rural families who bear the brunt of the proposed cuts to the service. North Yorkshire is a largely rural county and the costs of home school transport are therefore bound to be high. The current national government is very keen to promote the importance of freedom of choice as regards schooling, it should therefore be providing funds to ensure that rural communities have at least some choice as to where they educate their young people.

I think there should be more flexibility about which school is eligible for the provision of free school transport. Giving free school transport assessed strictly by it being the nearest school is not necessarily going to be in the best interests of the children, the schools in the area or in some cases even the best financial option to save money for the council. My 2 grandchildren live in Bentham and go to Settle college. The other school in the catchment area is Q.E.S. Settle College is slightly further away than Q.E.S but it is the school of choice for most families who have lived in the area for generations. It is in North Yorkshire whilst Q.E.S is in Cumbria. From observation it appears to me that the parents who choose Q.E.S. have mainly come to Bentham from other areas and are usually more wealthy than the local families therefore they could afford to pay the bus fare. Bentham has no public bus service to Settle. The school bus would have to keep running for the children who were eligible to go there because of Special Educational Needs ETC but there would be a lot of empty seats and I don't see how that would save the council money. Settle College is an absolutely essential school for what is a largely rural area, 75% of students at the school need home to school transport. The excellent headmaster is worried that if the policy is implemented in its present form it would mean a decline in numbers for what is already a relatively small school and ultimately a question about the future of the school. In my opinion this would be a tragedy for the whole area. The school in recent years has provided excellent educational opportunities for all its pupils. It caters for all the education and care needs for its pupils by getting to know each child individually and helping them reach their full potential. My main point is that every area is different and has different needs so a policy that is not flexible enough to meet the education needs of the area could be disastrous.

My child attends a primary school in North Yorkshire, which is where we live. If your proposal was to go ahead, my child would have to attend a school in Cumbria. This school is far too big for my child who has SEND needs (which are not recognised through an EHCP) meaning he would find secondary school incredibly difficult. Living in a rural area should not mean we only have one choice of school to go to, particularly when that school is not even in our county. It is wrong that choice is being taken away. My two nearest schools, which are very similar in distance, are very different schools. My child and I should have a choice giving him the best chance at a positive education.

I have no issue with the general context of the proposed changes, however it is clear that the blanket policy highlights the complete lack of understanding NYC has of the region it proports to represent. Even on this form Question 2 assumes we live in large towns, I had to select Hawes but I live in Thwaite on the other side of the Buttertubs; this example is really at the crux of the issue. I hate to be the one to inform you, North Yorkshire is not flat terrain, it has mountain passes, which are winding, poorly maintained and untreated in winter. Our village is geographically nearer to Kirkby Stephens, however we rarely drive there. Why is that? Well is anyone in the council offices stepped outside the towns and cities you would know the B6270 is not a road to be taken lightly. Bikers choose to ride it in summer because it is challenging, yet the proposal would end with a coach travelling this road in the depths of winter. If you wandered down your corridors and discussed this route with your road maintenance teams, at the very least they would raise an eyebrow at the suggestion. It is abhorrent to me that the council would seriously suggest playing with the life and wellbeing of the Upper Dales children by bussing them along this road. Ask a farmer or game keeper how safe this route is in winter. The route goes well above the snow line, and it's not just snow but ice. When people are reluctant to take land rovers over there an "out of touch" transport department feels its fine to take a coach full of children across there. At best I can assume the council is poorly informed, at worse this is a council actively seeking ways to persecute those would chose to live in rural areas. I want to put the council on notice that should the policy proceed and the route be enforced on Upper Dales families, should there be any incident which causes harm (mental or physical) to our children, legal action will be taken. It will be easy to show that the council was fully aware of the risk, it knowingly failed to ensure the safety of the children and was thus negligent in it's duty of care.

We live in such a rural area. With only two secondary schools with are very much different one being very big with thousands of pupils and the other not as big but more country pupils. It will be a huge impact on where I send my two children too for secondary school. As the nearest isn't the right school and it will cut the numbers down on your North Yorkshire school as the other school is in Cumbria (but as you say it doesn't matter about county's) but you would rather support a Cumbria school then a North Yorkshire one!!! I think the new proposed home to school policy is not the right action to take. You need to rethink about saving money else where!! You need to support your North Yorkshire secondary school.

Ability / option for children under the 3 mile limit to be able to access transport for a fare / pay as not always suitable access specially in rural areas to walk safely home

It's important that children in rural settings are transported to school

The proposals to only provide transport support for the nearest school significantly disadvantages children living in outlying villages. It also takes away any element of school choice for families. I want to be Ble to make decisions on what is best for my child, not what we can afford to do. If you live witjin the xatchment area you should be entitled to free school transport to any catchment school if you are unable to walk there. I strongly oppose this proposal

Our child does not go to our catchment school. We were fortunate to choose the right school for our child, and to pay for the school organised bus, therefore catchment and eligibility for transport did not come into our decision making. However, having lived in the northern dales previously, this may have a detrimental impact for the rural communities many of whom may not be able to afford to pay for the transport, to enable them to have a choice in schools. Officers and councillors should look at whether the detrimental impact for these people with protected characteristics need to be revised before pushing ahead with the removal of catchment. The policy change could adversely impact on rural schools and their finances and sustainability. Therefore urge officers and councillors to minimise the adverse impact to those impacted rather than just push ahead with the policy and budget savings. As both of us parents have benefitted from eligibility to transport for our secondary schools when we were children, to go to a good school, and whose parents could not have afforded the buses if we had not been, we are keen that this should not reduce those who are less fortunate from having the choice to attend a good school.

The policy is very inaccessible and wordy. Make short crib sheets for specific populations eg children with medical needs. Make videos rather than documents. School Transport is so critical in a rural area, we absolutely rely on it but it is scary when it is unreliable or only taxis.

I think it is wildly unfair, in a rural area, to take away the choice of pupils to attend a school which they lie in catchment for, purely because they cannot get free transport. Here that is removing all choice of attending the school they want to - it will split friends up, it could destroy smaller schools.

This scheme does not work in remote areas such as North Yorkshire. Our choice of school is based on accessibility for both parents around work commitments and resources only available with the schools area, rather than geographically. We also wish for our children to receive the best education and will opt for a school based on this. By limiting school choice for parent's who cannot afford transport to the better local educational centres will simply result in pockets of reduced educational outcomes, poorer futures wages and increased reliability on government handouts. It's also possibly that remote schools will also be forced to close as they will be undersubscribed and won't receive the funding to retain staff and could result in closures. The move also doesn't support the government's move towards eco friendly choices and it will force more drivers to go on extra journeys to keep their children in the schools they desire for their best outcomes

Would Settle college survive based on the catchment area. In a rural location, it is vital that our local children are not forced to travel long distances.

If lived in a built up area with better transport such as keighley, harrogate, Lancaster transport would not be an issue however because of lack of regular public transport. Transport is needed for rural areas. Parents / child should have option to choose school within in reasonable distance to where they live.

I would like to be eligible for help for home to school travel for my three young children that all attend primary school together. We live very rural life and it's a shame that we don't get any help with transport because the school we haven't taken them too is supposed to be closer even though as the crow flies our school is nearest.

The very rural locations in the county have been ignored when making some proposals. This is exactly why we wanted to keep our own counsels.

The policy has clearly been designed with urban schools in mind and does not adequately consider or provide for rural locations where there is limited choice of schools.

I think that the wider financial implications of the proposal to make it nearest suitable school, including out of county, have not been thought out. You will lose hundreds of rural children around the borders of the county to other authorities because parents literally cannot afford the transport costs for the longer than average journeys to school in North Yorkshire. Also not to mention the then lack of funding in NY schools due to lower pupil numbers and then NY having to pay other counties school fees. It makes no sense at all. My children attend Caedmon, our catchment school for decades on free transport on a bus. How are pupil numbers affecting the operation of that bus....be it 10 or 30 children the bus would still run so how does it save money preventing them travelling for free? Also their closest suitable school would be out of county in Guisborough or Brotton.....i live in North Yorkshire and want my children educated where i live in the county they are growing up in, where i pay my council tax etc. As education is compulsory i find it abhorrent to expect any parent to pay for their child's transport to the nearest catchment school. What is very difficult to ascertain here and will be for many upcoming parents is when will they find out if they can get transport to Caedmon for free....after they've applied, before? Does this now mean year 5 pupils need to be looking at Cleveland schools as well as NY schools. How do they find out where they get free transport to. Is it a lottery each year? How can they plan both for their child and financially to account for potentially paying to send their child to their local school. Already Stokesley has lost all children in Astleton and Danby as the bus is no longer free, please do not do this to Caedmon/Whitby. I wish there had been more info provided to parents BEFORE the meetings so we realised we needed to attend to have the questions answered. In short i strongly oppose the abolition of free school transport on this plan. It is unclear, makes it impossible for parents to plan and make choices and no child should have to pay for transport to their catchment school!

It needs to account more for children on farms and hard to reach areas as they miss out on so much including decent transport provision

The proposed change of eligibility for school transport to remove catchment school from the criteria will have an absolutely devastating effect on my family, and on the communities of my village and surrounding area. We are a Dales community, with close links to our catchment school (Upper Wharfedale School), with most siblings and neighbours attending this school. Our children attend very small rural primaries across the Dales and spend time each week attending Upper Wharfedale School for swimming and sports lessons and events, gradually getting them used to this school and keeping a close connection with children and teachers. We are not an urban community and we do not have any links with schools or communities in Skipton, so to give us no choice but to send our children to a secondary school in Skipton, outside of our rural Dales community has come as a great shock and disappointment, and is contrary to every expectation of both families who have lived here for generations and for families who have moved here with the specific understanding that their children will be eligible to attend UWS. Owing to our rural location, we are 30 mins away from our catchment secondary school, so transporting children ourselves or paying for transport (should this become available), is out of reach for many of us. With this lack of consideration for rural communities, this proposed new policy completely disregards our needs, and may lead to families being forced to move away, and possibility even to the closure of rural schools. I feel that we are being unfairly treated

We live in (Redacted), North Yorkshire with one child getting home to school transport to (Redacted), and one child getting home to school transport to (Redacted) - both our catchment schools. With your proposed changes, my youngest will have (Redacted) as her nearest school when she leaves Tockwith. In our opinion, this is not such a good school as our current catchment senior schools (Redacted). Wetherby is in West Yorkshire and comes under Leeds Council. Who will provide home to school transport (Redacted) to Wetherby - anyone? If we opt to send our second child to (Redacted), does that mean we will have to take her - or will you still provide transport? Will we have to pay for that transport for our eldest child who is already at (Redacted)? None of the examples you gave in the document applied to our situation so it's difficult to understand. If you are prioritising transporting SEND children, will my children be able to use that transport? Have you considered all the additional cars on the road with extra parents having to drive their children to school? The proposed changes seem to be penalising those in rural areas.

Implementation of this amended policy will seriously impact the future viability of Settle College as a functioning secondary school by penalising children who live 'just beyond ' catchment area who may no longer be able to afford to attend. In addition, it will impact the social and mental well being of students in the area two fold, both in the opportunity to mix with people from a wider area and, if bullying occurs, the inability to move schools without financial cost to parents. I am angry that North Yorkshire council seems now very town/city centric, with seemingly little understanding as to how it is to live in the rural west of the county. There is currently only one school that children in the Settle area can attend, compared to a raft of choices in bigger towns and cities. If you go ahead with these changes, there may not even be one! If numbers attending Settle College reduce because parents who live 'just' out of area cannot afford to pay for transport, the funding given to the school will reduce accordingly. Due to the population density of young people in the area - perhaps because of a lack of affordable housing - the number of children within catchment area is already quite low and so schools like our local school rely on additional students on the boundaries of catchment enhancing the numbers and social diversity in the school. In the past 15 years, North Yorkshire council have closed 3 primary schools within a 5 mile radius of Settle. By implementing the proposed changes to the transport policy, you are now putting our secondary school at risk, by effectively 'shutting out' children from north Ingleton and towards Skipton (e.g. the villages near Gargrave) whose parents cannot afford to pay for transport, and clearly have not considered how our childrens' well being will be affected if their local school has to close. In addition, if children who effectively live just within catchment area for Kirkby Lonsdale and Skipton schools (who currently attend Settle College) had to attend their catchment schools, are there places available for them now?

We are in the catchment for two schools, the closest one is much bigger and popular. The second school is smaller and 3 miles further away. I assume thought has been put into determining valid catchment areas, and that there is a reason it was deemed reasonable for us to want to attend the smaller school. I think it is important for the travel policy to consider the alternative transport options in rural areas. There is NO suitable public transport option to school 2 therefore all families wishing to attend that school would need to drive cars individually which will significantly add to the carbon footprint load in the area. It would also increase traffic around the school. When driving past other schools at start/end times there is significant illegal stopping of cars causing driving hazards and unsafe conditions for children. This change would put pressure on an already oversubscribed school (the closest) and penalize the smaller school. I think it is shortsighted not to consider the need for parents to work. Unemployed people may be able to accompany their children to school but they don't pay council tax, so surely it is financially beneficial to support working parents?

1)The right of choice is removed for parents. This affects the democratic right of every parent from whatever background, to seek out the best education and suitability of their child and will discriminate against those on low income or from deprived or ethnic backgrounds who may not be able to afford additional transport costs to their school of choice under the revised proposals. This will clearly discriminate against this section of society and the future of the children affected where the local school may not meet the necessary needs and requirements of the pupil. In restricting school/transport choice, should parents choose to still send their children to the preferred choice, then the likelihood of alternative transport choice i.e. taking their children to school in the car will be counter to the county policy of sustainable active transport and may adversely affect the net zero targets set by the state. 2)Not supportive to the rural schools. With the removal of the Middle school in Ingleton, Settle and special school in Netherside in 2012, the negative and detrimental effect on the local community is still being felt within the local communities. To implement this policy would see an adverse effect on a number of small local schools where this policy would destroy the school and adversely affect the local community. This could also have a detrimental effect on the larger local schools like QES in Kirkby Lonsdale and Settle College. 3) These proposed measures could have a counterproductive result, but no allowance or contingency has been made for this possibility. There is no allowance for the possibility for the nearest school being oversubscribed and children having to be bused out to other schools under the transport provision which the county would have to meet under its legal obligations. This would not then meet the projected figures given in the analysis. 4) Further where there have been open consultation days, these have been at times when the people who this is most relevant to have not been able to attend as they have been during working hours therefore actively disincentivising active participation with no after working hours consultation [5-30, 6-30 is not conducive with working parents] 5)Adverse effect on local companies, employment, and economy, particularly the transport operators. Should the tendering process look for shorter runs with reduced prices, it will become economically unviable for a number of local companies which will no longer be able to run the service, this in turn will lead to reduced competition, with reduced competition naturally lead to higher prices charged and the county could very well end up paying more for the same services due to reduced companies and submitted tenders. This situation benefits no one but the transport companies. 6)Adverse impact on the community. This sort of radical change to policy has a huge and subtle effect on the local communities, which generally to the detriment of the local community in lost facilities and services. 7)Adversely affect the mental wellbeing of the child. The restriction of a child's fundamental right to a good education at their chosen school can and does have a detrimental effect on the child's wellbeing and mental health and there are many well documented cases supporting this. The effect lasts a lifetime and can lead to depression, low esteem and in extreme cases, suicide. 8)Adversely affect the education of the child by sending them to an unsuitable school with long term effects

on the adult prospects, both personally, academically, professionally and for the country employment workforce as a whole 9) The data model summary - January 2024 [analysis] is poor in its analysis with only taking on sample day and clearly states that on another sample day, the results would be different, Projections are hypothetical with no sound financial basis. "In the scenario that every child attends their nearest school" is clearly a flawed assumption

I am shocked and devastated that NYCC are planning to remove the "catchment school" criteria from the Home to School Travel Policy. I understand that the whole of NY needs to be planned for, but I believe that there is a total lack of understanding of the rural communities that have to use transport for their children to attend school, due to the number of farming communities that live in North Yorkshire and that to attend a local primary school require transport, particularly areas of the county that are close to the borders. My family live in rural Yorkshire close to the Lancashire and Cumbria border. My child currently attending the closest village primary school, but I was denied transport costs despite the travel to any of the surrounding village schools being unsafe for walking (down the A65 or outside the mileage limit for his age group) because I didn't send him to the catchment school which was nearly double the distance, so I am now very angry and confused as to why NY are now making such a fuss about their statutory requirement only being to transport to the nearest school. So based on this, I made the decision to send my child to the catchment school of Settle College this coming September. A school that my family have attended and supported for generations. My oldest child also attended, despite Settle College not being the closest school, because it was a NY school and because the alternative was Queen Elizabeth in Kirkby Lonsdale, and despite a significant number of his friends going across the border to QES. So based on transport I decided on Settle College again for my next child, to support North Yorkshire and Settle College, again despite a significant number of his friends decided on QES. Under this policy, Settle College is no longer the closest. Based on the proposed new policy, the choice to support a North Yorkshire school will now be taken away from us as parents for future children as our closest secondary school with places will now be a secondary school outside of NY. So in North Craven, this policy will effectively prevent our children who live and reside in NY from being able to attend a NY Secondary School. Why would we pay for transport to Settle when we can have a free bus to QES? I attended the meeting to hear how this was going to save NY money. In North Craven, I fail to understand how this will save you money. All our children require transport as we all live outside the mileage limit for secondary schools. NY have to pay for transport, but are going to have to pay for our children to attend a secondary school outside NY, so all funding from the government for school places will go to QES NOT Settle College to support and fund a Cumbrian school. Settle College will be affected immediately. Parents will accept the free transport to QES and chose to send their children to Cumbria instead of Settle College from the start of the intake 2025. Those parents who might consider supporting Settle College will be unlikely to put Settle College down as a choice if they think the school might be under threat of closure. DO NOT underestimate the impact of Settle College losing pupils from North Craven and the ripples it will have on future families making a decision for their children when they look at falling numbers at Settle College or a thriving QES. And should Settle College close, I believe the next closest secondary school will be in Lancashire, not even a Skipton School, so our children are still going to be transported out of NY at NY's cost with no school funding coming back into NY. I will be making a different decision if this policy is implemented and sending my child to QES because I believe this will be end of Settle College as it becomes financially unviable and I don't want my child's education disrupted. I pay council tax to North Yorkshire to include educational facilities, and will not be able to have my child educated at a NY secondary school. Appalling!

Due to the nature of catchments and the broader locality within which STAR operates, unless behavioural change means that parents/carers do not select schools on grounds of transport eligibility, I believe our STAR schools will probably see a net loss of students. This is particularly the case at secondary. This MAY have considerable impact on the quality and sufficiency (curriculum offer, SEND offer) of our educational offer. Tadcaster Grammar School is already under considerable risk from the CYC consultation. Tadcaster Grammar and Riverside are impact by the transport consultation (s) and this compounds the well known issues with housing in the town i.e. there is an aging population with little available housing and to maintain numbers on roll, we have needed some students to commute to their schools. The transport policy may jeopardise this and compound our situation. We recognise these changes are in line with changes to statutory transport and also that NYC need to mitigate costs, but at the same time, we are also concerned that in a rural county such a change has significant implications for social mobility. A student may live within the catchment of a strong school which their family wants them to attend but because of policy change may be forced to attend a closer school which doesn't meet their needs as well, due to a lack of means of transport. In this way, and especially within the High School environment, we will undoubtedly see some of those large Trusts which have the means to do so, deploy their own transport offer to compensate for the loss of one run by NYC, to the further detriment of maintained schools and smaller Trusts who cannot afford to run buses around their catchment to collect students.

It doesn't work in rural villages when distances might be comparable as the crow flies but the drive is not at all comparable

This change will have a severely detrimental effect on rural schools. If a school loses students because they are forced to go to a school slightly nearer their home rather than their own choice, the school is then at risk of falling rolls or even closure. That has a massive impact on communities. Rural communities are already struggling to survive as mixed vibrant communities due to retirees moving in, lack of jobs and housing, Airbnb's etc. Our neighbours, a precious family with young children say they would move if their children can't go to a local school. We've seen the impact of small primary schools closing and the impact would be worse for secondary schools. The council should be taking steps to keep our communities mixed age and vibrant and this would have the opposite effect. It is very short sighted and a false economy.

Settle Town Council are concerned by proposals given, having a potential impact on Settle College. As "close to boundary" will be disadvantaged by the proposal. It is not reasonable to transport North Yorkshire children out of the County for school. There is a worry that reduced student numbers will lead to reduced provision such as extra-curricular offering and pastoral support. Further concerns are there will be a knock on leading to further pupil reductions. Settle Town Council support Settle College's key role in the community. The proposals could damage this and have an impact on the whole community. Settle College is an integral part of the Settle community with pupils involved accessing a range of groups and participating in local & Council run events. A reduction in numbers and subsequently funding could have a serious impact. At worst case scenario, there is a serious concern over financial liability and closure.

I believe that the policy will split up the community in Swaledale. All children currently go to the same secondary school which provides a cohesiveness to the community which will disappear if pupils get dispersed amongst different schools. In addition, this is a highly rural area subject to wintery conditions and at the moment, the relatively low level route to Richmond is gritted while routes over the Stang and to Kirby Stephen in particular are single carriage roads which are not gritted in their entirety. Any savings in actual distance travelled will be negated by the poor roads and hilliness. I also anticipate a greater number of school days lost because of "snow days" I would also be interested to know how the need to provide a number of vehicles to travel to different locations as well as maintaining a bus to Richmond for a few years will save money? I have been unable to find sample costings for travel from various Swaledale villages. In addition, I cannot think that the policy will be in line with North Yorkshire Climate Change Policy 2025 to 2030 because it will encourage more vehicles and if parents wish to keep siblings at the same school, a need for parents to provide the travel support in private vehicles. Some of the schools will be outside of North Yorkshire and again it will result in pupils taking part in school activities out of their area which again will have an impact on the local community To conclude, I think that the policy will have a great impact on Swaledale children and while I appreciate that the school transport bill is the second largest outgoing of the council and that retaining a catchment school is not required, I am not convinced that there will be savings made because of the nature of the alternative routes.

I think you are trying to implement a procedure that serves an urban population in a rural area. Facilities at local schools have been put in place to manage a large number of students. Nearest school will NOT be able to withstand the amount of students with lack of facilities, teaches and space. This is going to massively implement there education. The system is broken with no common sense involved. I understand that travel is a large expense but subsidies with choice and facilities available at the core of the decision.

Living in a rural area, the nearest destination is often over a narrow minor road that is impassable in winter weather conditions. If the school bus has to take the safer major road that is passable through winter it would actually be closer to go to our current catchment school, there's about 2 miles difference. My concern is also that our nearest school might be available for one of my children but then not for another due to our closest being a small school, and we would end up with one child being transported and attending one school and the other not being accepted due to a larger year group intake and maybe having to get them to the catchment school with a different transport arrangement. This scenario would make life difficult for us as working parents for after school collection from after school classes ect. I strongly believe that the nearest/ catchment school needs to be looked at closer in our area due the road safety for transportation of children on buses or coaches. You need to be aware that bus transportation to our catchment school in this area would be the only sensible and much safer than to the nearest schools.

I understand that council costs are increasing and they need to save money but so is the cost of living for households with no pay increases. And considering the provision of education to children is fundamental, the proposed changes are going to have an impact for many children. Once again rural families are being penalised for living a greater distance from the current school provision. And it is ridiculous that children who live near the border of North Yorkshire be penalised and be made to go to another council school when historically they have always progressed to the catchment area in North Yorkshire. And should parents not be able to afford the cost of transport from these changes, how does the child access education as public transport through the rural villages is not regular enough to support transporting children to and from school. And how will some of these schools deal with increased traffic of potentially hundred more cars (at secondary school) dropping off and picking up as there are all ready such high traffic areas and with additional vehicles it will increase the risk of accidents to both vehicles and pedestrians . I do not support this change of to transport provision to the nearest school only no made which local authority. Surely as a County we should be encouraging people into the area not pushing them to other local authorities.

The proposed changes are going to mean that families will have children in school in more than more than one local authority. Not only would I need to be able to take children to different school, it would mean taking them to two different schools in opposite directions. Furthermore the different location authorities operate on different school holidays. It is already hard enough to cover childcare as holidays from work do not cover all holidays it would mean covering more school holidays. Of which living in rural area , there are already limited out of school/holidays clubs providing school age child care. Rural bus services are not regular enough or have many routes to facilities transport to the 'nearest' schools. Then the cost I'm assuming parents will be offered to pay for school bus service will be higher than families with multiple children can afford. Once again low/ middle class working families are penalised. This is going to impact and be detrimental to many children and their families changing it to the 'nearest' school no matter what the local authority.

I find this new idea of having to send your kids to the nearest school as the crow flies ridiculous and something that could only be thought up by a tory government which clearly thinks everyone is flying about in helicopters!! We would have to pay thousands to send our second child to the same school as her brother all in the hope of saving a few quid. This hole idea will also have a huge impact on our local schools. This idea may work within city's and suburban areas but out in the country which is where we are this idea is laughable.

The proposal is ridiculous. We live in (Redacted) which has ALWAYS fed into Richmond School, my eldest starts Richmond School in September 2024 so he is thankfully eligible for a funded bus but under the new rules my youngest who will start secondary school in 2027 would not. The new rules would mean he would be funded to go to Hummersknott which is in a different county and often has different school holidays! How are parents expected to work and cover mismatching school holidays?! Equally if you have them both wanting to be involved in after school clubs how are you expected to pick them up from different towns at the same time?! On top of that starting secondary school is a daunting time in a child's life this would be made far worse for kids who are separated from their elder siblings due to these changes. Anxiety amongst kids is at an all time high, so it does not make any sense to make this worse by splitting up siblings and primary school friends. The schools are set up to cope with the existing intake of children, for schools like Richmond School this change in transport rules could mean a drop in pupil numbers and therefore funding to the school which might limit the wonderful facilities and experiences it currently offers. There will be a bus going to Richmond from (Redacted) so why add extra expense by putting on an extra bus to Darlington?! Please, please reconsider this change to the policy with the move away from catchment areas and the impact it will have on a significant amount of families.

I feel that as I live in North Yorkshire I should be able to choose a school in this County. This proposed change will massively impact friendships as the year will be totally divided into different schools. There is no transport provision for any other school except Richmond currently for our school so this will need to be provided which would increase bus quantities in the areas. The catchment area is a far better system as you would always know which school you would be attending instead of worrying if there is enough room at the closest school. Holiday clubs and family time would be impacted as different schools have holidays at different times meaning holiday clubs may not be open when needed. Absolutely ridiculous idea that will massively impact families and the villages that we live. Some would move out of the area to ensure they are going to attend the school of their choice.

Your child should have free transport to their catchment school. A school in another LA quarter of a mile nearer is unlikely to offer them a place and will certainly not provide transport. Children have to go to school. We have a shockingly bad public transport system and families in rural areas are sick of being punished for living in rural areas.

Families who live in the North Yorkshire villages north of Richmond will, under the new criteria, only have transport to schools in County Durham and Darlington. These areas often have different school terms from North Yorkshire which makes juggling childcare immensely difficult when working in one area and children in different counties. Furthermore, children who have built relationships with peers in primary schools will no longer be able to depend on moving through school with a cohort who live in the same area. There is a vast difference between children living in a village in North Yorkshire and those living in urban Darlington. I believe children should be educated in their home county.

Education is supposed to be accessible to all and non discriminatory . What you are proposing leads me to believe the the following points: - you are still going to have to provide transport/funding to the majority of families that this impacts - you will now have to provide/fund transport to additional schools as given a large proportion of North Yorkshire is countryside there are no suitable footpaths accessible for children to safely access school and with more little primary school closing parents have to travel further and secondary school are all ready further in a central location - the council will have additional transport to arrange/fund as from our primary alone children would fall into two other local authority schools 'distance wise'. Although time wise it would be less still to access the current future secondary school in North Yorkshire. Therefore all you are trying to achieve is make yourselves the council more money, as you will charge us parents to access school transport that is currently free and that will still need to be provided. Which will be a large expense per year especially for 1+ children , discriminating against those low/middle class WORKING families, many of whom may already be struggling to afford basics such as food and uniform but who have morals and go to work rather than staying home and claiming benefits. How is this fair!! Why should parents have to pay for their children to access school. We are penalised for not living in the town of the schools, and completely discriminates against rural families.

The proposed plan makes for less choice for parents and will surely massively impact the number of children living up the dales choice – for those who may have been considering the Girls High School and/or Ermysted's in Skipton. As even thou in catchment for the school, it would then not be nearest school in most cases. It is also not clear whether there will be a guarantee of transport, whether free or paid for by parents - as there is mention of only being able to pay for spaces if there are some available. For example currently taxis are provided for rural students around us - under the new proposal it isn't clear whether that will be an option, regardless of whether paid for or free. The scheme to limit transport to closest school seems to be massively compromising the prospects of rural students, particularly those where budgets/money is a factor – thus penalising children based on family incomes not the child ability. It is making the Skipton school system elitist and unfair.

We are very concerned about the proposal to cease free transport to catchment schools. Approximately 90% of our Y6 pupils transition to Richmond School in Y7. If the new policy is implemented, no pupils from our school will receive free transport to Richmond School. Free transport will be provided to either Leyburn or Barnard Castle. Key issues with this include: 1. Safety and attendance. The main road from Reeth goes to Richmond. All other routes from Reeth (to Leyburn and Barnard Castle) go over high moorland tops (420m and 515m above sea level, respectively) that are often closed during winter due to snow and ice. These are minor roads, with associated safety implications. Pupil attendance will decrease if pupils attend these schools. 2. Community cohesion. We work closely with Richmond School to support pupils as they transition from our very small schools to their catchment secondary school. Our cohort size is usually less than 10 pupils, and these children benefit from going to secondary school together. Rural communities can become isolated, and this policy would exacerbate that problem. This policy seems to be at odds with the government's drive to support rural communities: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-launches-new-drive-to-support-rural-communities> 3. Financial implications for families. If parents decide to pay for transport to Richmond School (to attend their catchment school, to maximise safety and attendance, and to maintain links with peers), this would have significant cost implications for them. The financial impact of this policy is working against the drive to support rural communities: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-launches-new-drive-to-support-rural-communities> We think that the proposed policy would have a detrimental impact on families in our community. At the very least, special consideration and provision is needed for schools like ours, where attending the secondary catchment school makes the most sense.

We are very concerned about the proposal to cease free transport to catchment schools. Approximately 90% of our Y6 pupils transition to Richmond School in Y7. If the new policy is implemented, no pupils from our school will receive free transport to Richmond School. Free transport will be provided to either Leyburn or Barnard Castle. Key issues with this include: 1. Safety and attendance. The main road from Reeth goes to Richmond. All other routes from Reeth (to Leyburn and Barnard Castle) go over high moorland tops (420m and 515m above sea level, respectively) that are often closed during winter due to snow and ice. These are minor roads, with associated safety implications. Pupil attendance will decrease if pupils attend these schools. 2. Community cohesion. We work closely with Richmond School to support pupils as they transition from our very small schools to their catchment secondary school. Our cohort size is usually less than 10 pupils, and these children benefit from going to secondary school together. Rural communities can become isolated, and this policy would exacerbate that problem. This policy seems to be at odds with the government's drive to support rural communities: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-launches-new-drive-to-support-rural-communities> 3. Financial implications for families. If parents decide to pay for transport to Richmond School (to attend their catchment school, to maximise safety and attendance, and to maintain links with peers), this would have significant cost implications for them. The financial impact of this policy is working against the drive to support rural communities: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-launches-new-drive-to-support-rural-communities>

communities We think that the proposed policy would have a detrimental impact on families in our community. At the very least, special consideration and provision is needed for schools like ours, where attending the secondary catchment school makes the most sense.

Impact on education establishments that maybe over subscribed now finding more people feeling forced to apply to them because they are the nearest school. What happens when no space at nearest school? Ours is closer than the one in catchment. In a different county. My children love the school they are at. And it suits them. Skills, talents and interest. Which is why we chose it. We would not have got into the closer school as already a highly oversubscribed school by those in their catchment. Are you telling me that I would have no choice and then have to pay. The DfE policy re transport may work in an urban environment where schools can be very local including secondary. But in a county like North Yorkshire predominantly rural. It will put additional burden on: * Finances of parents that are already struggling if they want to send their child to their choice of school * May remove the choice of school for many in an attempt not to have the impact above * Low roll numbers on extremely good schools as parents choose based on cost rather than what is best for their child - this goes against policy of choice surely. This will lead to them being able to offer less due to less resources and impacts on children's education and opportunities. Not what education is about * Impact on other education teams - allocation team, school allocation appeals, school attendance teams, local transport businesses, senior management teams within school trying to manage budgets too let alone budgets in other council areas that will be impacted on. * Local communities and house prices. If those nearer school will yet again increase potentially beyond the means of many. Overall it will add additional stress when choosing a school for parents, impact on schools budget and the predictability of roll numbers. It also seems to contradict the DfE's policies. The impact on being able to get children into the school they are best suited for is being taken away. How does this set them up to succeed in school.? Along with potential impact on attendance as parents who would have relied on the free transport struggle to get their children to school. Feels like savings in one area that will impact long term on costs and increase them in another.

The proposed amendments to only provide transport to nearest rather than catchment places rural families at a significant financial disadvantage compared to their peers in towns. Families may be priced out of sending their children to their local, catchment schools as they will face a "tax" on living in a rural area in order to do so. I understand these are the statutory guidelines, but for an authority like North Yorkshire, with such a large number of rural communities, purely following the statutory guidelines does not best serve the residents. I understand the financial reasons the council has put forward for these proposed changes but it is concerning that the gap will have to be funded by rural families. The cost of an annual bus pass is significant and may be a barrier for some families who will be left with no option than to send their child to a different catchment school that doesn't best meet their needs or to a school out of the authority that they live in. Whichever decision a parent makes (whether to pay for the annual pass or send their child to a different school based solely on this policy) the resulting outcomes will negatively impact children.

I live in Ingleton and the proposed changes mean I will not get free transport to my child's preferred choice of secondary school which would be Settle college. It means that free transport will not be provided for a North Yorkshire resident to a North Yorkshire secondary school but instead an Academy school based in Cumbria. This just seems unfair and could cost parents £1000's in bus fees when we are North Yorkshire residents. For more rural areas there definitely needs to be a stipulation in the policy that children could have free transport to a North Yorkshire secondary school.

Children in Swaledale have historically and traditionally attended Richmond School for generations (and for good transport reasons) . The geography of the dale follows the flow of the river to Richmond at the bottom of the dale and interaction with communities 'over the tops' is limited. The hills that surround us contribute to these boundaries. The community cohesion of the "2 Dales" is currently very strong. The council's proposal to split the community is ill thought through to say the least. Practical issues such as transport in bad weather, when schools such as Leyburn, Kirkby Stephen and Banard Castle may remain open, vehicular access to them may not. There does not appear to be a policy for these circumstances i.e. who will monitor the road conditions and make a decision to cancel school transport or arrange emergency transport or alternative routes in conditions when the 'tops' are inaccessible but the schools are still open? Is there any data on the occasions that this happens? If so could we have access to this. If not then surely this should have been researched before the proposal was put together? For example It may be possible to get children from Hawes to Leyburn in challenging weather conditions but impossible for school buses to negotiate the higher roads across into Swaledale. Has an official alternative route been identified? If so could concerned parties please have details. If not could the ITP please recommend and publish these routes. Looking through various documents and proposed policies several sections stand out, too numerous to mention here but I feel further representation need to be made through channels such as the Parish Council. Is there enough time during the length of this consultation to facilitate this?

If the proposed change 'Amendment to the main eligibility criterion to be 'nearest school (with places available)' to match the statutory requirement' results in significant losses of pupils to any one school then what plan has North Yorkshire Council put in place that responds to:

- 1 Impact on school finances - at almost £6000 per secondary student then the loss of 20 students equates to a reduction in capitation to the school of £120,000. The salary of four teaching staff, 2 Impact on school staffing - a reduction in capitation restricts the ability of a school to retain its teaching staff. If redundancies are announced then this upsets many of the people working in the school and especially those directly affected by a redundancy situation. If this loss of students (as in 1 above) occurs year on year then after a five year cycle £600,000 is wiped off the school's budget - the equivalent of 20 teaching posts. If scenarios like this are predicted and the projections are correct then staff will decide to leave before they are asked to go. Some of the best staff will see little future in that establishment. The scope for promotion could be very limited and points awarded for responsibility may have to be reduced and that may have a further knock on effect re retention and responsibilities.
- 3 Impact on curriculum breadth - less staff, less pupils and the curriculum has to shrink. Less options are available to students in terms of GCSEs and the possibility could arise of schools losing their 6th Forms. Ofsted's desire for a broad and balanced curriculum would become an impossible aim for schools with declining numbers.
- 4 Impact on families - in particular: Dales Families who by tradition and desire send their children to Richmond School - parents already concerned about alternative transport routes. Some considering leaving their jobs and their homes to move to Richmond so that their children can attend the school of their choice. To survive, the Dales villages need young people. We cannot afford to lose them. The eligibility criterion to be nearest school would in effect put many children at increased risk as some of the higher dales roads that are often impassable in winter and even more so by bus would be used under the new proposal. Two examples to illustrate this point of view:
 - a) Children in upper Arkengarthdale attend Richmond School or Wensleydale School. The amendment would have them travel to Barnard Castle. The Stang road would be the direct route and with its hairpin bends and 1 in 4 hills it's a non starter for a normal school bus. In winter it can be impassable. (NB: This route is one mile shorter than the route to Richmond School). The only safe route would be via Richmond passing a few hundred yards from the school that most of those students would have gone to under the existing scheme.
 - b) Reeth to Wensleydale School - the direct route and shortest route is over Grinton Moor but this has a steep hairpin and narrow sections including a bridge with a weight limit that would be difficult for a school bus to negotiate and it would be out of bounds in snow and ice. The alternative would be a drive around Wathgill Camp. This road is narrow in places with difficult 'T' junctions and blind summits (NB: This slightly safer but less direct route is two miles shorter than the safer route to Richmond School).In summary: looking at the increased risks of travelling on high routes that are narrower and unsuitable for normal school buses and perilous in winter allied with the very short distances saved by the proposed changes - one mile and two miles - then it seems incredible that this proposal has come this far and has caused so much upset in the community that lives and works in Swaledale and in the main sends its children to Richmond.

I would strongly suggest you look at Ingleton and their relationship with Settle College. The proposals would mean no child in Ingleton (which is in Settle's catchment) could go to Settle College and they would all have to go to QES in Cumbria. This is quite ridiculous for children who live in North Yorkshire, who have gone to primary school in North Yorkshire (and are in catchment for a North Yorkshire School) and then be clearly most unwelcome in North Yorkshire. Forcing children to attend a different authority's school is disturbing: clearly this proposal is designed to limit intake to Settle College in a desire to close or force academisation. There are enough of us around that know of struggling local authorities and the thought of forcing children away from a local school is scandalous. North Yorkshire should be supporting its schools, not trying to close them. I have experience to question the motives of North Yorkshire in regards to schools and catchment areas - giving all of Clapham's catchment to Bentham, and making Thornton in Lonsdale a Bentham catchment area is just beyond any logic, apart from money grabbing from NY to support their flagship school in Bentham. I don't know if this will create issues in other areas, but we will be fighting this with everything we have for the children and families of Ingleton and the Settle College community. It is awful to see how their own local authority has so little respect for the school that they wish to force them to close - and this cannot stand.

Although it may be measured as the crow flies nearest school the roads and valleys make this a longer route (main roads tend to run east to west, west of the A1 and north to south east of the A1) also the quality of roads travelled minor roads for example are not passable in winter /or safe due to curbs in gritting roads in a timely manner to meet the school bus at designated stop. So for example if you live in a rural area with minor roads you have to set off earlier to get to the main road which may not have been gritted early enough to get to the designated school bus stop. All needs to weigh up as has knock on effect on school choice, practically.

Damage to local community/local Secondary school/parents would choose an out of catchment school (QES in Cumbria) as transport would be provided there and not Settle College, due to cost, this would seriously affect Settle College as QES is the nearest school to students in High Bentham, Burton and Ingleton. Due to cost of transport, students from these areas would not pay the additional cost, as it is an extra financial commitment for families during the cost of living crisis, and this cost would escalate if you had more than one child. The rurality of this area and the lack of effective transport links already affect this area and if this proposal goes ahead, this reduces the opportunities of our young people. I feel that there is a sense that NYC is forgetting about the communities on the borders of the country, but they are happy to ensure that they take these communities Council Tax, but offer less and less in terms of service. You should be supporting your local Schools not penalising them. They are the heart beat of the community. If this proposal goes ahead I fear for the future viability of Settle College as this will be compromised, and this would lead to more students from other smaller communities who use this secondary school having to travel further to seek secondary education. I strongly oppose this change as I feel that it will damage to opportunities for our Young people.

To introduce a policy which does not take into account local conditions is going to cause harm to poorer families who can no longer be involved with choosing a school for their children and also will have younger children sent to a different school from their older siblings. In this rural area over 70% of children rely on transport to school and in future these families will not have any choice of school. This policy can only reduce the level of involvement by parents in the school activities which is very damaging. The vast majority won't be able to choose the school their children go to and some will have children sent to different schools making really important after school activities impractical in many cases. In the specific case of Bentham, Ingleton and the surrounding area the result would be to move around 30 children per year from Settle College to QES Kirkby Lonsdale which over the next 5 year transition period would reduce the school roll at Settle by 150. Kirkby Lonsdale (a Cumbrian school) is already close to capacity (1172 pupils 1228 capacity). The effect on Settle College (a North Yorkshire school) would be devastating. It could lose over 25% of its pupils by the end of the 5 year transition period. This would need significant restructuring leading to redundancies over the transition period at significant cost. The Settle College 6th form would also be in jeopardy as the reduced pupil numbers will make it difficult to offer a full curriculum and to attract enough pupils to study A levels. If Settle loses its 6th form then the pupils will need transport to another school probably in Skipton which would increase costs rather than reduce them. Is there really a net cost saving by imposing this policy in rural areas like Settle? For the next 5 years buses will still need to go from Bentham to both Kirby Lonsdale and Settle and the number of buses required may increase initially as the existing buses to QES could be full before the first Settle bus is empty. After 5 years it may be possible to reduce the number of buses by one but if QES is unable to accept all the students from this area (as the numbers indicate) then the remainder will still need to go to Settle by bus so no saving. This questionable saving from year 6 onwards needs to be measured against the costs of restructuring Settle College and probably requiring more buses for 6th form pupils. I feel very strongly that before imposing a system, probably devised for the more urban areas of North Yorkshire, on rural areas like Settle a full analysis should be made of the realistic cost savings and also the cost of the damage to Settle College and the detrimental effect on our families. One solution may be to use the criterion of the nearest school in North Yorkshire in areas where there would be a detrimental effect on schools and families by using a school in a different county. (Incidentally Bentham to Settle College is 10.7 miles and Bentham to QES is 10.0 miles.)

I think the policy, in stating that you are now to be sent to your closest school is absolutely ridiculous!! I already have a child currently attending a school in NYCC with another one joining this year, I then have another 2 children to start 2 years later, in which this one would be in the policy!! How is this going to sensible in splitting up children and sending potentially 3 buses to our remote house as I will have a child at primary, secondary and another secondary (out of area as it's the closest!!) The road in which is in question is a very dangerous road for transport in which would be taking our children to school!! It sits at a height of 1740ft and does not get gritted!! I also heard that if no buses take for tender you would then give parents the funding?! Please can I ask how this is going to work when I work full time at the opposite direction of the school you would be proposing if this goes ahead?! The father of the children is a full time farmer so will not be able to commit to taking children to school! This policy seriously needs thinking about as it is going to have such a detrimental effect on our children in the future!

We live in north yorkshire and should be able to attend a school in north yorkshire in coming years. I currently have 2 children in primary school and this would negatively impact were my children attend in secondary school. I went to settle secondary school and believe that is the best for my children. Under new proposals it would have and impact to send them to a different county in Cumbria which is utterly desirable. This i strongly disagree with cross county school travel. Children on low income/send and other should still be eligible to free transport. All children deserve free transport to school. I am shocked that this policy is even up for debate and change. Upsetting parents and children alike. If you live in north yorkshire you should go to school in north yorkshire. Traditions of families go to the same school as their parents and beyond. This would also break that tradition because of cost. Disagree whole heartedly

I think reductions in funded travel is inappropriate. Comparisons with other local authority districts is not acceptable and exposes our children to the possibility of in equality in service provision when compared to children living in other areas. A larger local authority area is always going to need to fund travel for more pupils but to reduce that service so that it may affect their chosen school is not acceptable and increases the level of disparity between North Yorkshire and smaller local authorities/the south. This is just the type of service that something like the so called levelling up fund should be contributing to.

The consultation does not provide any impact assessment other than on financial savings to the council budget. Whilst this is important, I'd also like to see an assessment on traffic and pollution levels, as well as the knock-on impact on households negatively affected by these changes - particularly low-income and SEND households

(Redacted) a local woman myself lived her all my life. I want my children to attend richmond school . It is the obvious choice, it may not be the very closest school but it has the safest road to it. - leyburn school is already "over subscribed" and it does not provide the facilities that richmond can , this is a major factor for us. Kirkby Stephen has been mentioned, it's in a different county , over a horrendous road to get there . And changing counties will bring more and more changes to children. These small village schools have small year groups of children who stick together throughout , splitting them up and sending th to schools where they don't know anyone will benefit no one especially children who have been through enough already.

the policy should include that it wont create new routes, so where a route goes past an entitled property it will go to the most convenient school which may not always be the nearest.

While the council seems extremely focused on making financial savings, it seems to me that encouraging children to travel to school on free bus transport would be a benefit to the environment and deal with issues of traffic issues around schools, for example with parking. While I'm sure savings need making I fo wonder if the task of getting children to school should be as cheap and easy as possible for parents.

Sustainable Travel - Must include ensuring that all bus or taxi operators contracted for Home to School Travel are not travelling excessive miles from their home/business address to complete the home to school journey. Lowest financial bid must not be the only consideration. The air pollution of villages and towns and the environmental impact must be considered too. This would have a positive impact on the climate. For example:- At present many taxi operators from West Yorkshire are travelling over 52 miles a day to complete the Home to School journey as they were the lowest bid for schools within the Harrogate Area. No other factors are taken into account, such as air quality of the villages and towns that West Yorkshire taxis have to travel through to reach their first pick up and the impact on the climate these extra miles are having on the environment. There is no other reason why West Yorkshire taxis would be operating in the Harrogate Area other than for Home to School journeys as no one from the Harrogate Area would call a West Yorkshire taxi to take them to Harrogate Train Station, hospital appointment or the local supermarket. The council's current expenditure on travel could be reduced considerably simply by reviewing the current routes and cutting down on the number of taxi operators in a small area. At present there are 3 taxis picking 4 pupils up that all live on a 2 mile stretch of road that all attend the same school. 1 taxi operator could do this and save the council money which in turn would save certain services. The very recent review of transport arrangements of the Harrogate Area will have rectified this waste of tax payers money and reduced the carbon emissions for this area.

We live near a primary and secondary school where I know families go on different taxis to schools next door to each other! This is where money is being spent so ridiculous. In our rural area why not have one taxi/minibus come from the small villages and take to the different school rather than 2, 3, 4 taxis all picking up in the same village.

The change to the travel policy has been poorly communicated. We received an email prior to the consultation stating advising that we would likely lose the opportunity to pay for a place on the school bus. This is a mid year impact with no thought to the impact on us as working parents. Taking away the option to pay for a place on a school bus is disgraceful. The negative impact on the environment of pushing parents into using cars each day is significant. Again, as mentioned above how are parents expected to work when they have to take their children to school and back each day.

My sons bus route from (Redacted) to Skipton is about to be cancelled after 8th April. My eldest son is in year 10 and youngest son is only in year 8. That means for the next 5 years we will have to be driving him backwards and forwards 10 journeys a week. There is no option of a public bus in the mornings, it starts at 9am. In the rain, with heavy kit bags, expecting a young boy to walk along a 60 mph road is unreasonable. This is a significant problem in (Redacted). There are enough children who live in the village who attend the three Skipton schools who would access a school bus if it were available to fill a coach or more each day. Instead they are removing the existing small bus. If you put up the prices so the route could cover its cost, people would pay it. The whole system is fraught with inefficiencies as it is. There was never a date released about when to apply for the annual bus pass. It relied on people "just checking" the website daily. Again, there was no date given when you could get confirmation of a place or not. The entire system is not fit for purpose and makes family life more difficult than it needs to be. The environmental impact of stopping the school buses is shocking and with climate change issues so topical the council should make this a priority. The social impact also is important-it will affect my possible working hours as I now have to transport my children to school daily. It is hard to see how this is a good idea. I hope the members of the council who have power in this situation can reflect long and hard on the sense of these proposals. It feels like the removal of the bus services is anti-family, anti-child policy.

My child's nearest school wouldn't take our child because of their disability. That was our catchment school and the nearest. So we couldn't get the catchment free bus and now have to pay to go further away just because they are disabled. If you are planning on making this policy then schools need to accept all pupils in catchment regardless of ability or disability.

If you cannot access your nearest school you should not be forced to pay for transport to another.

I think it is completely wrong not to provide funded transport to the catchment school. This destabilises the school application system and makes it hugely stressful for families. Catchment areas aren't a family or community choice - they are set by councils. They enable links to be created between catchment secondary and local primary schools. Having most children from a village going to one secondary school makes it more efficient for transport provision - rather than the likely fragmentation if this policy comes into effect. For our village of Kirk Hammerton our catchment secondary is Boroughbridge High School. But this is the 5th nearest - 3 York schools and King James being nearer. It would make school choice hugely stressful for parents unless willing/able to pay. Our view is that school catchments MUST be reviewed alongside this policy. And/or agreements cross-LA boundaries. It can't be one without the others.

The provision of schools in this area is so woeful we don't have any choices. The examples in the appendix are clear but irrelevant and have clearly been copied from another council's website or written by someone who has little idea of the schooling provision in parts of North Yorkshire.

I think it is a positive step forward to all home to school transport to the nearest schools as it will help smaller schools rather than parents picking which school their children go to. Our main concern is the provision of post 16 home to school transport as our nearest school (Wensleydale School) has no provision so the nearest school is Richmond which is going to be difficult to get to with current transport provision

Routes with no streetlights should be deemed not acceptable access routes for children to walk

Children will be forced to attend a school which may not be in their best interests purely because parents cannot afford to send them to a more appropriate school. The nearest school is not always the best option for the child. School transport whether free or paid for is better for the environment. So many parents have to use their own cars to transport children as they have been refused even paid for transport. This is impacting the environment and creating traffic chaos at school pick up/drop off.

I feel it's a disgrace to assess SEN children for their transport - are our children not dealing with enough assessments and disadvantage without the possibility of fear of losing their transportation. Please take into consideration the ongoing stress and effects of being a parent/carer of SEN and the ongoing fight for provisions let alone transport for our children

This could be a serious issue for parents who have older siblings at secondary school as well as primary school and could result in fragmentation of families to different schools. This is clearly detrimental to families and children. Any child who would be eligible to attend a school due to an older sibling being in attendance should not be affected to reduce psychological and financial burden on children and families respectively

No

I hope that savings can also be shown to be made in the administration of this service. This would help remove the view that frontline services are being hit by budgetary constraints.

To go to Scarborough further education would cost hundreds whereas Redcar is a fiver a term and better choices very sad for North Yorkshire education x

At present 3 taxis pass our house with four kids in! If this is an example of the council's idea of sustainable travel something needs to change. The taxi which picks our daughter up is one of a considerable number of cars which have been hired from West Yorkshire, he is travelling around fifty five miles from his base to pick up two kids then takes them to school then travels all the way back to West Yorkshire again and he is one of several doing the same thing because apparently they are cheaper! Surely one local taxi or mini bus paid properly would be more environmentally friendly and have less impact on the air quality than half a dozen taxi drivers doing 150 miles plus a day to ferry a very small number of children to school. To add to that problem quite a few kids are not happy travelling with these drivers. Reasons given driving at high speeds whilst on phones pulling up at shops with kids in asking if they want to stop for sweets, West Yorkshire taxi drivers asking pupils for their phone numbers so they can let them know weather or not they'll be able to make pick up all seems very wrong to me! All this whilst undercutting local well known safe taxi drivers from right on our doorstep who pay their taxi license fees to NYCC, Then NYCC spend their license money hiring dangerous unreliable taxis from West Yorkshire. Please tell me where the common sense in that arrangement is

Clearer definition of training requirements. Transport staff should complete training on SEN and awareness around autism. Currently no transport my child has been on has completed any training and is a barrier to their understanding of my child's needs.

At the moment all the Swaledale children go to Richmond. I think the policy change could mean some go to Leyburn and some to Richmond, splitting them up for almost no gain as the difference in distance is very small.

I don't agree with the post 16 charges. Children have to access education until they are 18 so I don't see why we should have to pay for the last 2 years and the cost from our village (East Harlsey) to the school (a 10 minute journey) is astronomical. This is pushing 17 year olds onto the roads too soon and will cause accidents which could be avoided.

Commitments to work are made by parents on existing travel arrangements. Our child would not be able to attend school with these changes as proposed.

Please consider increasing the routes for paid transport to capture more children in outlying areas. Appreciate this may increase certain fees but I believe parents will consider paying and the council may get economies of scale, benefit SEND and other groups to use the paid bus services in conjunction; effectively a hybrid model.

As a parent whose child attended their catchment secondary school which was further away than their nearest school by quite some margin, I would like to have clarified as to what mileage calculation to the nearest school is used. A short note saying whether it is quickest road route or as the crow flies calculation would be useful.

Documentation is poor, with no guidance setting out comparison text, i.e. high lighted paragraphs that have changed between the two documents

Not all schools would be considered suitable by parents/carers if they are closer to home and have places available. The change to policy could deter and prevent some schools particularly in rural areas having an impact on accessibility to them. Also, it is not clear if the 2 miles walking distance criteria applies even if there are no suitable walking routes to the school from homes within the 2 miles criteria (e.g. no footway on the rural roads with limited visibility due to stone walls).

If a family wants to select a school based on religious belief, they should fund transportation. The duty is to provide education. In Ripon, places at Ripon Grammar School are fought for and we hear of people purchasing flats so that they have a Ripon address. The school should be primarily for Riponians and that is not assisted by free transport.

All schools should offer transport. Currently some use public buses. This means that school enrichment sessions are not inclusive which is really unfair. If my child were to attend enrichment they would not get home until after 6pm. They would set off for school at 7.15am this is far too long a day. School should offer a later school bus on enrichment days to transport from school. Currently pupils are expected to walk from school to Pickering then wait for a bus from the town. very very unhappy about this

If these changes will reduce the cost of free transport to school then I think they are a good idea. I am not happy to pay more tax to provide free transport for children because all my bills are increasing at the moment and I cannot afford to subsidise other people by paying more tax. It is not fair!

The document is difficult to read, and many people, will not be able to access the information. The document should be summarised and be able to be used easily and efficiently. This should be sent out to stakeholders such as parents, from the schools. This is a typical council document which is not easy to read.

Agree that the Council needs to look at this policy to save money

It would be beneficial to NYCC employees if consideration could be given to transport arrangements where their child needs to attend the school where they work at even if it is not the "nearest" school.

Savings should be made by making the bus service more smart and adaptable rather than making more people pay for it. Eg looking to combine bus routes for multiple schools, reducing vehicle size, extending routes, etc. Is there any monitoring system in place to see how many pupils get which buses to and from schools? Some days our children are the only ones on a large coach coming home, and if the patterns of use were analysed then these services could be scaled down accordingly.

The current funding for free school transport is unfair. We are over 9 miles from Richmond and yet have to pay in full for transport to SFX which is literally one minute from Richmond School, yet parents in our village receive free transport to Richmond School. When a child misses the Richmond School bus they catch a lift on the SFX bus which parents have to pay for but a Richmond School pupil can travel on for free! This is unfair to paying parents. If budgets are really tight, free bus places should only be offered to those with SEND disabilities and the rest should be means tested for parents who are really struggling. It is though difficult for parents who have to work and live in rural areas who face the most cost.

Whilst this does not affect us going forward as I understand those awarded before September 2024 are honored, this would affect many families. Our catchment school is Boroughbridge High, but our nearest school is King James. Had we applied for KJS there was a big risk we wouldn't get a place due to numbers, so we opted for BHS as our catchment school. You are asking families to choose between schools and transport. What is the most important factor? A family might not want their child to go to the nearest school for whatever reason, but if they cannot afford to pay for transport (ie aren't eligible for Pupil Premium etc), then they may be forced to send a child to their second or third choice school. You are potentially increasing the risk of children therefore not attending school, or being unhappy with the school they are in. You have completely removed the word 'catchment' from your new policy.

I don't think it is clear how it will impact a pupil attending a secondary education with normal needs who may be attending a closest school that falls outside the catchment area. They already attend the school of choice. Would they have a choice between paying for school transport or swapping schools? Or would they still be entitled to free transport? Or would the provision of buses be cancelled and only provided to the catchment school. Also, what happens after age 16.

They should let all pupils of same household on the transport instead of just one child even if it isn't the nearest catchment school

We pay for our school transport in our village like a number of other families but this service is now being taken away meaning all parents now have to travel into Skipton from Embsay having a detrimental effect on the environment and congestion in Skipton (already a significant problem). Had we decided to send our child to upper wharfedale or settle the bus would still be available but we are being discriminated against for choosing a school in our local catchment. The road is unsafe, no safe crossing places and it is not well lit so I would not feel comfortable with my child walking to and from school. A very disappointing decision that has penalised those parents that have chosen a school within their local catchment and we were paying for the bus anyway!!!!

These policies are not written for parents to understand, they are full of jargon. It also doesn't factor in children that have had no option but to travel elsewhere due to bullying. (Redacted) was bullied, reacted and left with no option but to have a managed move. We live in Northallerton and she goes to (Redacted) which by the way is an incredible school Maybe fix the bullying at Northallerton school and children wouldn't have to attend other schools away from the catchment area.

The whole idea that you are looking at cancelling transport for a number of people is shocking. I know many parents of SEND children who don't need the service but use it as it is free. I strongly suggest asking parents if the transport is first essential to them. If not remove that cost. Schools are suffering (high schools especially) as the cost of public transport has increased leaving parents no option with schools and do not send their children on the bus as it is. If anything the council should be offering solutions to all people involving transport for school aged children and getting to school.

Transport can be a big factor for families when choosing schools and it shouldn't become a barrier to the most appropriate education for a child which it could be going forward with the purposed changes

Children need to be in education till they are 18 so I feel transport should be provided till they finish the academy year of there 18th birthday

It is vital that the home to school transport remains.

Thank you for considering this. I appreciate the financial constraints the LA has and the enormous physical distances the LA covers for transport. I think ensuring pupils whatever their age, physical, educational or emotional needs are put first is vital and ensuring that they can have access to the school Place that offers them the best educational outcome is a priority, so providing a clear, inclusive transport policy is essential. We want our young people to have the best education possible and ensuring they have the right transportation to get them there is key. In particular the number of children with additional needs is growing and we need safe, robust and sympathetic transport systems to deliver this. I'm hoping the Authority is also liaising with healthcare professionals about their understanding of what is best for pupils transportation to ensure more vulnerable students are properly considered in terms of safeguarding and promoting good mental health outcomes.

I think all school transport should be free whilst all children are in education up until age 18 years. I also feel that you should have a right to choose which school to attend or your child attends even if it is out of your catchment area. I also think the bus service provided for children is sometimes not great not always on time which is not good when a child has to wait in the dark at 7.30 am to get the school bus. I feel more buses should be available to cater for the amount of children using them.

If more children have walk home (often in groups) on unlit roads without footpaths there WILL be accidents. Safety MUST be the number one priority at all times during this review.

We currently have no school bus and have to spend hours each day driving children to school. This is silly, given the number of parents making the same journey. I think you/the government have a responsibility to get children to school (or make it optional). This affects our work. I expect many more children to be absent from school after you make it even harder.

I believe if a child/ren attend the nearest school and have a high income they should be charged for transport.

I really cannot comprehend what NYCC are trying to propose. Communication skills are very poor and your advice is as clear as mud! That is coming from an individual with a one Doctorate and 2 degrees, including one medical. Further simplified communication is required for all, rather than trying to disguise the changes, buried in the NYCC website. Amanda Newbold must clarify and communicate in simple terms so that it is fair to everyone and can be understood in its entirety.

This consultation is not accessible or engaging for many parents. The detail and key points buried in amongst excessive policy statements. The key changes should be articulated as individual statements with bullet points outlining what the changes are. Very poor stakeholder engagement and communication of proposed changes that will have a detrimental impact on many parents and children.

It doesn't really address the issues facing parents today. Very little has changed since I went to secondary school in 1987. We live in (Redacted) and my child attends St Aidans - there is no bus provided but there is a bus to Rossett and the grammar school which very few children in our area attend. We are not even in the catchment for the Grammar school, To calculate the distance via a route which is not a driving route is just ludicrous - would you send your child on potentially muddy and unsafe route to school. I am sure traffic congestion from Bilton along the Skipton Road would be greatly reduced from individual parents taking individual children to the same school if a bus was provided- Let's embrace the 21st century and modernise the home to school travel policy - Why should people in villages who have chosen to live there have the benefit of free travel when people who have chosen to live in (Redacted) do not have the same benefit. Public transport just doesn't work with school timings.

We live in Helmsley and attend Ryedale, it is our nearest school. However it is less than 3 miles from our home. What is not clear from your document is whether our school transport provision will be removed. There is no pavement, the road is extremely dangerous and there is no regular bus route. Could you confirm what your new policy would mean for residents of Helmsley. If transport is removed we would have to home educate our Y9 child

Change the catchment area or just get rid altogether its not fair that children that live in villages have to pay for a bus to get to school, those in an area with the one option of school that may not be suitable for the child to attend should. I feel no one should have to pay bus fare to get the education for their child

My son spends an hour and 10 minutes travelling on a bus, then a train, then another bus just to get to school on a morning (the school is a 15 minute drive in a car). Surely paying a bus to do the whole journey would be far more cost effective than this stupid roundabout way. The train is continuously late, or cancelled, resulting in the children and parents not knowing if they're coming or going. If you're wondering where to save money, start by this. Instead of someone in an office hours away deciding on a route, go on a field trip and figure out yourselves.

It is a key service and need to remain free of charge and should cover young people down to levels also

The lack of provision for SEND children on differing timetables seems extremely disadvantageous to those children and their families. I feel this should be an option for these children as they require a differentiated timetable to others therefore transport should match this.

Transport to school should be a basic right for all children in compulsory education regardless of any other factors

The policies are worded badly and don't make a lot of sense. Unsure what this means for my 3 children

The travel policy should not be considered in isolation but alongside a general transport plan for the county. In removing a dedicated bus service for some communities, there is no safe or realistic alternative but the car. General bus services for the public are often inadequate too. I also note that this consultation has gone public almost 3 weeks after we have received a letter that the dedicated bus service in our area will be removed. It is not really a consultation if decisions have already been made.

The proposal is awful to read, It takes a heck of a lot of effort to figure out who and how you are affected

This will hugely affect working class families who cannot claim financial assistance but also cannot afford to send their second child to the same catchment school as their older sibling because of annual travel costs. I understand why this has been proposed however I do believe this will cause a lot of stress and anxiety to families who won't want to move their oldest child out of their catchment school half way through secondary because they can't afford the travel costs for the youngest, and having 2 children at 2 different secondary schools is not practical. Our closest secondary schools are with a different local authority so I already know under this proposed policy my second child will not qualify for free transport to their catchment school when the time comes.

Reducing the number of out of area taxis transporting children would be better for the environment.

The format of the documentation is difficult to understand so many people will not be able to access or have the will to read on. This could result in people feeling disenfranchised with the consultation process. There should be some FAQs

We pay a much higher council tax compared to the 1990s when school travel was free! Why do you waste our money on vanity projects no one wants compared to spending on getting kids to school!

I believe that the travel policy should align with catchment areas. It would be unfair if transport is provided to a school that a pupil is not in catchment area for even if it is closer.

We live in a world where we expect everything for free. Parents have a duty to provide for their child not the taxpayers. Free school, free pre school, free school meals, free transportation. No, not good value for the taxpayer.

I think the walking distances need to be urgently reviewed. The very fact that a child of primary school age should be expected to walk 2 miles to school in this day and age is ridiculous and clearly unsafe. This distance is then increased to 3 miles at the age of 8!! Really 3 miles an 8 year old. Careful consideration needs to be made as to the actual County you are implementing these rules in. North Yorkshire is a very rural area and these 2 or 3 miles can vary from well lit and maintained footpaths to unlit county roads with no pavement or as your documentation states public rights of way.!?! If a child were to go missing walking these distances at these young ages, people would immediately question why their parents were allowing them to do so, but here we have a government organisation giving a clear expectation for them to do so. Even Thirsk School and 6th Form have publicly commented that the walking distance from Carlton Miniott to their premises is too far and unsafe. Why is there not public transport available at school times for children to use? There used to be, for both the morning and end of school day. I know from speaking to many parents that they would be utilised and therefore a scheduled service should pay for itself, rather than the usual timetable that ferries a handful of people about.

Where is the logic in taking away catchment from the transport criteria when you can have priority to a school based on admissions. So you can have priority to a school but not have priority for transport if there is another school closer, doesn't make sense. My house is over 3 miles from any secondary school so the council would have to provide some form of transport regardless of where they went so that's no saving. In fact are you not going to have to provide more transport to lots of different schools rather than just to the catchment school. Surely this is going to have a negative impact on the environment. Some parents will continue to send their children to a school further away and just get in the car. More cars more buses more emissions and more confusion. Totally illogical. I'd be happy to pay for transport to the catchment school as it's not the nearest school to where we live. Why can't you do that?

As long as the policy supports the large number of forces families in the area who have little choice in school availability and where they live

I strongly feel that changing the criteria to the closest school for free transport rather than catchment area would be extremely detrimental, not only to children and their families, but also schools especially in rural areas like my own. I strongly urge you to think again.

Schools are already clogged up with cars, fumes, parking issues. It's just an accident waiting to happen without pulling school buses away. One bus of kids is making a huge difference to the environment. Transport for children in care taken to schools miles away should definitely be stopped.

Why now we have no 'council borders' is this still impacting school transport, also i feel children on free school meals should get free school travel(outside of catchment)and post 16 should be definitely free on free school meals

we are a family where we have children that live 50/50 with parents one parent over 3 miles from school and one parent where not safe to walk to school . as transport passes bot address currently why can the children not use the transport from both addresses , or this yet another thing where fathers get unfair treatment

I don't think was helpful to announce these proposed changes after school admissions have closed for primary and secondary pupils. The consultation should have taken place in Michaelmas term. It still not particularly clear what constitutes a safe walking route and an unsafe walking route. Is it the lack of pavements, the volume of traffic, the road classification? It's not clear about the nearest school and catchment school. In some catchments, parts of the catchment are nearer to a non catchment school. The policy needs to clearly state if you would get transport to the catchment school or not.

When Dallowgill School closed there was a clause included for all children to be eligible for transport to Kirkby Malzeard for all time.

My children attend an out of catchment school and I pay full price for both and happy to do so . I do not get help for payments my children are in year 10 and 8 so as long as they can get the bus to school I'm am in affected

My daughter suffers with epilepsy , anxiety and depression her taxi is specially trained to deal with her needs reoving it will cause a massive issue for her , my eldest is studying at 6th form where even tho being the only college to offer the course shes on i have to pay 700 for her to travel being aas it is a requiremnt for her to stay in education untill shes 18.

If it is determined to refuse a child, on the basis of a place being available, at a nearer school, what is the council suggesting parents do? Example: I stay in (Redacted), but when my child started secondary, the only place available to them, was in Pately Bridge, some (Redacted) from home. My other child, has since begun at the same school, as it made sense to send them to the same location and we are happy with the school. I have driven them up to now, however, my employment will soon be changing from working at home, to working on site, therefore I will need transportation for them. If I applied for transportation and there was a place for my children, at a nearer school, the policy states that they would not be eligible for that transportation. Further, what if there was a place for one child and not the other? What is the policy suggesting I do? Continue to drive my children, although this might impact my work obligations? Drive one child, whilst the other is eligible for bus travel or move my child/children to a different school, when they are already established at their current one? This is a real issue and one that I am sure is not isolated.

I am an intelligent human and yet I have no idea what you are trying to communicate or ask me to do with this information and questionnaire.

While the definition of the 'nearest suitable school' is clear, there is no mention of how a new policy would be operationalised in a practical way: 1. for children already attending a school that is further away (in our case because admission to the school was based on passing an entrance exam) 2. taking into account changes in high school 'catchment' areas over the years (in our case while our home address has not changed, the school catchment areas have. Our nearest 'suitable' school was Boroughbridge high school but when our daughter was applying for a year 7 place we were not in the catchment for it, instead we were in the catchment for Ripon Outwood Academy.) School admission policies and home-to-school transport policies must therefore align and be consistent with each other (and evolve over time together in an admission policy changes) or the transport policy will not be fair and inclusive. 3. As a parent I would be happy to consider an option to consider 'cost sharing' on the home-to-school transport as I really value the service, (as does my child) and we have to-date never been asked to contribute towards it. I would prefer the council to consider this and other transition options as part of implementing any new policy, rather than going for an 'all or nothing' approach vs the current arrangement. 4. There is no information to suggest what will happen for those families currently using the service who will suddenly become ineligible when the policy changes and their child is mid-way through their education attending a school that is a bit further away than their nearest suitable school. I would not expect children to be changing school as a result of this policy change.

We live in a village > 5 miles from any school, and not with a safe walking / cycle route. Our closest school is not our catchment school. We are a two parent household, both parents working and needing to be at work for 0800hr. We rely on school transport to take our children to school. If transport is only now to be provided to the closest school, not the catchment school, our children risk not being offered a place at the closest school, getting in to the catchment school yet not being able to actually get transport to the catchment school. We would either have to stop working (with significant financial consequences, and consequences to an understaffed NHS for whom we work), or the children would have to not go to school if they cannot be transported. I cannot see either option being acceptable. To me, this proposal would have to result in a change to the catchment schools so that they align with the closest school. Alternatively, and, in my opinion a far preferable solution, free transport is provided to only one school of either the catchment school or the closest school. This would not be of extra cost as it would not cover free transport to an optional school many miles away.

Selling places is a bad idea. If there is a place and a child goes to the school it should be allocated. After all it is compulsory education so the body demanding this should be liable for the costs of all compulsory related items.. Uniform books etc including travel.

For children with EHCP schools that agree they can meet need don't take in all factors and parents may disagree. Unfortunately changing the travel guidance is only going to affect the already under funded SEN care. If more schools had more or better SEN education and care attached to schools, to get advise more locally with shorter wait times. More schools would actually be suitable. Therefore reducing the need for travel! By taking away the rights for travel to a school that the parents feel is the best school for their children you are only putting that child in a setting that is not up to their needs. It's discriminating against children with SEN by removing choice for schooling. North Yorkshire is unfortunately seriously lacking when it comes to SEN needs. I would like to add I don't get free transport for my children.

My sen child was not offered travel. Ive had to sort ot all. And as i cant afford the cost of coach to school ive resorted to taking him.

As a mother of an SEN child, i feel the same taxi should be used so not to upset the childs routine. My son has adapted to the taxi service provided by NYCC. It also helps me, as i have to go to work

It's basically more cuts to save money. I bet the budget for your expenses and subsidies for councillors aren't being cut .

Unfair to remove the provision for catchment schools especially where decisions have been made taking this into account.

Fuel allowance needs looking at for parents who drive their children to and from school placements Due to the increase in fuel costs.

If children cant get to school, they soon wont be going at all.....people cant agford to pay for transport that what weve paid taxes for to cover the whole education system

My current oldest attends BraytonAcademy as we live in (Redacted)and this is the only option for transport in our area. Fortunately this is our preferred school around the surrounding areas. Although some of the closer schools to us do not offer transport I do feel this maybe beneficial for those who do want to attend theses schools. We are happy with the bus service provided from (Redacted) to Brayton.

There is no public transportation from Whitley to any high school which makes working families unable to collect their children, this will have a negative effect on the community as a whole.

Blanket policy which doesn't look at individual needs of pupils Has no concern for protecting the county in which we live- small village schools will be simply lost- ones like we currently attend that are amalgamated over two sites will loose one setting We have had countless emails regarding parking at schools from North Yorkshire police and yet there is no adequate car parking provided and yet there will be an influx of more people expected now to commute?

Having to pay for bus travel as attending a school in a different council area, when that is the nearest school. The costing for this puts strain on finances as a family

I think it's a good idea to go to the nearest school even our of the local catchment area rather than the closest in the local authority. Current travel arrangements are a worry for our household & providing clarity together with possible funding would be very welcome.

I think it makes sense , pupils that get taxi's to out of area education is madness,

I do not think many people will read and understand the considerable volume of information provided, and then make meaningful responses to this questionnaire.

I think careful consideration needs to be made on if the closest school can meet the child's needs. If they cannot surly this puts them at a disadvantage to their peers. Also some children at secondary are unable to walk the 3 miles as it crosse's dangerous roads and rivers. I think instead of the mileage rule consideration needs to be made on the dangers on those routes.

I am a parent to a child who will be moving to secondary school in 2025. I live in Whitley where you have already taken our public bus service from us and now propse to take our school bus. With NO buses at all you are forcing many parents in this village and surrounding villages to send their children to a school they do not want to attend, totally against their wishes. You are taking away my rights to choose the best school for my child as there will be no way to get there. This is TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE. I am paying an extortionate amount of council tax and not receiving even basic services. There is a large amount of children that will be attening the same school, in our catchment area, 1 bus that will be full, 2 miles difference, but for the saving of 4 miles a day you now want to have a massive decision about their childrens education forced on them. This is disgusting.

Concerns over transport to 'suitable school' for SEND for those who run EHCP as it should just be the school named in the plan which is deemed as suitable.

I think putting on more paid for travel for out of catchment could subside the councils expenses. For example in Pickering lots of children travel to Ryedale but there's a shortage of bus places. Parents would happily pay for a bus service and the price could be profit making.

Your current policy is not inclusive enough never mind reducing the service levels within the proposed document, NYC are only paying lip service to this consultation you have already decided you will not support families in need for the sake pandering to the bean counters. If monies need to be saved to balance the books then cut the executive management salaries to no more than the UKs Prime Minister instead of the obscene amount you are paying Flinton and his cronies

If the bus service from (Redacted) to Middleton Tyas primary school is to cease, my (Redacted) may be greatly impacted. I moved (Redacted) from (Redacted) primary school to Middleton Tyas because I rely on her Granparents to get her to school as I and her father work full-time. Her granparents live in (Redacted)so it is easy for them to get her on the bus and means they don't have to travel anywhere. If the bus service is to stop, I will have to move her again so that it is easier for everybody involved. My daughter will be very upset as this would mean she would be moved from her friends and peers and could really unsetlle her emotionally and academically.

You spend an extraordinary amount of money on this. 90% could be saved if you simply used the normal bus company routes with a "minder". Using taxis etc is an extravagant and lazy provision that cannot have come from a sentient adult.

my eldest son who's on the send register has been accessed and been honest I'm sick and tired of chasing them too see what's happening ? and my youngest has health issues asthma from birth and we cannot travel in bad weather or if he or I get a cold or flue or virus it's impossible for me too take him due too been a single parent I'm also looking into getting my youngest assess for ADHD and autistic I have been diagnosed with the same and I am 1 of 12 children so back then it didn't exist and I didn't understand why ? now he's 6 I can get him assessed so yes I would love extra help specially with transport it would help massively due too my son's needs and mine also attendance wise it makes me sleepless and anxious worrying . so I would really appreciate it if I could get any help out there sometimes it's just Nowing were too turn IV tried with my eldest I do get there's a massive back log since COVID and I do appreciate it's hard to get more workers etc it's been too long with no help so yes I'm asking kindly again .

Having to pay for the last 2 years so my second child can continue to attend the same school as our eldest child did, where travel was provided at no cost is disgraceful and not being informed in a timely manner placed financial hardship on our household income.

What would be the provision for children currently entitled to free school transport, that will not be if this change to 'nearest school' happens? I think it's is unreasonable to expect the child to move schools or have a parent available to drive them 13 miles there and back twice a day whilst working (this is to a catchment school). Will a bus still be provided but paid for will these costs be kept as low as possible? There is no public transport available to the school currently and the distress at moving school would be immense, without a parent being available to drive them there and back whilst working full time.

It needs to stay with nearest Suitable school as nearest school with places will not work for pupils with SEN especially in the craven area as there is only one SEN school so it will not be the nearest school for most pupils. Also those that can mange mainstream schools need to be at a school that is right for them and manage their needs which may not be the nearest school to their house as not all schools are the same or specialise in the same areas.

If we had local schools that were able to meet the needs of local children then they wouldn't need to travel so far. It is essential that my child has access to transport so that they can access their school.

Some students could be disadvantaged and may end up not going to a catchment school of choice due to bus costs. For example the nearest school might be a poorly performing school so they prefer a different catchment school, but parents on lower income may have to choose the nearest school if they can't afford the transport costs. Not all schools are equal and there are schools in the N.Yorkshire area that require improvement. Is it fair that lower income families might be forced to send their child to a poor performing school just because they don't have as much disposable income? This may also mean children go to different schools than their friends. The best solution is to means test free school transport eligibility. Some families with large household incomes could easily afford the school transport for their catchments schools, if families were asked to pay something towards school transport then N.Yorkshire Council could generate income that could help cover the school transport costs.

I note that your consultation document, section d - "removal of eligibility based on 50/50 second address" states that there are currently no children being transported on this basis. I believe this to be untrue as I have had one child being being transported on this basis for the last 3 years and am expecting to add a second child this September.

By changing to nearest school, this is likely to negatively impact a parents right to chose which school to send their child to, and will have a significant impact on families on lower incomes, who may not be able to live nearby to their chosen school, and will be forced to send their child to the nearest school, regardless of the performance of that school, or the suitability to the child

We lived in West Yorkshire and do not qualify for school travel even though it is only a few miles away from school

I think North Yorkshire needs to look at building or repurposing existing facilities to expand special education facilities so that more children can attend a school closer to their home rather than travelling long distances. This could save North Yorkshire money in the future. Special Education needs completely overhauling and being made fit for purpose meaning more money long term would be available for other areas of education services.

Children who have special needs should have priority does anyone ever look at all the private taxis and assess if more than 1 child can go in it as I see loads of transport going to School and dropping off when they come from the same area

We live in (Redacted) and my youngest goes to st Mary's in Askham Richard (York council). The route to primary has been assessed as unsafe many times....no pavements etc, but each time somebody new moves to the village, it has to be argued again! Surely once reviewed parents shouldn't have to go through this again! Also, I have an older child who is in year (Redacted). He gets free transport from the village....it is 5 miles away and this is our catchment school. What will happen when my youngest goes there? It is the only school for which a bus goes through our village! Also, how would I know whether other schools that are closer (but only just) will be full or will have places?! This is unfair on younger siblings as they won't know what school they will end up at or whether they can go to the same school as their sibling! The policy also doesn't mention whether a sibling that potentially won't qualify for free transport after the changes can still get a pass for the same bus as their older sibling that does qualify for free transport assuming that the parents can afford to pay for it! As noted above, the only school bus that comes through our village is the one for Tadcaster (which is a catchment school), but there are potentially two closer schools that I didn't think we were in catchment for....York High and Manor. Both over 3 miles away, but no bus from our village! Manor also has faith criteria. This new policy all just sounds very unfair on the second sibling! It also sounds like parents will end up driving children....how will this help the environment?! Finally, the policy also doesn't give an indication of the price of a bus pass, should people end up needing to buy one.

(Redacted) at Brayton. There is no public transport there. (Redacted) and would also go there. Will massively affect me, a single working mum with cost if private transport or them on moving schools.

There's no transport at all for villages surrounding despite high numbers that would use the provision

I strongly believe that the buses which children travel to and from school should have seatbelts, for all ages. My child travels to secondary school on a bus without seatbelts, and I am very unhappy about this. I also know that some buses are oversubscribed and some children have to stand to and from school which is unacceptable. Both of these are a risk to children's safety and lives, should there be an accident.

Try thinking about kids mental health in all this granted you have a budget but there mental health should come first over everything. Some kids have a hard home life as it is and need the stability of the school they are at. All the councils bothered about is money cut wages to them at the top of the scale or get rid of some that would free up a fortune and put kids first instead of the fat necks with there massive wage packets.

I think that proposed changes will impact the county negatively. While savings need to be made I do not believe the travel of children to or from school should be a sector to detract from to do it. The extra cost of maintaining roads, policing increased traffic outside schools and so on cannot be cheap. New traffic regulation orders may be needed which cost a significant amount of money. Increased fuel costs to parents and as a result increased emissions is clearly a large drawback to consider. At a time when emissions need to be lowered, removing grouped transport is an awful, awful idea.

If transport cannot be provide some type of subsidy or reduction in council fees should be given to those who have to transport children themselves as this comes at a great expense

We viewed many schools in the area for our children. The nearest had a particularly poor ofsted report- we decided that we wanted better for our children, as I'm sure many parents would. We found an 'outstanding' school in Brayton Academy. The school is reasonably close and we were informed that there was a strong likelihood that due to the number of children wishing to attend this school from Riccall that transportation would be put on. This enhanced our decision to send our children to this school. The transportation has not materialised, a group of parents have been liaising with school and have been met with either false hope that it is in hand, or have been told it's not going to happen. We again viewed Brayton Academy for our next child to attend in September this year and the prospectus stated that transport from Riccall would be put on- we assumed this is because the expect more numbers from Riccall to attend. Talks with the school have indicated that this is unlikely to happen. We would have had to consider our options if there is no school transport as the option would be to send our kids to an 'inadequate' but closer school, or try to do the best for our children and enrol in an 'outstanding' school possibly with transport but possibly not. If the only appropriate transport is for the closest, possibly inadequate, school this should be made crystal clear to parents rather than keep dangling false hope that transport 'hopefully' will be provided in the not too distant future. If our children must go to the closest school it needs to be at least to your OFSTEAD standards. Otherwise people do not have any choice.

None

I had no choice but to mive further away from my childrens school due to needing a bigger house, but I definitely would not be able to afford to pay for the travel for 2 children. The cost of bus fare is disgusting even at half fare prices. It would cost over £30 a week/ £120 a month. But transferring my childrens school is not an option now they are in their GCSE years. Also the school most lical to us has the worst ofsted in the area. My son who will be dues to start high school in sep 2025 has SEN needs and I am extremely worried about having to send him yo the nearest school as they cant offer him the support he will need.

The documentation is vast and convoluted and not easy to follow, therefore I doubt that this consultation's results will indeed be relevant. While we are not expecting free home school travel, the fact that the council allows the operators to practice outrageous prices for this service on the principle that they have a "trapped audience" is unacceptable. A more affordable home school transportation provision would take a lot of cars of the road, reduce congestions and gas emissions near schools. At more than £6/child/day cost for an unreliable school bus service, North Yorkshire County Council and Abbots (the school bus operator) has pushed us to drive our children to school every day. This is impacting on their independence, our work and not least the environment.

You have not included where there aren't footpaths. For example my child's school is less than three miles but there are only footpaths for maybe half of the journey which isn't safe to walk?

I feel it is unfair to withdraw free transport for children who have already committed to attend a school on the basis that transport would be provided only to then have that provision removed. This is especially unfair as the closest school is only marginally closer (a mile or so) than the school chosen, and in a different authority to where we live. The change seems overly punitive to some with relatively little benefit in real terms as buses are still going to be required and will have to continue to come very close anyway. The change in this case would realistically change our decision about where to send our children which is going to affect the school ultimately.

You have not stated in the new policy how it will work when children have two homes, you have removed the 50/50 part of the policy but not replaced it with anything to explain how it effects children who go between two home's half of their lives. I have two children, one in primary and one in secondary. My secondary child has to get the bus from his dads 50% of the time but pays for it because he lives 2.9 miles away. If you were to add in about separate parents it would help as i don't know where i stand with the new policy. I am on low income but his dad is employed, but his dad lives 2.9 miles away so on mileage he would qualify on the new policy. Please consider split parent houses. My primary age child (year 5) is a SEN child who will be getting the bus when he goes to secondary school but again i need it clear on what he qualifies for when its at his second house. Thank you

We live in catchment for Tadcaster grammar school - changing funding so we have to pay for transport to our catchment school would have a significant adverse impact upon our family.

It is a disgrace that NYCC are looking at introducing a policy that could potentially cost parents £60+ per month in bus fares. Are NYCC going to facilitate moves to all of the children affected so that they can attend the nearest suitable school to save the families £720 a year per child. I highly doubt it. Council tax is to increase by 5% in April 2024... so yet more outgoings for families that are already struggling. In addition the the above my son would have to walk about a mile and a half from the bus station... to get to school... he would have to set off to school before 0700 for a 0830 start to facilitate his arrival on time. Dark nights... foul weather... where is the duty of care... disgrace... hang your heads in shame.

People cannot afford / have the time to pay for their own transportation, while trying to work , to pay their bills such as COUNCIL TAX !

If these proposals go ahead already over crowded streets surriunding schools at drop off and pick up time will become even worse. This will have a detrimental affect on local residents and even possibly house prices of properties in the vicinity of schools. Lots of parents and carers will not be able to afford the school bus charge so will be forced to send their children to a school that may nit be the best fit for those children. The environmental impact of extra vehicles on the road is also a big concern if these proposals were to go ahead

We live in (Redacted)and originally sent our daughter to (Redacted)but the standard of education that she received was poor. We made the decision to move her to our catchment school, Brayton, and have noticed a dramatic difference in the quality of her education. By implementing travel changes going forward, some families will be forced to send their children to poorer performing schools which will not help drive up educational standards as it will effectively remove choice. Furthermore, has the environmental impact been considered of potentially forcing more cars on the road.

Some families will be forced to choose the nearest school, as opposed to the school with the highest educational standards, and by removing choice, educational standards will be impacted negatively across the board. Undoubtedly more parents will choose to drive children to school which will have a negative impact on the environment. It seems unreasonable for families paying council tax in North Yorkshire to be forced to send their children to school in a different county. A tier system of payment seems fairer as opposed to a blanket yes/no where a contribution is made to transport costs depending on where you live and household income.

I live in Whitley, the transport option of sending the children to snaitth has been taken away and now you are proposing taking the option of Brayton away. The majority of children in the village attend brayton which is an outstanding school. Taking the free transport option away will have an extremely detrimental affect on the children that wish to attend this school (whose parents can not afford the fare) we already pay very high council tax in this village- I was under the impression that by combining the council this would reduce costs, this is not happening! I am very concerned that this is even being contemplated- why on earth are children being penalised because their parents would struggle to pay the fare. Given the distance involved I doubt there would be vast savings as the majority of children go to the same school.

We live in a village 2.5 miles from Skipton, where our local schools are. There is no available public transport to our village before 9am or after 3pm. Although I am aware this is within the 3 mile boundary, the walk is along a country road which is mostly unlit. Surely the provision of public transport, at cost to the users, should be provided as a public service. We currently pay for bus passes. I don't know why we can't still do this, if we are covering costs.

It is grossly unfair that children living within 2 miles of school have to pay to travel by bus to their nearest school, whilst pupils who live many miles away and choose not to attend their nearest school get free transport. I welcome the change.

Please keep the free bus my daughter uses to go to school in Brayton from Whitley. It is a good school and she is happy there.

Strongly believe that travel options should be available for any school within the catchment area, even if these are chargeable. Without such provision, parents may struggle to get their child to school, but schools will also experience an increase in traffic and more cars on the road if parents are forced to take their children to school. Which in itself has many impacts. Getting a bus to school builds confidence and independence in children which is a key part in their own social development at school.

Our daughter attends a special school within North Yorkshire that matches her needs, as a low income familubthere is no way we could transport ourselves as we have 2 other children who attend local secondary and primary school. Why is everything such a battle with North Yorkshire? Our daughter has another number of years at her special school and this wont be changing so therefore north yorkshire can foot the bill and continue with transport sadly many children dont ask for there issues but mainstream school doesnt suit everyone.

3 miles is far too long to expect an 11 year old to walk to and from school. I would be happy as many others in the village to pay for a public bus service into skipton or pay for the school bus as I do now. If there was a paid service which provided places I know many parents that would use this service. By removing the school bus from Embsay to skipton you are encouraging circ 50 individual cars into gargrave road at a very busy time and dangerous for all the children leaving schools - this does not make any sense at all.

Many pupils are some considerable distance to the catchment school but close to a nearer school in another authority. The effect of the new policy will be to disadvantage families and schools geographically located close to North Yorkshire Council boundaries and in particular those close to Leeds and York. The effect of this is unfair.

I think the environmental impact considerations are great. My child has access to a train station close to home and her school over 30 miles away. Unfortunately the frequency and times of the trains mean that even though it is desirable environmentally and from my child's point of view mentally, it is not feasible. Public transport needs to be more integrated. Access to schools closer to home that have proper facilities and support for children with autism would mean that fewer children would need to travel.

The congestion down Gale Lane, with coaches and cars, for Ryedale school 'drop off' and 'collection' is already appalling. For local children walking down that road, it is an 'accident waiting to happen'. If more parents/carers are forced to take/collect their children, this will only get worse.

Sensible changes that bring in standardisation and common sense for cases when parents don't choose the closest school - That should not be a cost for the taxpayer so agree with this proposal.

The school should be the right fit for the child, not just the nearest school for financial reasons. Could encourage children to be absent, suffering with their mental health

Children should be encouraged to use free transport rather than the eligibility being too strict and creating further traffic delays and pollution from thousands of parents driving their children individually to school.

The buses to Sherburn High School should drop pupils off at the bottom of New Lane, on the Sherburn High Street road, instead of going up New Lane and turning round. The other day there were 30 cars and four buses waiting to get out of the Lane onto the main road, but the junction makes it very hard. Also Mytum and Selby lorries come down there sometimes at school times. There is no other way of getting to our houses. I have asked North Yorkshire Highways if the Lane can be extended to meet the Church Hill road, but no response. This is a big safety issue. If there was an emergency, like last year when there was an accident, we can't get home by car, and some of us aren't that mobile.

At least there has been some communications regarding the proposed changes unlike 2019 transport changes that were hidden in a Sends meeting in 2014 and implemented in 2019 with no notification to the parents. This only became apparent in the week before high school choices were to be submitted. This reeked havoc in our primary school and village. The high schools were no even notified and were unprepared. Parent had to pay for taxis and private transport until the schools made arrangements and secured a bus. While I appreciate you need to save money, we dont have any alternative public transport in the outlying villages in our area. Whitley & Eggborough. This will lead to hardship and children not attending school. (not all parents that are struggling are on benefits) On the other side, our roads, are going to be full of extra cars doing the school runs, affecting the environment and even putting children in danger around school drop off zones. It is not clear on the virtual schools website on whats the closes school either. As it shows my postcode in Goole 20 miles away from my address!!! and in a different county!

The only elements I disagree with are where the council is proposing to remove eligibility. Whilst my family may or may not be impacted, these changes are likely to adversely affect the poorest families where cost of getting to school will be a key part of decision making. This in turn may limit their children's choices of which school to attend and perpetuate existing discrepancies in society between rich and poor

Wasted money on HS2 but you cannot provide travel to school. Dreadful.

My youngest daughter is currently in year 10 and was the first year which transport was affected. We had already made our choice of school and was not made aware we had to pay for our school transport until the very last minute before she started in year one. The school had to rush in making arrangements in paying for a private bus company for the first year as no provision or option given via the North Yorkshire Council. A last minute option was given to go to Brayton Academy instead. Although marginally nearer by a tenth or so of a mile, it would have took considerably longer to get there due to A19 road closure. We had already made our decision after visiting schools and didn't want both my daughters to go to different schools dues to term time differences for childcare arrangements. We both worked full time. My elder daughter continued to use the free bus. That double decker bus over time became very empty as each year left whilst my younger daughter was on a very often busy overcrowded single decker bus. We are not on benefits and not considered as on low income but do not have surplus money to pay for school transport. With the rising costs we sometimes struggled to pay this. (Redacted) now goes to Selby College and pays far less for bus transport which is further down the road then my (Redacted) whichbis ludicrous. I truly believe no child should pay for secondary education 16 and under. We should be at very least subsidised.

More council runs spaces for paid passengers are needed. We aren't wanting to take a free place on transport, but the council could provide more access for paying passengers specifically on school transport, not public transport. The cost of busses provided by the school for transport are extortionate, absolutely unacceptable prices for any family to have to pay for a child to get to school. Never mind if there's more than one child to get to school!! Absolutely disgusting. Whereby a paid passenger on a council run transport option is much more affordable, so please offer more!

Our village has 2 catchment secondary schools. One is 1.5 miles further away than the other. About 2/3 pupils attend one school, and 1/3 attend the other. As there is so little difference in terms of distance, this decision feels arbitrary and pointless. Both buses will still be paid for by the council, as the other villages served by the slightly further away school will still need and be entitle to transport, so you will be taking away choice for our young people for no cost saving. The element of choice is absolutely critical for the mental health and educational attainment of the young people, as the schools have different approaches, strengths, environments and communities. This decision will have a huge and detrimental impact on the lives of young people in our village and on the school communities affected, with long-standing historical connections and communities torn apart. It will affect vulnerable children and those with SEND more acutely, as the element of informed choice is so important for children who have specific needs in order to thrive at school.

the current situation and the way transport is arranged and awarded is working well..... it is obviously expensive, but this expense has been created by NYC, in part caused due to the lack of adequate school places available to SEN children who are often required to travel singularly, over great distances to schools out of area.

I think that the criteria for living 2 or 3 miles away needs to be updated. Our current 2/3 miles is described as the crow flies. We all know children don't fly and in fact use the roads. Given there are no pavements to walk as the crow flies either it is a pointless and ridiculous policy. If you want more children to walk or cycle to school, more should be done to make this accessible and safe. All this will achieve is costing hard working parents more.

I feel it unfair to constantly keep changing the criteria for which school a child is eligible to go to. A bus will still be provided for children currently attending the school of their choice so why not allow others if there are spaces get on the bus to their preferred school. It will mean children will be separated from their friends that they have spent the last 7 years making. Eggborough village is growing rapidly so therefore an option of which school you wish your child to attend should be allowed and not dictated. You should have the option to send your child to the best school in the area that will meet their academic needs. Snaith has already been removed as an option without paying for a bus from Eggborough now it seems the council are removing another option in Brayton and forcing you to send your child to the De Lacy. It is unfair on the children.

I do not think the changes to eligible school by removing the catchment school should go ahead. This policy should remain as it currently is. The current policy is fair and reasonable and provides a balance in allowing parents/children to have some degree of choice, whilst limiting council expense to a reasonable distance of travel.

Our family finances are already stretched but I will not be bullied into applying for school which I believe is inadequate for my child I am extremely angry about this !! The 'local' school being quoted as De Lacey in Knottingley, unfortunately I cannot calculate accurately as local roads are currently closed until July 2024 to a suitable school which I believe would be the best choice for my child. Both of these schools happen to be in a different county (West & East Yorkshire)

We live at the edge of North Yorkshire. Both our children currently attend the local Primary in year 6. The secondary school (school A) we are in catchment for is 13 miles by road and is OFSTED Outstanding rated, and is where we want to send our children. There is a school bus from our village to the secondary school, currently funded by the council as all the children are going to the school they are in catchment for. The nearest school to our house (school B) is 2.5 miles by road, but in a different local authority, and we are not in catchment. That school has a lower OFSTED rating, and we have no desire to send our children there. We applied last September (to school A only), and are expecting to find out in 4 days where both our children are going in September. The provision of fully funded transport was a consideration in our choice of school, even though we are only in catchment for one school. If the proposed policy is implemented, it appears that we will have to pay for two passes of £747.50 for our two children. It will be cheaper to drive our children to school every day, thus increasing traffic, carbon emissions and road wear. I fully understand that the current government is reducing council budgets below what is necessary, and spending cuts are needed. If this policy is implemented however, it will most likely lead to a reduction in children using bus transport to school, and an increase in emissions and traffic. For the avoidance of doubt I strongly object to the proposal to only offer transport funding to the nearest school, even if the nearest school is in a different local authority and out of catchment. The council has a duty to provide education and the physical access to education to the children physically living in that council's area, with parents paying council tax to that council.

Strongly disagree as we want our children to attend their catchment school not the nearest school. We moved last year to be in catchment (away from the designated nearest school) for this school for our eldest and do not want this impacting our youngest children. There are no transport links other than the included school transport to our catchment school. This would massively burden us, from a time, cost and environmental impact. From our village alone this could be an additional 10+ families all driving to the catchment school. All impacted in the same way - time cost and environmental

I think that the current scheme regarding the change to catchment area needs to be left alone. We have already put forward our choice of secondary school as my daughter is in year 6.

The nearest school to us is out of catchment area 1.6 miles away with no public transport and vulnerable children would have to walk down a 60 mph road with no pavements and no lights. I think it's unreasonable and puts children at risk of serious injury or abdication due too low visibility with large hedges and no street lights, and winding roads.

The school identified as my nearest would not be ideal for us as a family.

Transport to a schools in my catchment area is essential and should not be removed. If no transport is offered then as a family would need to provide this which is not feasible in our current places of employment. Not offering school transport would greatly impact the environment as multiple vehicles instead of one would need to drive to the school.

Making decisions without consideration of siblings when 'nearest' school is in another county. Will have more over subscribed schools

I have particular concerns regarding travel for special needs children. With specific and specialised needs, and insufficient places to meet demand, many almost certainly need to travel, and not because they are being picky, but strive to have their needs met, in order that they achieve the best outcomes possible, thus ensuring that they require less services from the council in adulthood. Cuts to what is already an underfunded and inadequate service is short sighted. That said, measures should ensure that use of it is not abused, and if parents covered transport themselves, or contributed on a means tested basis, would the money saved go instead to the school to top up the under funded EHCP, and better meet individual needs of children? As a parent of a SEND child, I feel my child is going to be failed by North Yorkshire on the transition to secondary education in September 2024, and part of the decision made by the LA has everything to do with transport costs, and nothing to do with individual needs, and provision available, because this would be some distance away.

This change is forcing parents to send their children to schools that they don't want them to attend, in my example living in Whitley, the catchment school is Brayton Academy and with the proposed change, the school will be Campsmount or DeLacey. These schools would not be suitable for my daughter.

I find it unfair that I pay for two in my children to catch the school bus , I earn £15000 a year , yet another parent living five minutes further than me gets it free for her child becasue of where they live despite her having pay of £40000 . I don't think the free pass should be given to everyone on location , I think finances should be investigated too . A lot of the children getting free passes live at farms and larger properties further away from the school and affordability for the bus wouldn't be an issue

The closest school only gives parents and children little choice over who provides their education. Especially with older children already in a school that is in 'catchment' rather than 'closest' school. Paying for the bus is not the issue, but finding provider who will cover all the small villages in our area is.

What if the nearest suitable school is different to the catchment area school?

I changed schools for my daughter to attend where there was a school bus due to both parents working. I even went down the route that I live too far out as my daughter had growing pains in her legs proven by a doctor's letter and they still said she can walk 2.8 miles to school. It has really affected our family as a whole. No transport. It's awful. I live in (Redacted)

North Yorkshire's remit (as well as other LAs) is becoming increasingly difficult due to the demands of children with mobility or additional needs. I dread to think what the percentage spend of that budget is on transport with 2 people or less in the car, that may be a useful stat to share. I do also think (even though as an operator we benefit) that due to parents' choice to move to a home in the country, it should not be mandatory that free transport is received. A parent should be responsible to get their child (children) to the nearest fixed route. That would also save a fortune.

I would be concerned that my children wouldn't be going to the same school as friends from primary school as the nearest secondary school may not be the catchment area. This could have an impact on my less confident child if having to start a new school not knowing anyone.

The current policy works well for our personal circumstances but I am keen to see changes in the post-16 travel policy for students in full-time education.

As an operator who has specific vehicles that are only used for SEND and Social Services transport but those vehicles have to be licensed as a taxi with all the relevant fees and costs associated along with a licensed driver. At quotation stage we could significantly lower the costs if these vehicles that are solely used for school and Social care transport didn't have to be fully plated up as a taxi/PH. As an example we have a saloon car that is only used to take one child to their school in Brompton from Selby and return. The vehicle is not used for any other purpose other than social service AdHoc transport. We could reduce the quote by 1300 if the vehicle wasn't plated. Both driver and PA would still have an enhanced DBS and the vehicle would still be walk-round checked daily as well as the 12-week mechanical checks and twice-yearly MOTs. As an operator that eventually aims to step away from standard Private taxi Hire work and solely concentrate on social care and home 2 school work it would allow us and other operators to offer reduced costs to the NYCCV IPT.

The proposed policy does not make clear what the position is regarding the transition to the new policy - will children not entitled to transport under the new policy be allowed to continue travelling or would they have to move schools? Also what are the options when a child is not entitled to school transport? Will there be an option to pay for travel? The policy appears to be silent on this. Will N Yorks operate school services which can be paid for as if services are withdrawn it may have a negative environmental impact as it will increase the likelihood of parents taking children in cars. Perhaps those entitled currently with no entitlement under the new policy should be required to make a stepped contribution to mitigate the current spend as they progress through school. A gradual approach may help embed the new policy. Main thing is to ensure when parents choose schools for children they are fully aware of the new policy and whether they have entitlement - also parents need to appreciate the cost of providing transport - often they have no idea of the value.

The proposal (in line with DfE (Department for Education) guidance, that transport will only be assessed and, if eligible, provided from one home address.) is mistaken. The incomes and discretionary spend of parents who are separated or divorced is usually lower than those who live together so only funding transport from one home would hit such financially stretched families and might promote conflict about which parent would have to pay for the unsupported transport - hardly something which is good for the wellbeing of children. Parents separate for many reasons including escaping violence, threats, abuse, and unacceptable behaviour - compounding their problems is hardly helpful! The number of journeys between home and school is independent of the number of homes which the child lives in. Surely it's not beyond the wit of those who manage transport contracts and the operators to accommodate this!

As has always been the case the most affordable way of transporting children to school is by effectively using large passenger carrying vehicles- these vehicles reduce congestion , have had many years investment in reducing emissions but do need an organised integrated approach to route planning . I believe based on 30 years as a transport provider that not enough time and energy is being invested in this planning . Families feel happy to let their children travel By bus and coach if those providing the service deliver the high standards that are needed . I am greatly concerned on a daily basis by standards I see from both coach and bus operators and non compliant taxi operators . Although my heart sank at the proposal for a specific training module I do feel that it is needed. Please can this training be properly registered so that it counts as a module of PSV driver CPC training. I am sure it will be much more relevant than some of the training that's on offer to us . I think the 2 mile rule for walking to school for children from low income families is unfair and discriminates against children from all other families - a 3 mile walk expected for those. I have recently raised this issue with my MP . A realistic walking distance is required if congestion around schools is ever going to be addressed .

I live at (Redacted), our catchment school is Sessay. In the same federation is Husthwaite, where (Redacted) attend. It is quicker for me to get to Husthwaite and a 0.25 of a mile in the equation of catchment. A school bus goes from Kilburn, 1.5 miles away, with less than half the seats filled daily. There are four or five other families in the vicinity that would use a school bus to access education at Husthwaite. There wouldn't be a school bus covering our area if the children went to the catchment school of Sessay?? Where is the thought around the environment in this thinking?

None

no

I would like to see more transport options. There is no way for our son to get to school without us driving him.

My high school child lives out of catchment for transport so we have to drive each day. Would be happy to pay for a bus scheme though if this were to be provided.

Transport should be made easier not harder. Children should be able to have a choice of schools & not be told they can only attend the closest school because that's all transport can provide. School transport is nearly non existent already from Eggborough.

The proposed policy will force many parents/cadets/guardians to send their child/children to a school that may not be their first choice or the best choice for their child due to transport implications created by this change in policy. Many families are already struggling especially with the continued hefty increases by North Yorkshire Council on Council Tax yet seem to be looking in the wrong areas to make cuts and penalising the average working family by reducing services and taking away something as basic as choice of school for our children by proposing these changes to transport. As a resident of Beal we should not be left with one choice of school out of county as first choice due to transport costs as a village we get little for our money paid to your council the least we can have is a choice to send our children to our choice of school in county with transport provided even if subsidised by the council instead of fully paid for depending on income.

We are in North Yorkshire, I don't want my child going to Wetherby High School. It's West Yorkshire and makes no sense. My child's fellow pupils will not be going there either and I think the free transportation should be for a school that is one majority of the children from my child's school go to. Where we live I hear of no children going to Wetherby High School.

I am not happy with the proposal as under the proposed new policy they will only provide free transport to the nearest school. Meaning as long as the 'nearest' school have spaces you won't provide transport to any of the remaining catchment schools. Parents would have to cover this cost and at present a yearly school bus pass is around £750! When you have multiple children this is a significant expense. A school choice for parents is not just based on nearest location but about the needs of the child and what environment would work best for them (academically and sporting considerations). The proposal appears to only take into consideration 'cost' as opposed to a child's need(s). This needs revising!

Instead of making working families lives harder and adding more and more costs to them, why does the council not create policies that affect demographics of people that can afford extra costs in their lives? Introduce a car congestion charge based on the value of the car, rather than emissions (since wealth people can afford electric, those less affluent will be punished by a pollution/car age charge) Increase business rates on non-independent shops and businesses. Means test school transport so that only those families that are six+ figure salaries pay. Reduce the overheads of running the councillors (move to a cheaper property etc) Increase council tax for those on the highest tax band only.

My son attends Settle College. A significant proportion of the students are from out of catchment - are attending when it is not the nearest school. They pay for the bus service into the school. My worry is for the future of the school. Settle's NOR is fairly low and this may dissuade families from trying to attend the school and ensuring it is viable for Settle to retain a secondary school.

Currently in Spofforth as we are more than 3 miles from any secondary school, the council will provide free transport to Wetherby High (this is the nearest school) as well as Harrogate Grammar, Rosset and Harrogate High (these are our catchment schools). But under the proposed new policy they will only provide free transport to the nearest school. Meaning as long as Wetherby High have spaces they won't provide transport to the catchment schools. Parents would have to cover the cost for the child to get to Grammar, Rosset or Harrogate High - A yearly school bus pass is around £750 at the moment. To not provide transport to catchment schools is discriminatory and prohibitive to parents on low/middle-low incomes. I do not agree with this new policy.

The proposals are going to put a lot of pressure on parents

My child attends George Pindar School in Eastfield, Scarborough. We live in crossgates. It is a 2 mile walk along a busy road with inadequate street lighting. I would be willing to pay for a school bus but currently there is no service available. I feel this needs investigating further.

The council should stop haemorrhaging money in other departments before looking at this. The lack of control over spending is ludicrous.

I live at Whitley, which was not on the list. We are a North Yorkshire LA. My (Redacted) at Brayton Academy and (Redacted). The proposed changes would remove the school transport service for my children (I thought it was for September 25 intake, but on reading the materials it is for September 24 so we are affected). This transport is essential as I work full time and I am unable to take the children myself, the disruption would have a very negative affect on our situation and place unnecessary pressures on me as a parent and my children.

You need to define how nearest is measured; is it straight line or shortest route via road? For children already attending their 'nearest' school that is not their catchment school, will the policy entitle them to free transport in the remaining years at school (i.e. it doesn't ONLY apply to new admissions)

I was pleased to read a pragmatic, sensible and caring approach to a complex and potentially immotive situation. Well done.

We have moved into the area and our children will be attending the grammar schools from September. A large factor which we took into account when we bought our house was whether there were good connections to get to school and we budgeted on the fact that they would get free school transport. The issue would be that as a parent choosing which school children will go to in Year 7, it is made far more difficult for parents to assess which school to choose based upon the current proposed policy. For example, a parent may choose a school which is closest, but not in catchment, per the suggested changes to comply with the travel situation. They can then be turned down due to being out of catchment/no availability and then the school option goes to the second school selected on the list. The child may then miss out on this school too, as everyone who put that school down as their first choice was able to take those places. Then, they are on their third option.... It means that it is difficult for parents to plan their lives, work options etc and the school choice will be increasingly uncertain. Furthermore, when secondary schools are within 1 mile of one another, I think any of those schools should still qualify for free school travel. The final issue is that these changes may affect people who have just selected their secondary school, based upon the existing travel arrangements and it seems highly unfair that the rules are changed after children have already been allocated their secondary school places.

I feel that it is unnecessary to provide free transport for primary aged pupils but good to provide for secondary pupils

This policy will force many parents in my catchment area to send their child to an undesirable or poorly performing school out of the local catchment area. This policy for some parents diminishes the right to choose a suitable school for their child.

If this goes ahead catchment areas should be scrapped. Either use distance or catchment area, not both, to influence school choice. Children's mental health is likely to be affected if they do not move to high school with their friend group, which will happen if some choose the catchment school and some choose the nearest school to get the free transport.

Mainstream costs have increased 50% since 2015/6. Special provision 350%. What analysis has been done to find out why? Disagree with removal of eligibility on primary phase of denominational grounds for low income - it seems a small group to single out. Who will assess 'safe routes' - do you have the staff to check out 'safe walking routes' when you are under financial pressure? (Beyond looking at a map online, which doesn't show pavements, or lack of them.) The requirement for parents to walk to school with children could have unintended consequences - the time taken might lead to them losing their job. This might then push them into lower income brackets, and the children would qualify for free transport. We appreciate councils are stretched financially, but are these suggestions going to enhance the educational experience of the children of NY? How much is this in reality going to save?

Thank you for putting this together, the proposals (while I don't agree with them on every account) are easy to understand and presented clearly. Well done to the team at NYC who put this together - it's not easy and I appreciate the work put in to it.

We are lucky to have 2 very different school within in a very similar distance where currently we have transport provided to both of this were to change it would mean having to pick 1 school over distance rather than which school would fit best for our child which would be a really sad situation and I'm sure would be the same for a lot of local families

Why not encourage cycling? Some sensibly planned, and traffic free cycle, would be amazing and encourage many more pupils to cycle. At my school only two pupils ever cycle to school and both of those only really in summer when the roads are safer.

I think it makes sense to keep it on a county basis in terms of school holidays for one thing, working parents could potentially have children of different ages in school in different counties subsequently on separate holidays at times. If this happened in our area settle college would be gravely affected and kirkby Lonsdale inundated with pupils

I'm concerned that if free school transport was restricted to closest school that pupils in Ingleton and Bentham would be forced to choose QES over Settle College which would have a negative effect on Settle College. Surely as this is the county school for this area (whereas QES is in Cumbria) that free school transport should be extended into this area. These changes would have a negative effect on both my children.

This proposal will result in the removal the right of families and children to make a choice about which very good schools in our area their child attends. In today's society and with everyone trying to make ends meet this is completely wrong. It will reduce numbers at your own North Yorkshire schools in our location and boost numbers in another council's school, surely not what you set out to do!

An outrageous proposal!

Transport provided to nearest school is welcome. However, I appreciate that savings need to be made. Having worked with such families, I think priority needs to go to those families with children with additional needs who have a school place a long way from home - these families should certainly be provided transport and the systems for applying / arranging this should be as simple and supported as possible. I certainly think money could be saved with regard to Reception Children as it could be argued they are far too young to be expected to travel to school without parents anyway and parents should arrange this when looking into reception places? Thank you for the consultation

It needs to remain the same as it is now

It discriminates pupils living on the boarder of catchment areas. The reason for living in North Yorkshire was to enable my child to access some of the best schools in the country with transport availability. There is discrimination against working parents whose shift patterns do not allow transporting children to school, this could encourage parents not to work and rely on state benefits. Cost of transport will put extreme pressure on family finance. Noted only one mention of religion within document, religious belief is extremely important and has not been considered unless on benefits.

The nearest school should not include selective schools. This new policy will mean more pupils travelling by car rather than by bus

It would be detrimental to our children's wellbeing to move schools. Whilst I do not agree with the changes at least avoid affecting existing school children so they are not moved once they have started. A further consideration is the sustainability of the changes as it would mean more parents driving children to school when there are likely to be empty seats on the bus going the same way. There are five schools in Richmond next to each other...more cars will mean even more congestion on Darlington road and affect parent's ability to get to work on time.

With reference to providing transport to the nearest secondary school, you have not made it clear if this is the nearest secondary in North Yorkshire or the nearest secondary school outside of North Yorkshire. I and many others live very close the the borders of Lancashire and Cumbria. Whilst we live in North Yorkshire, our closest secondary school is out of the County in Cumbria, QES. Please could you make this point clear. If you mean the closest secondary school outside of the County of North Yorkshire, this could have serious consequences for our local North Yorks secondary school, Settle College, and children wanting to attend this North Yorkshire secondary school in the future who live in North Yorkshire, but near the border of Cumbria and Lancashire. Thank you

My little sister will go to high school and if my mum has to pay for her to get there i think this will be a struggle. My mum works hard and does her best. Why would you affect a childs education its unfair if you removed free transport for us kids. I do well at school and so will my little sister but i know my mum will struggle to pay transport or get her there if she cant afford it. This could affect her work i dont think you are thinking about the bigger picture this could put ppl on benefits due to not been able to afford school bus fees so they have to take them and work around that this is impossible. Please take all this into consideration.

I think its very worrying for parents of children in Bentham/Ingleton that they wont get transport to their nearest North Yorkshire school (Settle College) This would leave no choice but to go to a school in a neighbouring county. It would have a hugely detrimental impact on numbers at Settle College which would surely leave its future in doubt. Its also a terrible idea to only provide transport for children after their 5th birthday. These children are expected and hugely benefit from attending their whole Reception year. It seems ludicrous to penalise spring or summer born children in this way.

This proposal is unbelievable and will certainly impact children's learning and well being. This proposal shouldn't go ahead. What are we paying our increased council tax for when you are offering less of a service? You should be ashamed!

I think it's crazy that the travel policy is going to be changed. It takes the option of secondary school out of the parents hands who do not have the money to be able to pay for a pass to their chosen school. It is discriminating against families who cannot afford to pay it. It's disgusting.

My child's nearest secondary school transport route would not be the most suitable in the winter time and our next nearest secondary school is only 2 miles further in distance but would be the quickest and more appropriate route.

<p>the measurement of distance by using public rights of way these are not always safe from an environmental and social danger, and not always passable (flooding)</p>
<p>Our 'closest' secondary school would fall into a different county and over a road in which doesn't get treated in winter which would make it not safe for my children to travel!! I would be full against this is it was a matter on distance as this is not safe!!</p>
<p>You have made no mention of improving the opportunity for some to cycle/walk to school. Certainly for the older children , if provision were made for safe active travel the number of bus spaces could be reduced , certainly in the drier months and families allowed a choice. Your high spend reflects the very low spend on active travel. So much could be done at relatively low cost to improve this. Whitby TC has supported a 20mph default speed ' where people are' which would make home to school a safer and cheaper option for many but you have failed to address this.</p>
<p>I don't think the policy should be changed so that only the local school choice is given free transport as my catchment school is easier to get to. The local school is harder to get to in winter. It would require the council to grit more roads than currently do</p>
<p>I don't believe that school choice , a school in which a pupil would be most happy , most appropriate for them as individuals should be dictated of affected by the removal of costs being covered by the council got free school transport - and the cost therefore being passed onto parents who may already be in financially difficult situations, but perhaps not eligible for support. I think overall the proposal to just provide free transport to pupils to their 'nearest' school is not appropriate or in the best interests of the pupils or schools.</p>
<p>It seems a nonsense to send children to their catchment school but not provide transport, the two systems need to work together.</p>
<p>Where the distance of some of the schools are within a similar distance from a child's home, children should be eligible for free transport to all, especially when the schools with a better teaching record are slightly further away.</p>
<p>I think instead of nearest school it should be catchment school This worked very well for many years</p>
<p>If this stops children who have passed for Skipton Girls & Ermysteds from getting free travel because Skipton Academy is closer to their home, but on the same bus route it would make no sense. Families might have to make the decision if their child gets a grammar school education based on if they can pay for a bus pass - this would be a very disappointing move. I hope that this has been taken into account, considering the three schools are on the same bus route.</p>
<p>The proposed changes are not made clear for those reading this consultation document and associated policies - there is, as always, too much waffle and not enough clarity. A simple bullet-pointed list outlining 'these are the changes' and FAQs to answer 'what will the changes mean for me / my child(ren)?' would be much more helpful, enabling for residents and helpful to yourselves in terms of resulting in meaningful, accurate responses from those likely to be affected. Consultations like this only serve to prevent people from responding appropriately and therefore are not consultations, they are purely 'box ticking' exercises to use to metaphorically 'whip' people with - when they say they didn't know about the changes, you can say 'well a consultation document was issued'. Disappointing but, sadly, unsurprising.</p>
<p>It is still not clear from your excessive pages of documents if children travelling to the grammar schools I. Skipton will have free transport despite having a closer suitable school.</p>

I applaud the fact that the council don't try to disguise that this is about financial savings and will not provide benefit pupils. However that very notion is shocking and amoral. It appears to be another instance of those most vulnerable in society being penalised in favour of money. I'm not at all surprised that NYCC is targeting SEND pupils once again, it is an easy win for their pockets. Some of the minor changes are, in fairness, logical but the key is in the wording to the more substantial charges. Regardless of this process, i have no doubt the proposed chnages will be implemented as money is the master.

If transport is only provided free of charge to the nearest school, I think this will have a detrimental effect on the future of Settle College. We live in Ingleton, one of our children currently attends Settle College, however, our daughter has chosen to attend QES. The cost of travel would have effected our decision making with regard to which school they chose to attend.

I can see this policy being critical to those That have to use it. I'm lucky enough not to need to, but feel those that do need it need a fair amount of access to this support when balanced against the cost to the council. The change seem to be a fair middle ground to me.

This proposal will have a massive negative impact on many families as well as many schools in the county. The money 'saved' by the changes will be negated by families transporting their children to the school that was previously in their catchment area and of their choice rather than the one nearest to where they live - this in turn will have a huge effect on the transport infrastructure, state of the roads and the environment. I really don't think the Council have thought this through. I am totally opposed to these changes.

The policy seems clearer and considers the difficult financial context. However, it would seem sensible to offer 'paid for' school transport in areas where public transport is not available for pupils who don't meet the eligibility criteria for free transport. This would be more environmentally sustainable than forcing people into cars, and if organised properly should more than pay for itself. It would also allow parents more choice on school applications.

So unfair to remove catchment schools

Why remove catchment schools. Totally disgraceful.

Need to make the public aware of how distance is measured from home to school. There currently is no clarity here.

I am strongly against these changes, our current route to school (Keld to Richmond) is a B Road that is gritted and safe in bad weather. If these changes go ahead we and alot of other family's in our area will be forced to either send our children on dangerous / potentially life threatening ungritted routes to school (kirkby stephen or leyburn) or pay an extortionate amount of money to organise and pay for our own transport.

In my opinion, children should be educated in the nearest suitable school. Thereby sustaining village schools.. Please note that in the. scenarios of child P and Q. the word visual impaired should be used as opposed to blind.

It is very wordy and long. Some people may struggle with understanding it/bothering to read it

Has any thought been put into place about how many different services would be required to get children to these different schools based on mileage. Also how children would get to these schools if the roads are unsuitable for buses and taxis in the winter months as they may not be priority gritting routes and alternative route may be vastly longer to get to the so called nearest school

(I have sent a separate email to H2Stransportreview@northyorks.gov.uk)

No free school travel should be provided. It is a complete waste of public funds School children taking service buses (very short distances) are disruptive and rude to paying passengers and drivers. I have no idea why they are not encouraged to walk distances of 3-4 miles.

I am aware that travel to school is constantly under threat from either rising prices or an introduction of a fee. Unfortunately I do not understand the consultation papers enough to agree with them or not. My main concern is that travel to school remains free from where I am, or at least maintains the same price. It massively impacts on my decision as to where to send my children. I am in (Redacted) and sent my (Redacted) to skipton on the basis that it is free, unlike wharfedale or settle.

It will make access to the grammar schools for children in rural areas more difficult and only available to weathlier children and not be based on academic achievement.

The majority of parents and children in this area choose their school on the basis of the best educational fit for the child (ultimately in the best interests of our country as much as the individual child as successful children contribute more to society and require less local authority support in the long run), so they will not choose a school further away unless there is a very good reason to do so. All the local schools are quite different and which children will benefit most from which school in our local town has nothing to do with which school is closer to the child's home so it is not in the children's best interests to have transport available only to the closest school. Almost all parents choose a school in the local town, in fact those not doing so have not been eligible for local authority transport for years in any case so these are irrelevant to this consultation. So essentially the change to supporting travel for closest school only means that a child attending a school (in most cases) less than one mile further from home is no longer eligible for local authority transport which seems grossly unfair. Removing the travel option to children attending a school marginally further away will also definitely increase local traffic and pollution as parents drive their children to school instead. This is not in the children's interests, the interests of local residents, other road users or the interests of the environment. The council should be increasing pupils' use of school buses, not reducing it. It is naive not to expect the majority of parents to drive their children to school instead as this is the normal behaviour of parents in this area. In this day and age most families cannot afford for a parent to stay at home so those few children who walk instead will do so without parental support as most parents will have to rush off to work at this time in the morning (they might have time to drive their child to school but not to hang around for the half an hour extra it would take the child to walk). If something goes wrong on the child's way to school there is likely to be no one at home available to come and help them. Also, many parents have children of different ages at multiple schools and they rely heavily on one or more of their children going to school on the bus as they might be walking another child to school elsewhere at the same time. I feel the change in policy to closest school only is grossly irresponsible on so many levels that I am alarmed it is even being considered. If the policy is not about saving money on transport as it first seems but instead aims to take school choice away from local parents and children forcing children to attend their closest school this will also have adverse effects on these children in the long term. Parents don't choose schools further from home if the closer school offers the best education and support for their child. Ultimately any funding local authorities have for education and associated transport is there to help give each child the best education possible. Removing children's choice of local school is NOT in their best interests. If the council wishes to save money it might consider charging a supplement for the additional mile to those children attending a school further from home. If this fee is reasonable it will still be cheaper for parents than paying to drive their cars to school and back twice a day, not to mention their own loss of productivity for those two

hours of the day. Whilst this would still be harsh on parents already taking on additional costs from all directions, it would at least keep school children on buses and out of cars.

With the proposed changes, our 'nearest school' is not even in the same local authority or county. I should be able to send my children to a school within the authority I live and transportation should not be a factor in this decision. There are a number of reasons as to why a school may not be suitable for a child and such important decisions about their futures should not be based on mileage between home and school.

as a North Yorkshire resident and council taxpayer I should have the right to send my child to your nearest North Yorkshire school and receive free transport if that is my choice.

I think free school transport needs to be given to those who need it (affected by distance and/or disability) and should only be offered to those in the aforementioned sectors where they live in the catchment area for that school. Those outside the catchment who want their child to attend that school should sort transportation costs out themselves. I am entitled to it for my child (in catchment but live outside of walking distance) yet I choose not to use it, as we don't need to, so our funding for that is better spent elsewhere.

The school bus service is essential in getting my children to school. There aren't footpaths for the main roads and it would be incredibly dangerous for me to walk this with a 5 and 6 year old child. It also wouldn't allow me time to then get to work as I would be walking almost 12 miles a day

Where there is only one school in the catchment area this feels unfair as parents are left with no choice. In our car the sole catchment secondary school has been underperforming for years, has changed to an academy and back again and is notorious for bullying. It is not an attractive prospect for an education. Economic pressures mean that families will suffer in order to support a better education. It makes sense that there needs to be stricter control but there ought to be a choice of at least two schools with transport to best support childrens' education.

My (Redacted) have all attended Reeth school followed by Richmond school as I have always understood that children from Reeth and gunnerside school have always had a right to go to Richmond school which is also in sealedale your proposal is going to split up friendships forged at primary school. Friendships that in many cases have lasted a lifetime. Finally taking North Yorkshire children into Cumbria to school is just the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard of

School travel cost is so high that I genuinely do not know how I will afford to send my children to secondary school. My husband is classed as a higher income earner and we do not have the money for the bus pass in September. We have chosen the secondary school for very sensible reasons. I cannot believe as a two graduate household who have always worked hard, paid our taxes and been careful with money that we are in this position. You should be doing more to help people, not less. If you had SEND units in every school you would not have this problem. It would be better for families using them and your transport bill would be far lower. Seems a no-brainer to me in a very rural authority. Sadly you have neglected SEND provision and it's impacting your transport budget. Some joined up thinking is needed rather than slashing things even more.

Removal of catchment area for closest I don't agree with. People have bought homes because of catchment area and therefore it should still be taken into account. Our village school closed in 1989 and our parents got the choice of catchment area out of 5 schools by the Local Authority. It has been the same ever since. Generations going to the same school.

All parents should be asked to contribute to school transport if they don't transport their own children. Allow parents to pay for places on the free buses if they live on free transport routes. Stop using private hire taxis.

Eligibility criteria should NOT go beyond that set out by central government. The level of tax payers money (~£42m) being spent on these free travel services is unacceptable! Children should, other than those children with additional needs, be either taken to school by their parents or should use public transport. If parents wish the tax payer to fund such transport schemes for their children then NYC should introduce an additions element (£x/year) to Council Tax bills that is only applicable to those households containing school age children . Households and couples without children should not see their taxes going towards services from which they will never benefit!

The condition and suitability of roads for school transport must be considered, especially for the winter months. Many children do not attend the nearest school due to unsuitable and unsafe roads particularly in the upper dales. I also think serious consideration needs to be made to the effect this would have on rural schools. Again with particular regard to the upper dsles you may end of providing more transport not less to get children to the nearest school rather than providing one route to one school.

I feel Free Home to school transport should only be provided to in county schools, schools out of county but in catchment should not receive free transport. Free transport for primary children that are less than 1 mile from school is unnecessary

Instead of cutting back on services for children the council should enforce a cap on the price paid to transport providers. It is a standing joke that transport companies make huge profits from overcharging councils for this service. It would actually make more financial sense for the council to employ its own drivers, purchase its own fleet and stop penalising children for the transport companies' greed. The policy about removing free transport for catchment schools is ill-thought through, threatens some village schools close to the boundary and potentially places children at risk, particularly where the road to the nearest school (Kirby Stephen) is too dangerous for gritters during the worst winter months.

It is totally unacceptable to expect peers to attend one school and me another after attending primary school together. Education needs to be the whole experience not just in class

There are 2 practical secondary school options locally, this currently allow families to select the most appropriate for their child, based on size, distance and performance, you are in many case removing that parental choice of what is best for their child

Trying to change the criteria if you have changed schools is yet another disruptive of children's schooling. They have had 4 years of constant disruption and really I'd destroying their education

Distance alone should not be the main criterion. The road travelled should be taken into consideration especially in winter conditions. Will it be gritted or snow ploughed ? Is it suitable for a bus ? Have the people compiling these documents travelled these routes ? Will Reeth children be expected to go to Leyburn or Richmond ? Reeth has always been in the Richmond catchment.

There isn't an option for Whitley as part of this survey. I agree with the nearest school change but it should be within the North Yorkshire catchment. I'm aware that my children's nearest school is Campsamount therefore under the proposed suggestion they would get free travel to this school. However, as I pay (significant) council tax to North Yorkshire, I expect free travel to our nearest North Yorkshire school.

It is a shame that as a payer of council tax to North Yorkshire we would be forced to choose a school outside of our local area in order to meet the free transport criteria. It would be to the detriment to the community to force children in Ingleton, Bentham areas to be forced to choose QES. The distance is negligible and benefits would therefore be minimal in terms of cost reduction for the council. In an area where choice is hugely restricted due to school availability you're effectively removing any preference on basis of financial exclusion.

The document is very confusing to try and read. I'm used to reading these sorts of documents because of my work however I can imagine many parents will struggle and give up.

We live and are part of North Yorkshire council. I think it is disgusting that our children may have to enter a different county to go to school when they don't wish to. Also taking children away from our county schools!!

The proposals to be applied to children in Upper Swaledale (and Arkengarthdale), would put the children in danger when travelling to school in winter, or any times of icy or snowy weather. The routes to the schools they would have to attend with free travel are over the tops at high altitude and such roads are impassable and dangerous to travel on at certain times each year. The Stang road is not gritted all along the route. The road from Grinton to Wensleydale is over the tops on a narrow steep road. Similarly the road to Kirkby Stephen. Apart from the genuine travel risk, children would lose attendance days thus affecting their educational progress. The road to Richmond where most children travel to is kept gritted and at a relatively low level, ensuring safety in travel.

You won't get a school bus over Grinton Moor, The Stang or out to Kirkby!!!! You cannot split these children, they have all grown up together and now you want to split them into new schools midway through their secondary education. Do not do this!

I live near a 'special school' where pupils are brought and taken home in a taxi. It would appear that each taxi carries only one child. This is probably a safety issue, but is the cost of these separate taxis taken into account in the figures shown in the financial tables? If not, why not? The people, in this part of Craven, with bus passes have had many of the bus services that they have relied on in the past removed. Are you going to remove transport from the young as well? Not all parents have access to a car, 3 miles is a long way for an eight year old to walk to and from school. There may be younger children within a household - pity the poor parent who has to feed, dress and then take a young child and younger siblings on a journey that may well take an hour to walk, and then another to get home. AND then do it all again at the close of the school day. ABSOLUTELY RIDICULOUS. I am appalled at the lack of forethought from all concerned in preparing these proposals. If a car is available, it's not a very 'green' way of transporting pupils to and from school.

I am worried I am not going to be able to afford transport for my child to go to school

No consideration given in the new plan that the nearest school geographically does not mean the most accessible due to road and weather conditions.

Under your new proposal you are putting many children into very dangerous situations. The roads you expect them to travel on are often untreated in winter and are exposed to the elements which makes them impassable! Our children will so much school in the winter which is totally unacceptable! Not only that, my child would be sent to a school in a different local authority than ours and would have to cross the A66 road twice a day to get to school, that is totally unacceptable and I will NOT allow that for my child. Her safety is my number 1 priority. Your proposal is sickening, you haven't taken local rural roads and conditions into account. You should be ashamed!!

I feel communication with families is poor and some of the documentation is hard to understand. We've had some good and some very bad experiences with school transport due to the lack of communication and the many staff changes which our children do not cope well with

I support the proposed changes to nearest school. I wrote, via our governors many years ago saying how wasteful the present system is with free transport to catchment area and to nearest school which are often different. Transition will be tricky and I can see there are places in our rural area where nearest school may be a trickier journey than another one. The policy very definitely needs updating. Closure of schools over the years hasn't taken into consideration transport costs.

Parents and carers should have a choice of schools for all ages and transport to the nearest two or three schools at secondary stage should be provided free of charge. Presumably NYCC are receiving more money from council tax etc due to the massive rise in new homes, therefore it isn't sensible to be seen as penny pinching from parents.

I think it is disgraceful that children may not be able to access or afford transport to the nearest school in their local authority in the future. This will have an overwhelming negative impact on children and families that already have children going to a school in North Yorkshire eg: settle college, who then have to use a different school with transport in another county. School holidays will be different. It's clear the proposed changes have been made without taking into consideration families who may have children in two different schools in two different counties. Children may even not have any choice in which secondary school they want to attend, which will have a detrimental impact upon mental health and wellbeing which is already in crisis.

We live in North Yorkshire, my daughter goes to a school in North Yorkshire but with this latest proposal she wouldn't be entitled to free transport and would only get the free transport if she went across the border into Cumbria because that is 7 miles away as opposed to the one in County that is 12. How does that make sense ?

If the proposed changes to the main eligibility criterion to be nearest school (with places available) were to go ahead, I think that many children will be disadvantaged by being forced into going to a school which may not meet their educational and social needs. Council tax payers should not have to send their children out of their community to go to a school in another county because it is closer. Council tax payers pay a large amount of money every year and expect the services of their own council at schools in their home county. The council should look at contract pricing and efficiencies before implementing policy changes which will affect such a large demographic of North Yorkshire residents.

Closest secondary school is 6.7 miles away from us but 2 counties away being in Cumbria. Settle College is 9 miles away yet in the same county. This should be available for us. Our eldest is at Settle College now so why should we have to send his (Redacted) to a different secondary school, which is over subscribed and in a different county and not to the undersubscribed school in the same county? This then looks bad on the hard working families that can not afford the extra expenses. For generations Settle has been the school after both middle schools. It should still be the school for the same primary schools the middle schools were then to send pupils too.

It's an absolute disgrace

We moved to (Redacted) last year. We could not get a place for our children in our nearest school (QES in Cumbria) therefore our nearest choice was Settle College. North Yorkshire have failed to take account of the fact that QES is the most oversubscribed school in the area and children are not automatically guaranteed a place there. Now that my older children attend Settle and are happy, I intend to send their younger siblings to the same school. Especially since the school holidays in the different counties do not match up. I think the council is trying to simplify an issue which is not simple at all. I live in North Yorkshire and therefore should be guaranteed transport to a school in North Yorkshire. What's the point in having a county area otherwise? I would implore the council to reconsider their action in this matter, specifically in our area, so close to the council border.

Settle is the nearest school on OUR COUNTY the county in which we pay council tax for. QES is a massive school already and not suited to a lot of children. I know my children would not have been happy there going from a small primary school (especially as you closed the middle schools which would have made the transition easier) I would not be able to afford the bus fare. It is an absolutely disgusting proposal. We have already had so many services taken away from us. And now this.

Absolutely disgusting! What happened to school being a personal choice a choice for each individual with free transport to transport the student to and from school! Living in Low Bentham 2 children been through Settle College 1 currently attending & 1 to attend - yet your telling me my nearest school and ONLY choice for free transport will be Settle! How am I to fund it also round work if I am to transport myself! The distance between the 2 schools is so close - bring back freedom of choice for these students & give them a safe free travel to and from - who's going to take the punishment when a parent can't afford to pay the travel expenses??

I feel that transport should be provided to the nearest school within the county in which the child lives

I think it is absolutely disgusting that this is even being discussed, children should not be suffering all for cutting costs. If you want to save money reduce the amount of money paid to all the pen pushers at North Yorkshire who make these stupid decisions. Settle College has always been the first choice for families in the Ingleton and Bentham area going through the Middle School system but yet again another crazy decision made by the council closing the middle schools. QES is already at capacity so how do you expect it to take anymore children? We pay our council tax to North Yorkshire and get absolutely nothing in return, pay for police and there is no police in Ingleton or Bentham and now you are depriving our children of a free choice choosing a school that they wish to attend and affecting their education as well. QES is a massive school and some kids just can not cope with such an overwhelming environment and shouldn't have to. The world's gone mad, it's an absolute joke you should be ashamed.

The proposed changes would mean my children's nearest secondary school would be in a different county. To get there they would have to travel over a moor road which in winter doesn't tend to get gritted and often is blocked with snow. This would have a major impact on their school attendance as it just wouldn't be safe to travel there. The children in the area currently attending secondary school travel down the dale, staying on well gritted roads which is much safer. This has been the case for many decades. I also think it's unfair sending them into a different county when they have built up friendship groups within the primary school and other schools in the area that they are clustered with. I myself struggled with the changes from primary to secondary and having the support of my friends going with me definitely helped. I understand you are having to try to cut costs but surely our children's safety has to come first. I hope you reconsider and look at some situations individually rather than looking at North Yorkshire as a whole. Many thanks

I think it's disgusting that we live in North Yorkshire but you are expecting our children to go to a school in Cumbria because it's the nearest and is going to save you money. If I wanted to live in Cumbria then I would.

I have significant concerns in respect of the policy whereby transport will only be provided to the nearest school. Large parts of NYC operate a selective school system, undertaken via the Eleven-Plus test. This system already benefits wealthier parents, who have the resources to support additional exam coaching. The travel amendments will make the 'wealth = advantage' position far worse, with substantial socio-economic consequences. A student can currently obtain free transport to one of the NYC Grammar Schools, even if they have a closer non-selective school. By removing this free transport, those on lower incomes will not be able to attend the Grammar School, due to the significant financial burden of additional transport costs. This change will further advance the opportunities given to wealthier households, who can afford the transport costs to access the Grammar School. Those on lower incomes will be excluded. We would suggest some form of free transport is maintained for those on lower incomes, or the transport cost to be means tested, to ensure lower income families have access to the Grammar Schools. We would encourage you to review the potentially unintended consequences of this proposal, as they may well be more severe than expected.

Transport costs will go up over time because things cost more over time..in the same way we pay more council tax each year, the council needs to pay more for transport. This proposal will have an incredibly negative impact on our local secondary schools to such an extent that I genuinely believe Settle College will close or be taken over by an academy chain. Whilst this absolves the LA of any responsibility for the school (yay for the local authority!) it is not a good thing for the community, staff or pupils. This is very clearly an attack on these schools that will lose out due to the border and new rule of closest school only for transport. Why North Yorkshire wants to destroy these schools and give the pupils to other local authorities or academy chains is beyond me. We will do everything we can to save these schools and that certainly means keeping transport going to their local North Yorkshire, catchment school, not one across borders just so North Yorkshire can wipe the hands clean.

This would mean my child would be going out of their catchment area. Along with the fact the road to this school is too treacherous for the gritters to even go over. Therefore so much education would be missed. I know this is due to budget but it would cost more money having numerous buses all going in different directions rather than having the one going the same way. Surely?

I understand the rationale for this new policy- looking for ways to save money is of course important. However, the specific circumstances of Selby High School and Brayton, being schools that are very close together, mean that this policy could have a profound impact, without saving any money in this particular case. This is because almost all the students who currently get free transport for Selby, would also require free transport for Brayton if that was their closest school. Therefore, the only impact would be making those students less likely to choose Selby High School. We know from our Open Evenings that many families have a difficult decision, as they see both Brayton and Selby as excellent schools. At the moment they often choose Selby. I do believe that if there was a financial sacrifice in making this choice, especially at the current time, that it would be a strong factor in school choice. It is impossible to judge the precise impact of this policy without having information about students currently attending Brayton whose closest school is Selby. However, for Selby, nearly half of the students who currently get free transport to Selby, live closer to Brayton. That is over a 100 students. Once again, I need to point out that almost all of these students would still require free transport if they chose Brayton, meaning a negligible saving (if any). In my view, any policy needs to consider the specific case of having two schools that are so close together, and if necessary have a local policy agreement. I would ask that Governors are provided with detailed, accurate data about potential impact, including about Brayton.

We live slightly closer to Wetherby (West Yorkshire so out of catchment) than our nearest catchment school. To have a policy to be eligible for travel that the school has to be the nearest one even though my child can't go to that school as it's out of catchment is preposterous. I'm frankly astonished it could even be considered. It very clearly should be a policy that it's the nearest catchment school / one allocated at admissions. You are removing any choice to be eligible for free transport.

Unclear what proposed changes entail

Disgraceful as usual from North Yorkshire council you should be ashamed of yourselves

We pay council taxes for what??? We had awful road conditions, bin and continuously missed on collection days ... the list goes on. Maybe address the numerous taxis travelling from Burnley and further a field daily that come to collect local children to then travel a couple of miles to drop them off to then make the long journey back to Burnley and similar places. Total waste of petrol!! We are once again being stung by the system! We only had two local schools to choose from as is was and now the choice is being taken away. People CANNOT afford to pay travel expenses especially when most will have more than one child to pay for!! It is outrageous, unfair and criminal to propose this change!! To arrange a meeting on a Thursday day time is also a sly move made by the council! Everything is corrupt!!!

This takes away from a pupil having a choice of where they would feel comfortable to progress their future. Some suffer from displacement, anxiety and many other not seen forms of mental health problems that will not be taken into consideration if they are forced to take the nearest school that could completely ruin their futures. Some schools are too big for the quieter more timid pupils, where as others may prosper from that, but it should be a choice not just a general blanket of one fits all!

Settle college has always been the secondary school for the area. Previously parents from the area had to make special arrangements for children to apply and attend QES it was not an automatic choice. Even though it is a closer school be 2 miles it is not a local school as you have to pass 2 county borders to attend. Our younger children should be able to access their secondary school in their home county as freely as their siblings.

The nearest secondary school with places available to our village of Ingleton would be Queen Elizabeth School (Cumbria) The nearest secondary school with places available to our village of Ingleton in North Yorkshire is Settle High School. I believe the proposed amendment would force the majority of pupils from Ingleton Primary, Bentham Primary, and other smaller schools located in North Yorkshire to travel out of County, and it would be a huge loss to Settle High school, which accepts a large amount of pupils from these Primary schools (including (Redacted) over 20 years ago!)

We can walk to school at the moment which is great. I am worried when my children are secondary school age if they get into a Skipton grammar school. Would they get free bus places even though their nearest school is Upper Wharfedale? We may not be able to afford the bus fares and therefore this could have a negative impact on their education if a grammar school is the best option for them.

The proposed travel policy is taking away choice from a number of children in the future. The change would impact greatly on the area which i live and also the currwnt high school my children attend. Thia proposal could potentially effect ongoing numbers at Settle college and then impact on the schools funding and the overall local community

Due to the close proximity of Selby High School and Brayton Academy this new policy will take away the choice of secondary school for many students. It may also affect the pupil numbers attending both schools and in turn affect budgets. This will have a knock on effect to staffing structures as less budget would mean redundancies. We see huge invoices for SEN taxis requiring sign off here at the school, surely there is a more cost effective way of offering this service. One taxi owner actually puts on his invoice not to show the driver the costs which tells us that he is charging extortionate amounts. A lot of the transport companies see a school tender as a blank cheque. During the teacher strikes taxis were were still paid as the reason given by NYC was they were contracted, however I believe a taxi firm could have got other business at this time. If we compare to school staff are not paid during school holidays and they cannot get other work during this time, it seems we have no control over their charges or conditions and perhaps why costs are spiraling out of control. What considerations for cost have been made when students have managed moves to neighboring schools, will NYC then foot the bill of taxi's if the student is out of area. Lots to think about, I think it would be a huge error in taking this service away. Perhaps look at a concessionary rate for travel (free for FSM). We have spend a lot of time educating students of sustainable travel to school and this may drive the students on out with villages to be driven in by car, undoing all our good work and also increasing traffic to an already congested town.

If my child has to go to a lower rated school that is not good Bring them up to the standard of Ripon Grammar School

My children live in (Redacted). Under the new proposals their nearest secondary school is Leyburn and therefore that is where their free transport would be to (under the new policy). However, historically, children from this area attend Richmond school, and that is where I would like my children to attend. I am concerned about Winter weather and road conditions associated with higher level routes to schools beyond Swaledale, and the potential impact on school attendance. Under the proposal it could mean that children currently attending one primary school, would attend 3 different secondary schools. This would have a negative effect as there are benefits to the children of attending the same secondary school as peers, especially during transition from KS2 to KS3. There would be less community cohesion (both for families and friends) through attending different schools. Therefore there would be considerable cost implications incurred by my children attending a non catchment school. I also may have to look to move out of the area so that they could obtain free transport to Richmond school which would be our school of choice.

If these changes goes a head my child will then be given transport to a school in Cumbria where they will not know anyone instead of going to the same school as others in his class and older siblings, I think the move to secondary school is hard enough for children without not having friends around them, also the road I over the tops are unsafe over winter and can be blocked for weeks with snow. As mine would've only child from up dale to go to Kirkby Stephen this transport would surly cost more then sending him to same school as which siblings and neighbours go to there is also add school uniform cost as wouldn't be able to use siblings school jumpers and stuff I think all this is a very unfair on the children please leave as is

Nothing further to add

I feel that you are playing with children's education. I currently have one of my children in Brayton Academy, my other two children have now left that school. I have had to pay for transport for all three of children and it has cost me a fortune. The reason for this was due to me choosing a better education for my children.

Problems for children who live 'up dale' as Richmond School won't be there nearest school.

Does not deal adequately with cross Council border issues

Like many others in this area we have lived in Craven district our entire lives. Paid the council tax at the highest rates for the area, paid the extortionate house prices to live in this area mainly to keep my child in a North Yorkshire school now to be told that I have to pay extra to get my children who lives in North Yorkshire to a school in North Yorkshire! I object!

Free places on buses inside North Yorkshire vs £800 a year for those even slightly out of it is disproportionate

It's disgusting that children won't be able to get free transport to a school in the same county that you live in

The proposal hasn't been thought through thoroughly and in the area that we live the vast majority will be very strongly opposed to it being implemented. Whilst appreciating money needs to be saved in the current climate, this proposal, if approved, will create more problems than it would resolve and ultimately, avoidable, additional expense. We live in Yorkshire but are very close to the Lancashire and Cumbrian borders. If in future children from our local area will only receive transport assistance for their nearest Secondary school it is likely NYC will be paying to send these pupils to a different county, (Cumbria). A completely ridiculous scenario which would make no sense whatsoever when the difference in travelling mileages between an ideal school in North Yorkshire, the school in Cumbria and the students residing in our area, are virtually the same.

Think SEND proposals should remain as is ie after referral done as the new proposal duplicates the process causing extra resource cost

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.

'Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.'

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.

Our school, community, staff, and pupils would be massively effected by this and it could mean the closure of the school. Many pupils who need a smaller and secure environment to work in will not be able to make that choice in the future and will suffer in consequence. Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.

As a parent of a child approaching the need for post 16 education there needs to be travel provisions put in place as our nearest establishment for this are not within walking distance it's either a 20 mins bus ride if they provide the courses my child needs or 1 hour on the bus this will cost us approx £1000 per school year. Transport distance needs to be considered in terms of areas and safety of the children currently they walk 2 miles to school along a main poorly lit road in all weathers. Often soaked to the bone by the time they reach the school.

I live in (Redacted) and both (Redacted) go to Settle College. Under the new proposals they wouldn't have been eligible for free transport to Settle College because QES in Kirkby Lonsdale, Cumbria is nearer. I am very concerned for the future of Settle College if this goes ahead and for the potential impact on other parents. The difference in distance from Ingleton to Settle or Ingleton to Kirkby Lonsdale is not actually much and would have virtually no impact on your transport costs because the bus that currently goes to Settle would still have to be paid for but to Kirkby Lonsdale instead. In addition QES is a much larger school than Settle College and probably doesn't have room for extra students. I chose Settle College partly because of its more caring smaller environment and Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area. I also have concerns for children in Settle if Settle College were to decline because of this, then you would need to provide more transport to get them to Skipton to the nearest Secondary School. I observe that your costs have probably gone up because of the large number of smaller taxis that are operating for small numbers of students and this is where you should look to change things.

I understand and, indeed, applaud the rationale for this new policy; looking for ways to save money is important. However, the specific circumstances of Selby High School and Brayton [and perhaps other geographically close schools], mean that this policy could have a serious adverse impact, without actually saving any money in this particular case. This is due to the fact that almost all the students who currently get free transport for Selby, would also require free transport for Brayton if that was their closest school. Therefore, the only impact would be making those students less likely to choose Selby High School. We know from our Open Evenings that many families have a difficult decision, as they see both Brayton and Selby as excellent schools. At the moment they often choose Selby. I do believe that if there was a financial sacrifice in making this choice, especially at the current time, that it would be a strong factor in school choice. It is impossible to judge the precise impact of this policy without having information about students currently attending Brayton whose closest school is Selby. However, for Selby, nearly half of the students who currently get free transport to Selby, live closer to Brayton. That is over a 100 students. Once again, I need to point out that almost all of these students would still require free transport if they chose Brayton, meaning a negligible saving (if any). While agreeing with the objective in principle, any policy needs to consider the specific case of having two schools that are so close together, and if necessary have a local policy agreement. This could be achieved by including a clause excluding schools that are, for example, less than one mile apart. Thank you.

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area

I fully believe in and support Settle College. 'Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area'

'Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.

I understand that currently a huge 75% of students at Settle College rely on transport to school. Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers, potentially having a severe impact on the college's ability to continue delivering this offer. The proposed savings for NYCC would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the negative consequences for Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.

'Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.

The proposed changes are naive and ill-considered. We love in (Redacted). When we moved here our children were in (Redacted). Our nearest secondary school is Queen Elizabeth School Kirkby Lonsdale. However they did not have space for both our children. We therefore chose Settle College. Under your proposals we would now have to pay for our children to attend the only secondary school in the area that had space for our two boys. We have (Redacted) who are due to go to secondary school in a couple of years too, and given to the proposed policy, we might have to send them to Queen Elizabeth School, even though their (Redacted) go to Settle. The proposed policy is ill-considered and will penalise and make life harder for ordinary families like ourselves who have not had any realistic choice where to send our children to school. Our nearest school did not have space for (Redacted), only one, and, (Redacted), we could hardly send them to school in different directions. I really can't believe that the council is proposing this - is life not hard enough for working parents to these days with the cost of living crisis?

It is ridiculous that North Yorkshire county council would fund transport to a secondary school out of the county but not fund transport to a secondary school only 3 extra miles within the county, the provision of education that settle college provides the children of Ingleton and the proposed effected area is outstanding and it seems the children living in North Yorkshire are being denied the right to be educated within their county. A county that has different holiday periods which will effect siblings and therefore the income capacity and ability to work of the parents. As a council tax payer I expect my council tax to be used for the best interest of all the residents in North Yorkshire, however paying to transport our children to a school in another county to save absolutely nothing is of no benefit to anyone in North Yorkshire.

As a parent with children currently attending Settle College, I am writing to express my urgent concerns regarding the proposed change to North Yorkshire Council's home-to-school transport policy. The current policy, which provides funding for the transport of students living within the catchment area of Settle College, has been instrumental in ensuring access to education for our children. However, the proposed change to restrict funding only to students for whom Settle College is their nearest school will have significant implications for families like mine. Settle College is not just a place of education for our children; it is a supportive community where they receive a high-quality education alongside invaluable pastoral support. As a parent, I have witnessed firsthand the positive impact that Settle College has had on my children's academic progress and overall well-being. However, the proposed change threatens to disrupt this supportive environment and limit the opportunities available to our children. For families already facing financial challenges, the prospect of having to arrange and fund transportation to a different school could pose a significant burden, potentially depriving our children of the educational experience they deserve. Furthermore, the proposed decline in pupil numbers could have adverse effects on the resources and quality of education offered at Settle College, further impacting the well-being and academic success of all students. I urge you to reconsider this proposed change and to take into account the concerns of parents like myself who value the educational opportunities and supportive community provided by Settle College. Preserving access to Settle College for all eligible students, regardless of proximity, is essential for ensuring that every child has the chance to thrive and succeed. Thank you for considering my concerns, and I hope for a positive resolution that prioritizes the best interests of our children and our community.

'Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.'

'Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.'

this proposal will significantly impact smaller secondary school's like Settle College which if numbers drop the varied curriculum which is now on offer won't be impacting all pupils attending the school

I think the proposed policy will mean that children whose parents cannot afford to pay for school transport will be very adversely affected by the change to only allowing free transport to the nearest "suitable" school. This is because it does not allow the parent to decide which is a suitable school for their child and surely the parent is the one who knows best what is suitable for their child. It unfairly gives an added advantage to the already advantaged children of well off parents. In the area where I live, Bentham, there are 2 senior schools in the catchment area one in Kirkby Lonsdale and one in Settle. Settle College is slightly further away but is the one that traditionally most families have chosen to send their children to. Bentham is a very close knit community and many of the families have lived in the area for generations. Settle is a relatively small school in North Yorkshire where the staff get to know all the children individually QES is a large school in Cumbria not suitable for many of the Bentham children. It is possible that the policy may reduce the number of children who can attend Settle College so much that it would send the wonderful School into decline. QES would I think become oversubscribed. I therefore think Bentham school transport should be considered as a special case and transport to both the schools should remain free. I think the added cost to keep the busing children the slightly longer distance to Settle would be negligible. It should also be considered that the school bus is the the only bus from Bentham to Settle and it will need to be kept running for the children from Bentham still eligible to get free transport to the school. Please save this free service it is very important for the children in the Bentham Area and for the future of Settle College.

Not all schools can fairly accommodate send children and that means going away from the nearest suitable school for the benefit of the child and their needs. This restricts the ability of families to work if there is only one car in the home because it must be available for school runs. With transport both parents would be able to take employment. Something beneficial for all. Something that cannot happen if only one parent can drive and undertake the car journey. Surely it would make economic sense to be able to offer transport in these circumstances as it would allow families with children with SEND who are better placed in a particular setting a better opportunity for education and also a better home life as both parents can work and contribute to society and the economy.

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.'

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.'

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.

The proposed changes to the travel policy will have a devastating impact on the choices for parents at Ingleton Primary School. The current challenges around the cost of living will give them no choice but to send their child to an out of authority school. Settle College provides an amazing offer as a school with a wide diverse curriculum⁸⁸ and strong pastoral care. The changes to the travel policy will result in a drop of student numbers having a devastating impact long term on the quality of education and existence of the school with a negative impact on the town of Settle itself. Reconsider this proposal and maintain choice for our parents. Settle is a school to be proud of.

I have two children who will need transport to secondary school in the future. Currently we are a 3 minute walk from their primary school so transport is not an issue. A change in the policy would mean that our children might have to attend a school that would not be the best fit for them socially and academically. There is no way with the current cost of living crisis that we could afford to transport our children ourselves due to our jobs (we both work shifts, including nights) and we couldn't afford a transportation service for them. We urge the council to please reconsider this policy for the sake of all the children living in rural villages who dont have a massive choice of schools and the ability to get to school easily.

The planned changes to school transport only being free to the nearest school will be extremely detrimental not only to children & families but also to schools within North Yorkshire. I live and pay my council tax to North Yorkshire I expect to be able to send my child to a school in North Yorkshire, not be forced to send them out of the area due to the cost of school transport.

This may need investigating further as from what I can understand using simple common sense it will cost NYCC more over the next 4 years. EXAMPLE A local family in Burton in Lonsdale, have just secured a place for their 3rd child, of 4, at QES. They however are struggling for the transport. This is because the school busses for that route are currently at their maximum capacity and will continue to be into the next school year. In turn this is going to mean a further type of transport is needed, when the current year 5's then are to attend a second school bus for that route will then be required. In the meantime the current capacity for Settle College transport is also at full capacity, with some children at either school, having to take the service bus. This has to be paid for by NYCC. This means that the next 5 years it is likely, with only a few children leaving school each year from each bus route. A bus will still need to be provided to Settle College at least full size for the next 3 years before reducing to a smaller after that yet another bus/ mini bus will need to be provided on each route to QES as the service bus can not guarantee places for the high amount of student's. Service busses in the area are that far apart in timing if a child misses the first service bus they will then not arrive at school until around 11am. So this is going to mean at least another 3 vehicles need to be provided by the council yet only reducing the size of other vehicles for a number of years. This will cost more for transport until the service is no longer needed to be provided for the current year 6 students when they finish school at Settle. I hope you find this interesting to look into and can see that financially it is not viable to keep children from attending their preferred school in the county they live.

I live in an area where only Settle College currently offers free transport from home to school (currently I'd have to take my children 6/7 miles to Ingleton to access free bus for QES) With the change QES would have to offer free transport from home to school for all the children in our area, which would be up to eight miles out of the area they currently transport from. I think it makes sense to look after your own county school as it would have a negative effect on Settle College if this proposal was to go ahead. I understand we should only be offered free transportation to our school. Why are we not looking after our own county school?

If the amendment to 'nearest school' criterion is adopted, the schools in question for many families in our area would result in placing QES under significant additional pressure when it is already over-subscribed due to a large catchment area, and Settle College, a good secondary establishment, would be likely to lose applications through no fault of their own. We would be sad to see this happen and it would make our own choice very difficult as we are a low-income family and would struggle to pay for transport, but would want our son to attend Settle College. Due to its much smaller size it will suit him far better as he has ASD and finds large groups and busy places overwhelming. Thank you for taking our thoughts into consideration.

It is concerning that the number of students able to attend Settle College will be impacted significantly and if as a result of falling numbers there is no local secondary school new families will not move here and those children living here face a long bus journey or their parents will have to meet the cost of private education at Giggleswick School.

Providing transport to the nearest suitable school, regardless of county is going to have a significant negative impact on pupils and of schools in the local area. Why are NY providing transport to a Cumbria school and not a local NY school. This is going to have a detrimental impact on Settle College, one of your own schools!

I think that children should go to the nearest school, what's the point of them spending hours of their own time per week travelling further to school than necessary, all the extra haulage of children to far away schools impacts on the environment, road conditions, traffic pollution and our childrens health. The sooner this is implemented the better.

Settle College offers young people a broad & balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.

'Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.' If this goes ahead I can easily see a time in the future that Settle College will close due to pupil numbers being so low that it becomes financially unviable for NYC to keep I open.

There needs to be clearer guidance on what would happen for schools which are very close to each other. If a student is choosing between two good schools and there's only a few hundred metres between them, it means that travel eligibility would suddenly become a much bigger factor than before. Especially as if someone needed free transport to school 1, then they would also need it for school 2, therefore no money overall would be saved while decreasing the amount of students who would be able to go to school 1. I believe there needs to be a local policy agreement put in place for situations such as these, and more detailed data needs to be supplied about the ramifications of this policy on such schools.

I am seriously concerned about the financial impact such a strategy will have on Settle College: there will undoubtedly be a fall in pupils, as many families would not be able to fund school travel and so would be forced to enrol their children in schools which are unlikely to be as excellent as Settle College: fewer pupils = less money to fund teaching and pastoral budgets, so ultimately all the pupils will be impacted negatively.

We run a farm and work incredibly long hours, we do not have flexibility or finances to transport our children to secondary school. There is also no bus service at all where we live so if your proposals were to go ahead unless we paid we would be solely responsible for transport to a school generations of our family have attended transported from our addresses. We live on the side of a dangerous road (Redacted), there is no way it would be safe to walk along to get to a bus stop even if such service existed. The fact that our children would have to pay to be transported to upper Wharfedale a school within catchment is an utter disgrace. The council should be ashamed of themselves that they are even considering this as yet again children and families in rural areas are being negatively impacted by council cuts.

Another massive rise in council tax and your wanting to remove more services, absolute joke. We are struggling to make ends meet while your mismanagement of budgets just puts more pressure on us.

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area. In addition and as a parent, the choice of school is impacted negatively.

'Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.'

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.' This also applies to all rural school ultimately

I think the consultation period needs to be extended to allow NYC to ensure that their facts and figures are correct. Based on information provided to both my own and neighbouring schools, we believe the information on potential impact on our school(s) to be incorrect. We believe this because we can make accurate projections based on the families that we work with day in, day out. The potential changes have the potential to reduce our NOR - the catchment area essentially becomes irrelevant. The potential changes would remove the ability for some parents to make a choice of secondary school for their child based on need, instead determined by potential cost. The potential changes could signal the end of our only secondary school in North Craven, this would have wide ranging consequences. As a Headteacher I am aware of the transport arrangements for our children, past and present. The transport arrangements are costing significant amounts on unnecessary money. I believe this should be looked at first to see what savings could be made.

Not suitable

This feels like blackmail, my high achieving child be will in secondary school within 18 months & the whole new system stinks. Why should I need to apply to an appalling school out of my district & hope it's over subscribed to receive a free bus pass for my child to my much preferred school which would be far more suitable ?! We have several school in different directions in different authorities which currently have different forms of school transport. There is no direct bus route to some of these school, therefore if no school bus if provided parents will drive their children to school - which I am sure is against everything that this council stands for, meaning many more cars making trips & clogging the roads & atmosphere with fumes! Unfortunately Eggborough doesn't have a high school within a few miles & there is no path out of the village in any direction, we are stuck without transport of any kind. Local bus services are inadequate so a car is essential & the council seemingly encouraging this in a revamped school transport policy. This change is also a disappointment because it prevents emerging independence of school children which a school bus brings, a certified driver for safety but managing their own time & movement into school. Surely a school bus is a human right, especially since we live in a large & growing village, putting children to a disadvantage in this economic climate & limiting school choices is an utter disgrace & I no longer feel proud to be living within the district of North Yorkshire!

If these changes are carried out then better public transport needs to be in place, buses in Embsay don't start until 9am which doesn't cover schools or work times. This is a vital necessity. Walking is possible but also dangerous along the 60mph road!

Should charge for all school transport within N Yorkshire but also provide (on a charging basis) for children who live outside N Yorkshire but attend a school in N Yorkshire. It is scandalous how poor and unfit for purpose some of the private companies who provide such services are.

If the proposal for the 'local' school transport goes ahead, it is not safe for my grandchildren to travel over Tailbrigg to Kirkby Stephen and they will miss many days of school. We live at (Redacted) When children started being encouraged to leave their Primary schools to attend a Secondary School in the 60s, not long before I was due to start, parents were promised that transport would be provided to Richmond Schools. The catchment went down the dale due to a common sense route. This common sense approach should not be changed and transport to Richmond School, should be maintained. The route to Wensleydale School includes a high route or lower priority gritting routes. Travelling 25 miles to Richmond is much safer than travelling 15 miles to Kirkby Stephen. Please can an exemption be made for this area and the current catchment area remain.

Our nearest secondary school would be in a different local authority. This would mean that our children would not go to the same secondary school as their peers. This would have a negative effect on friendships formed over their time at primary school. Furthermore the road over to our nearest secondary school is not gritted in bad weather condition and this would mean our children would miss many days of school as it wouldnt be safe to travel. I strongly believe that free transport should be in place for children to their catchment school.

I feel the routes need looking at for the child's nearest school because our nearest school is in a different county and would not be fit to travel in winter months!. The child should be able to go with there peers when they move to secondary school rather than unsettling them and having to make new friends in a school where they will probably know nobody.

I am concerned about the winter weather and road conditions associated with higher level routes to secondary schools beyond Swaledale, and the potential impact on school attendance. I would like to highlight the benefits of attending the same secondary school as peers, especially during transition from KS2 to KS3 I also highlight the community cohesion (both for families and friends) through attending the same school Finally the cost implications incurred by attending a catchment school need to be taken into consideration.

The travel to school policy is ridiculous, all these children will have to go to schools outside of our county taking our choice away. If we loose settle college it would have such a negative effect on our community. There's 100's of children in settle and surrounding that need our school and I for one would not be putting my children on a bus to send them to Skipton if that ended up being our nearest school.

Of course, as a governor I am very conscious of the need for the local authority to take finances into account. However, the proposed changes fail to make sensible and reasonable consideration for all schools in the selby area....and particularly my school. In the selby area we have three secondary schools very close to each other and parents/carers make decisions on the appropriate school based on what each school offers. Certainly, that does differ - SHS offers a broader curriculum than either of the other schools. The seemingly arbitrary measurement of distance (they can be so negligible as to fail to make any worthwhile savings for the authority) could have a detrimental effect on parental choice and, pertinently, on numbers of students attending SHS, with the attendant loss of revenue for a school that strives to offer an excellent and broad curriculum.

This survey is prohibitive it is directed at parents only. Impacts go beyond that family friends who may be involved in a variety of ways supporting parents. To limit responses is controlling by NYC. This is a ridiculous proposal. Upper Swaledale is unique your blanket approach is totally unsuitable here. All three routes to the new schools are unsafe and dangerous during Winter, the diversions on gritted road are excessive and will impact on children's Education. Why are you changing something that has worked well for 70 years. I myself travelled to school in Richmond in the sixties. Travel to Kirkby Stephen is unthinkable in Winter. Unless you are prepared to make significant investment in the road to Kirkby Stephen and for Cumbria to do the same without it you are placing children in danger. All 3 routes are over high ungritted routes. Driving the roads in Summer is not straight forward. I implore you to make Upper Swaledale an exception.

The policy change could see the LA providing transport to academy schools out of county. This would have a negative effect, ie falling rolls on nearby LA maintained schools. The LA would be providing resources, school transport, to support an academy in a neighbouring county at the expense of it's own Maintained school. My concern, as a parent, is the strategic impact this will have on my local school. Has any consideration been given to the viability of 6th form provision if you provide transport to move children out of county? Surely NYC's first priority should be maintaining your own maintained schools?

I think that group transport rather than individual journeys should be considered to save costs. I do not think it is appropriate that children can attend schools that are not their closest and have their transport funded. This is a choice factor and if the closest schools are rejected by their care givers, they alone should be responsible for providing transport.

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.

Our current catchment school is not our closest school. This change in policy makes no sense why would you have catchment schools and then only pay to closest which is not catchment.

'Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.'

Where on earth are you going to find all the additional transport providers. We struggle atm

Our parents have enough to pay for now and now this. So unfair

Laying on transport from a single location to multiple suitable schools instead of the nearest suitable school is costly due to the need of providing multiple buses or taxis, and so inefficient. If parents want to send their child to a school that is not their nearest then it is fine that they should bare the cost of doing so.

My daughter is in effect being forced away from her catchment school, where she has transition days, links and primary school has a relationship, to a school, closer by a couple of miles that we have never even heard of, no relationship to her primary, rated worse by OFSTED and not even in North Yorkshire, to who i pay a massive amount of council tax. There is no public transport from our village of Whitley so no other way of getting her to the school of our choice. The school budgets have been decimated as much as council's so cant expect them to pick up the slack. Dreadful decision caused by the cuts forced by the government that my council tax is already paying for as it goes up up up and the services provided go down down to nothing. Now our children have to pay too.

Clearly savings must be made if this is the 3rd largest cost area. I don't think the policy is hard enough, the SEND proportion of the budget is out of control mushrooming from £6m to £20m, this is way in excess of inflation. I have experience of pupils at Ryedale school getting £800 discretionary awards for travel despite them living well outside this school's catchment area. This is not a specialist SEND school & the pupils have no physical difficulties in using the chargeable private school buses which they used happily and without issue for more than 2 years, before the profligate council gave them an award. This basically enabled the child concerned to get a private chauffeur service from door to school, primarily so that the parent concerned didn't have to leave her house and transport her own child to the local bus stop, which is a mere 5 minutes away. This award has been misused as a privilege rather than a necessity, due to the council's far too all-encompassing SEND policy. The child is dyslexic, and has been absolutely capable of getting on a school bus if her mother can be bothered to drop her off at the normal bus stop. For context I pay £700+ PA Per child for a bus to get to Ryedale as we live outside catchment - I feel others who choose to send their child to a non catchment area school should make their own travel arrangements unless they attend a specialist school or have clear physical barriers to travel (wheelchair users, blind etc).

If this proposal goes ahead I will have one child forced to attend a school they may not choose to as we wouldn't be able to afford transport to a North Yorkshire school even though we reside in North Yorkshire. My eldest attends settle college so I would then have a split of secondary schools to content with too. This will have a huge negative impact on settle college with children from Bentham primary school and our children will not have any say in where they would like to continue their education

The proposal has not taken into account specific situations that can affect certain schools. This is true for Settle College. The fundamentals in this one approach will question the viability of having a secondary school in north Craven. Reducing the numbers will have a significant impact on the students, parents and teachers and other stakeholders, short term, medium term and long term. The negatives have not been clearly communicated to all people, facts and figures are incorrect and the process has not actually effectively asked the students what they want therefore this process and proposal is misleading. Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.'

We wouldn't be able to choose a North Yorkshire school even though we reside in North Yorkshire our nearest school would be Cumbria.

There certainly is. Schools in North Yorkshire have been systematically shut down or, the latest, mothballed to such a great extent that the Council bear sole responsibility for transporting children so affected to far away educational establishments. The Council chose short term savings for the lesser cost of transport and are now reaping what they have sown. Parents, I believe, are required by the Council to select their preferred school, not just one but six with a requirement of at least three and a preference of five, the so called "Parental preferred choice!" It is in my view that parents have lost all confidence in the Councils educational policies and are seeking out their own genuine preferred choice. It is quite reasonable for parents to expect the Council to provide school transport to and from all of the 6 parental preferred choice educational establishments listed on the Councils form.

I already pay for a second bus pass for my older daughter from her fathers house if the proposal goes ahead i shall be paying for my younger daughters transport also from both houses, if i wish to avoid costs i would have to send her to our nearest school which is in Lancashire and would have children in different schools and different holidays for Easter and October half term, as a single working mum childcare would be extremely difficult. I live on North Yorkshire, I pay my council tax to North Yorkshire I should be able to get free transport for a North Yorkshire school.

Why should my child have to attend a secondary school in Cumbria to be entitled to funding for the transport. Ludicrous. We reside in North Yorkshire and would prefer to send our children to a secondary school in North Yorkshire, not Cumbria.

The closest school as the crow flies is not our catchment school and, the shortest route to this school is high level narrow and in winter weather the roads are not treated. Having driven the route suitable for bus transport, to both the closest and catchment schools, the catchment school is actually 0.2 miles closer. There is also the potential impact on school attendance in bad weather. Richmond School has always been the secondary school for children in Swaledale, children who have established relationships with their peers over 8 years which would be damaged, especially during transition from KS2 to KS3. To maintain these relationships by sending children to the catchment school in Richmond would incur significant costs due to the distance and limited public transport.

Existing friendship groups will be lost. It's daunting enough moving to High school. Seems ridiculous that the council to whom we pay council tax can't/won't provide school transport and my grandson would travel out of area. What about freedom of choice for Ofsted ratings?

Not having the options for sending our children to the best available school. In life it is essential to have an option in all aspects, to take away school travel deprives young friendships from flourishing

Having lived in Swaledale and attended Richmond school I was (Redacted) so I understand how important school transport is to families in this area, I also have first hand traumatic experiences of getting stuck on Tailbridge Hill in the snow. The nearest school does not mean it's the most suitable school, it is not suitable to expect children to travel in an unsafe manner. Sending them up or down Tailbridge 547 metres high during bad weather is totally irresponsible and unsafe, which will mean if they then can't get to school they will be prevented from accessing the education they are entitled and expected to attend. Parents will be forced to keep their children out of school. The new home to school travel policy has to be amended, the education and ultimately the safety of our children has to be of paramount importance to us all.

The Home to School Travel Policy should retain eligibility based on catchment areas. If a family lives in North Yorkshire and pays council tax to NYC, they should be eligible for free transport to a North Yorkshire catchment school. In all of this, there is too much emphasis on parental choice. Many have to accept that their children cannot attend a denominational or Grammar school simply because there isn't one nearby. Issues relating to traffic, parking issues, under and oversubscription and resulting transport costs would be better addressed if the emphasis was on children attending their catchment school. (NYC should not be paying transport costs year after year for children who transfer in year and can't access places in their catchment school because these are taken by children from out of catchment.) A national review of School admission policies could therefore have a positive impact on the drive to reduce transport costs. With reference to the 4. Special Educational Needs, and/or Disability, the paragraph 'To qualify for eligibility' should be above the paragraph 'A child is eligible for free travel if:...' This would make it clearer that individual assessment of the child would be necessary unless the child lives within the statutory walking distance and they can not reasonably be expected to walk there.

Changing the criterion to nearest school will dramatically alter the lives of families living in Bentham and Ingleton, most of whom have strong links to Settle having attended the school themselves. Not to mention the detrimental impact it will have on the intake of children at Settle College.

I am concerned that Settle College will be severely impacted by the proposed changes. Currently many of its students travel longer distances than average as we are in a sparsely populated area. I would like to note that the changes will not affect my family but we believe that Settle College is a great school that provides a good education for children from a wide variety of backgrounds, which becomes even more important once it is noted that 50% of the "nearest school" for many will be a selective single sex grammar school. Settle archives good results for its students regardless of testing at age 10/11 and deserves to be given every opportunity to continue this excellent work.

The difference between walking distance, as the crow flies or a bus transport route can be the defining factor as to which school is deemed as the nearest - especially where schools are say less than a mile apart. This is arbitrary decision making with little benefit and should not apply to schools in close proximity to each other. In respect however the decision making is sensible where schools are say 10 miles apart and a child attends a school 8 miles away and obtains free transport when they could attend a school 2 miles away with no free transport provided. Common sense needs to be applied where schools are close together.

'Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.'

'Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.'

The children of Bentham once they reach high school age will no longer be able to attend a school in North Yorkshire where they live. They will have no choice due to NYC transport policy have to attend a school in Cumbria. Council tax is paid to North Yorkshire so I presume it would be fairer for NYC find a school in Cumbria. This also takes away all choice for parents and children unless they can afford to pay for transport. I can not think in anyway this policy puts a child first in anyway. It puts the transport policy first and even now we have become a devolved council ie no more Craven district council the services are now poorer than ever. There is a lot of good work that can be done however there is little evidence. Please help the children of Bentham.

I completely disagree with the home to school travel policy now becoming the nearest school without taking in to account the type of road that is to be traveled on. Whether it is a priority 1 gritting route should be taken in to account.

We, Melbecks Parish Council, would like to object to the proposed changes to home school transport policy in North Yorkshire. The proposed changes would have a significant effect on the lives of local school pupils and the whole community. Swaledale is a long dale, running over several miles. The current transport policy means that for their secondary education, children travel down the dale towards Richmond School, which although not the nearest school, this is the catchment school and the most practical route to travel, as it is low-lying and well-used and gritted throughout any inclement weather. The changes to the policy would mean that children from upper Swaledale would travel to Kirkby Stephen, those in Arkengarthdale to Barnard Castle, and those towards Reeth would travel to Leyburn for their secondary education. All three of these routes are impractical as they are often impassable in bad weather. Increased winter maintenance would be needed, an additional cost for North Yorkshire Council. This plan is not a sensible solution, as it could put children at risk in terms of road safety, by sending them to school over high roads in the winter and it could also have a detrimental effect on their attendance. It was also separate the children of the local community by sending them to three different secondary schools. Melbecks Parish Council strongly oppose the proposed changes, and request that the option to continue with existing arrangements is given serious consideration. Melbecks Parish Council melbecksparishclerk@gmail.com

The nearest school is not always the most practical for where we live in Reeth. No one has taken into account the roads in bad weather conditions and also the reliability of transport providers. If we have to pay for our children to attend the same secondary school it will affect our living income wage and out quality of life

If the policy is put in place all children of secondary school age from Hawes will be sent to Settlebeck School in Sedbergh which is in Cumbria. My understanding is that both Settlebeck and Wensleydale school in Leyburn are both full as far as the 2024 intake is concerned. A large number of new houses are being built in Sedbergh. What happens to Hawes children in future if both Schools are full. Where does the County council stand legally when they remove any parental choice and send a whole towns children to another county for schooling. Has this policy been discussed with the Education department? The money for those children will leave North Yorkshire.

I am really concerned that the changes to this policy are going to close Settle College in a few years time when the numbers drop due to their not being free transport from the surrounding local areas. The change to the policy meaning catchment is removed means less children from surrounding villages can get free transport and this will have a huge knock on effect to Settle College's numbers. We live in Settle and I don't want to have to send my child to Skipton to a secondary school if Settle closes.

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. I have a son in Year 7 who is given fantastic support at Settle and I feel sure that this level of care and tailored provision would not have been provided by QES. I have 2 daughters and I would like them to attend Settle in the future, however I would not be able to pay the cost of transport and I think this would be the case for most families. Parents would be swayed to make a choice based on money rather than what is right for the children. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. Where we live the two schools available are QES and Settle. We live almost directly in between the two schools, so the cost of transport would be the same to either, so it seems ludicrous that pupils should be denied the opportunity to attend the school which is actually in their own county and has a reputation of caring and working closely with feeder primary schools to ensure the best transition and the best continuation through their school journey. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area. I think it is appalling that NYC are not supporting their own school! Also there seems to be some disagreement about how the distance is calculated to determine which is the closest school. At the consultation meeting your representative seemed to be saying that it is the school in closest walking distance - which is also ridiculous because the cost of transport is obviously dependent on the length of the journey by road and I believe that by road the journey from Bentham to Settle is shorter than Bentham to QES. A representative from a local coach company who has provided transport to both schools from Ingleton said that the cost would be exactly the same to either school. I understand that as a rural community close to the county line we are in a different situation, but I do not see why there needs to be a blanket policy. Reasonable adjustments must be made to ensure that people have equal opportunities - having a different policy for this area with its unique circumstances would be a reasonable adjustment and not doing so would be denying people the right to have a choice of schools based on what is right for their child. This is a SCHOOL transport policy yet there is no mention of the rights of children to THRIVE and achieve their POTENTIAL in education. The ability to thrive and achieve potential is directly linked to whether the school is the right placement for the child. My understanding is that attendance is high on the agenda at the moment. Removing the opportunity to choose a school that is right for the individual child will have a negative impact on attendance and will result in more cases of EBSA. Also, it seems to me that QES will not actually have the capacity to take the extra pupils - which will result in some pupils not getting their first choice of school and then they will end up at Settle - but it will then just be a matter of luck - some will choose QES only because of the provision of free transport and some will get a place at QES. Some will choose QES because they feel it is the most suitable school for them and some will not get a place, because the places will be taken by the pupils who actually would have gone to Settle if they could have chosen. The admissions process will not distinguish between the 2 groups so inevitably some pupils who preferred Settle will end up at QES and vice versa - which is again utterly ridiculous!

This policy will have disastrous effects on all the children within the North Yorkshire area, both primary and secondary and will be directly responsible for the negative effect of the children's educational needs and general health and mental well being throughout their lives. Stop now and rethink before you destroy the future lives of our children.

I object to the proposal to withdraw transport eligibility to the catchment school. The consultation does not provide enough detail for parents to understand the full impact of this proposal. There is currently no way for parents to check where their “nearest suitable school” is. The consultation could at least have provided a list of communities and schools potentially affected. Some younger children will become no longer eligible for transport to the same school as their older siblings or the children of their neighbours. Are councillors ready for years of complaints and appeals about this? The savings from this proposal have not been clearly demonstrated and could cost the council more. No account seems to have been taken of the cost of commissioning new services to transport children to their nearest school, rather than to the catchment school. Transport costs are “sticky” - having one or two fewer pupils eligible for a single route does not necessarily mean that you can run a smaller bus or taxi. The cost of providing the transport is not always reduced, because transport is still needed for the remaining children who are still eligible. The proposal will encourage parents to use their own cars (where they have the time and money to do so) to take children to school. This will result in more congestion, parking problems and safety issues around school sites. There is no proper assessment of this in the current proposals. The council has declared a climate emergency and this proposal runs contrary to this by encouraging actions that will generate more vehicle emissions. It will also mean more expense for parents during a cost of living crisis. There will be a mismatch between school admissions, giving priority to children living within the catchment, and school transport, only providing transport to the nearest school. If a parent chooses the nearest school on the grounds of transport, they will not necessarily get a place if it is not the catchment school and the school is oversubscribed. But if a parent chooses the catchment school, they will not necessarily get transport if it is not their nearest school. Parents will not know at the time that they apply where they will get transport to, because they won't know whether or not the nearest school will be oversubscribed. In many parts around the borders of North Yorkshire, the nearest school will be outside the county. If children attend these schools, schools in North Yorkshire will lose out on pupils and funding, which could lead to the closure of some North Yorkshire schools. It will also mean that some North Yorkshire council tax payers will be unable to get home to school transport to a North Yorkshire school. The nearest school may be a church school which the parents do not subscribe to. Options to reduce transport costs by recommissioning services, or using council-owned vehicles rather than private contractors, or looking at safer walking options, have not been considered. In the first years of a new council there are many other areas where savings could be made. Why not end the subsidy of £2.7M each year that the Council makes to the Harrogate Convention Centre?

In support of our main feeder Secondary school, we would like to support Settle College who we feel would be significantly affected by this proposal in a negative way. We have concerns about the potential impact on the future education choices of our children and parents/carers and how education in North Craven could be negatively impacted in both the short and long term by this proposal. We feel that based on the information we have, the calculations completed by the local authority are inaccurate and that the impact on our main feeder school would be very different to what is projected. We would strongly ask that the local authority re-look at this.

I pay for my son to travel 13 minutes on a bus. The price is extortionate. We have one school in Northalton, there should be at least a choice for another school within a certain radius with free transport. It is not just people on benefits who struggle financially, parents with mortgages are struggling right now. The system is so unfair. My mortgage alone is £1800 right now. The council should offer free transport.

Investment in Education is an investment in the future. NYC has made significant savings by removing democracy from local councils (such as Ryedale) and in creating a central monolith. Time now for NYC to invest that money back into Education and ensuring our children have paid for transport to access education.

The removal of 50% share means that families who have tried to split amicably will be penalised. This has happened in my school

Important to save money as much as possible. Fully agree with removing as much eligibility for transport paid for by the taxpayer as possible. It is important not to subsidise peoples choice of where they choose to live with free transport.

An element of choice, particularly for ongoing secondary education, can be a significant factor in the progress and ultimate success of pupils who may feel less suited to and not happy at their nearest school. For schools with a wide catchment area within a rural environment the impact of strict application of the new policy is a cause for concern and I would like to see a little more flexibility. My own children who did not require transport, thrived alongside other young people who would now have fallen only a few miles outside the proposed limits. Children would still have to be transported to their nearest school with distances that would result in very little reduction in cost. Strict application of the proposed Home to School Travel Policy could potentially lead to a reduction in pupil numbers in some schools with the consequent reduction in what those schools can offer. Whilst I appreciate that savings have to be made, any policy on transport should take into account the impact of the changes on the quality of the educational offering in North Yorkshire.

We live in (Redacted) and the nearest secondary school to where we live is skipton which my child attends. The removal of the bus service which I was happy to pay for with out any public replacement is ridiculous. It is too far to expect my daughter to walk on her own especially in the darker winter nights - the main road is 60 miles and hour in to (Redacted) and not appropriate to walk on her own. Secondly there are circ 20-25 parents from the village that have to individually use their cars to collect their children from the secondary schools in skipton creating more traffic and congestion and is not promoting green travel. My suggestion would be to either provide a public route before 9am from the village Into skipton so the children can pay daily to get to school there is a public bus to get home at 4:25 which is suitable to use. Or provide bus service that all children can pay to use - I could easily get 20 students that would sign up for this but have not applied in the past as it was always pot luck if you could use the bus.

I think those that need the transport and can pay for it should. I think that those who need the transport and can't pay for it those are the people the council need to help. There should be school buses provided and that families are charged to use the service. I think SEND and medical conditions have a real impact on children and families. It is very very difficult for all. Purely financial decisions can't be made. It needs to be a more holistic view for the child and for what is best for them long term. The right educational setting has to have an impact and the transport requirements have to be a consideration but in the round. I think there should be a form of point system to see if there can be a contribution on the costs.

The use of taxis is a prohibative cost. Whilst some children with significant needs need this, many could be on a school bus. If needed have a second staff member on board - far cheaper then lots of taxis Also please reintroduce the ability for parents to pay for an empty seat on a school bus - it helps council and individual families

No

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.'

As the meeting at Ingleton may well have indicated, the feelings about this are very strong in the area. I hope you will take note of the following, especially after Richard Flinton has given an interesting insight to the future of schools and the Craven community. I will mention this further anon - please read on. It is essential that transport remains in place for reception pupils, regardless of age of child. However, I was bitterly disappointed to hear that the reason for this is the ease for the transport department to organise, rather than it benefiting the communities, schools and, above all, the children. This highlights that parts of the current policy can remain in place, but only if it benefits the council workers and makes their lives easier, not the families they are supposed to be representing and serving. This is the sound bite I shall be sending to the press and every councillor who will be voting. It's a dangerous game to ignore the needs of the community for the ease of a public department and I would be very careful in allowing that to come out to the press. I'm sure you've had a fair few responses explaining why the removal of catchment school will impact the Craven area so badly and I would like to hope that you've come to the conclusion that it isn't right for this area. Richard Flinton has emailed to state that the council hopes to "realise a financial benefit over time through this proposed change" and it is very sad that he expects this as I shall explain - and I would like it to be raised with the executive members when reviewing the feedback. As your own transport contractors have already explained, there is no saving in transport costs by forcing pupils to go to QES, rather than Settle College. It costs exactly the same. However, by forcing (I know Richard Flinton has done his bit to toe the party line and say parents still have the choice, but they don't - they can only go where they can get transport, so it's a pointless pretending otherwise) people in Bentham, Ingleton, Burton, Clapham, etc to choose QES, they will, without doubt force Settle College to close. It will be a painful, long, drawn-out process that will hurt everyone involved, but it will close. Perhaps then, the council will see a saving, but not in transport. It will cost significantly more to bus children to QES, Lancaster and Skipton. Not only that, the pupils will have to endure over an hour on the bus each way. So, the net result for this amendment would be a school closure and hundreds of children under North Yorkshire Council's care that are facing two hour commutes and under the care of the bus driver for this length of time. Perhaps Settle College closing is the saving that Richard Flinton is referring to, but to forcibly close a successful school in the heart of a large, rural community would make re-election very difficult for any council member who votes for it. On the plus side, there is a simple solution. Whilst there can only be one policy, as your transport staff have already said, there are times when you have to do things on a case-by-case. Surely, your policy needs to state that the decision to choose between catchment or nearest school needs to be made on a local level. Craven is very different from Harrogate, York or even Skipton. Therefore, how can a policy for an urban centre work for a rural site? Surely, a simple line saying it requires a case-by-case judgement for schools would remove any anguish and still stand to make savings, rather than by closing important schools. As a way of highlighting the ridiculous nature of the proposal, imagine this: child A wants to go to QES and applies. Child B wants to go to Settle but can't get transport because they are closer to QES so has to apply to QES. Child B gets a place due to QES' admission policy, but Child A doesn't get in. Child A goes to a school they don't want to, child B goes to a school they don't want to, and it saves NYC nothing. Don't do it!!

1. There seems to be an assumption that parents who work would be able to organise other arrangements should their child need to be accompanied to school (in the instance of other children of the same age being able to walk alone, ie child 1 has special.educational needs). Where parents (single or both) work to keep a house for their family, not all employers give freedom to work around school transport commitments. DLA transport allowance would certainly not cover other provision. I know this may be rare but in choice of paying rent keeping your child safe when attending school, you can see how that makes for a challenging decision. The parents wanting to fulfil their responsibilities for educating their child and to keep them safe and housed. 2. In year changes of school are not necessarily outlined fully. Where a parent (single) chose another school further away because of work commitments (I realise the new policy says it does not recognise work commitments as their issue) so they could drop off a child with special educational needs, however they then need to change in school to their nearest but cannot accompany their child to walk safely. (Single parent, job no allowance for circumstance) Would they then apply for the sen assessment in year? Would this be a case for extenuating circumstances? 3. Overall the new document is much clearer, seems much more credible, more easy to see your own circumstances and how they fit within it. 4. Special educational needs being recognised without travel being outlined in and ehcp or need for an ehcp is wonderful, especially since ehcps are even harder to get even for those with obvious need. It gives those of us with sen kids hope we will be heard and helped. 5. It could still be clearer that travel accomodations all depend on the circumstances in the initial entry year, regardless of which year they are trying for transport help. I think where the example talks about moving to a nearest oversubscribed school from a further away school and whether the child would have initially received a place could be clearer or referred to in more examples. I think especially of where it says the "last child given entry " whether the applying child would have received their place or not had they applied, is this in the entry year? Or the last child taken in to the school at all? as this could be an in year enrollment for all sorts of reasons and be coming from further because of expulsion or area move. Even if the school was oversubscribed in the initial year, beyond their PAN, they may have accepted beyond that number, which child is the last? The PAN max child or the last child beyond PAN numbers?

I personally think the school transport is great as it , I think if they become difficult for children to travel to school it will cause a greater issue of traffic in small areas. Schools are already over run especially small village primary schools and Bedale high schools where there is so many cars collecting students it's not helpful to local residents or the environment but some people may not have the option other then to start dropping there children off.

Absolutely ridiculous proposal as in our case North Yorkshire will be paying for all the children in our part of the county to go to a Cumbrian school loosing Yorkshire students .And the local Yorkshire school loosing the funding that goes with them

I strongly disagree that transport for the catchment school will be removed and will potentially become payable. I live in a village that the catchment school is not the nearest school and currently there is nil transport for the nearest school, so as a parent I will be penalized financially for selecting the catchment school. I feel in this situation the policy should remain the same. There are many struggling family's financially with the current state of affairs. I am a single parent with a child in secondary school and one due to start next year. I work as a professional in the NHS on average wage and I am not eligible for benefits but this would have a huge negative impact of the quality of life to my children and I, as travel cost would be a finical burden I cannot afford. I am disgusted it has been proposed to remove travel to the catchment school. I seriously hope this is re considered.

Its ok taking in a 2 mile to the nearest school however there has been no thought process to whether there are footpaths. I pay for my children to get a private bus to school due to the fact there are no footpaths on a large section of their "walk" to school and on a 60 mile per hour road I'm not letting them walk down that as it would be irresponsible however this is at an expendital cost to myself when I am already bankrupt and with no chance of been able to drive them myself. Its whether them 2 miles can be walked that needs looking at!

Start helping working parents. Just because we don't receive benefits does not mean we don't struggle. My son attends Thirsk school. We could do with help with travel.

My concern at present is the inability of council staff (whom I have been in conversations with) to fully understand the needs of families of children with Send and the impact on not only those families if travel arrangements are not in place but the impact it has on the wider community.

If we choose to send our children to the second nearest school, who have more places available than children in their catchment area then I would like to see the cost of school transport reduced by the amount it would of cost the council to give them free transport. I totally accept our choice should not be completely free of charge but because of where we live being so far from the second nearest option we have to use a private ' not for profit' company and it is at a significant monthly cost. I feel strongly that the council should subsidise a small portion given that the second nearest school is not over subscribed. Our nearest school is subscribed by a town that is the same distance away from us as we are to the second nearest school and their students are offered transportation at a reduced rate. Why should we be penalised for using a private company that services children from further afield when it is a not for profit organisation. This lady set this up because her son had no way to get to this school either several years ago. They now have 3x 16 seater minibuses, demand is high and it is over subscribed. Safeguarding is a high priority and we are working parents. Each family travelling there are back each day would also have an impact on the roads and climate change. Which another aspect of the policy to be considered.

currently travel passes for children not eligible for free travel, but who wish to use these services are only available for whole days. consider making this more flexible to allow for set journeys per week, obviously where availability allows. but if the service is already running, this would ensure a better return on potentially 'empty' seats.

Parental contribution to the cost of travel needs to be introduced. I don't believe this would be a barrier to attendance and it could be means tested

This consultation has not been widely shared (ie I was only informed by my children's school of it today) and the meetings have now all happened. How would you calculate distance to work out "nearest" (crow flies or road connections) - this isn't very clear? This will have a big impact on villages (eg mine!) where the excellent catchment school is not the nearest - does this need to be rethought in conjunction with thinking about catchment areas? The transition period of the new policy will be rocky, distressing for parents with more than one child (eg one at catchment school with continuing free transport and 2nd having to go to a different school because no longer eligible for free transport). In villages like mine kids already go to multiple local state secondary schools (there are 4 or 5 in the area) but very few go the closest (it's not the catchment) and a new bus would have to be provided - has this sort of situation been modelled in the costings?

Transport should still be free for children attending their nearest sixth form school

The council will not see any cost saying whatsoever as the transport companies will just raise their prices. ie, a bus has 10 kids on it, the company charges the council £1 per kid, that is £10 for the bus. The new policy makes 5 kids walk or go in the car, the bus company now needs to charge £2 per kid to pay for that bus to run. The council still pays £10, but now there potentially are 3 extra cars on the road & 2 kids walking & now in danger! Some services just need to be run better, bus companies usually run their old & knackered busses for the school runs anyway. Offer them less money, they need the school run just as much as the council does!(probably more, they are not the ones trying to cut it) The village & road situation in North Yorkshire is different to London, where everywhere has a footpath & street lighting, around here, were lucky if we have a verge to walk on.

We live in (Redacted)when we applied for Ryedale school we could pay for a place on a shared bus. This was cancelled with no notice and now cannot be reinstated. Children in rural North Yorkshire have no opportunity to have any choice in school as there is no public transport system to be able to use as an alternative. They are at a disadvantage to in city children who would be able to get to 2 or 3 schools. If Parents could pay for places on buses organised by the council it could acutally be profitable for the council. The lack of buses altogether have a negatvie impact on childrens health and well being.

Should be means tested. Check walking routes are safe. Ie well lit, footpaths etc. Lots of school bus runs are through villages with little or no safe footpaths on route to schools. Also it cruel to only offer transport to one household if child has two homesdue to divorce/ separation. Offer a reduced price to both households to make it fairer and also means test this.

The lack of consideration of post 16 transport in this consultation is unhelpful. The whole school career should be considered as one. The fact that you make post 16 kids pay is absolutely ridiculous. This encourages them to start using their cars as soon as they pass their test. This is counter to any claims of environmental sustainability that you make as a council

Where the distance to school from home address is similar (within a few miles) to multiple schools in catchment, parents should get to choose which school to send their child, without being penalised by having to pay for transport for the sake of a mile or 2.

The proposed changes to transport to only the nearest secondary school could have a huge detrimental effect on rural schools like Settle College, meaning lower numbers and in effect, no choice for parents. To bus students to another school seems counterproductive and will have a huge effect on the local community in Settle and surrounding areas, making them less attractive to families and children in future years. I strongly disagree with this proposal.

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact

I think having a choice of school that is most suitable for your child is important and transport shouldn't have to be big factor for parents providing it is not an unreasonable distance from their home address

Very poor policy. Does not help me or roughly 30-40 other parents in Riccall get their children to Brayton Academy. Extra cars on extra journeys which is bad for the environment. More traffic and huge disturbance to local residents at drop off / pick up time creating a negative feelings and unsafe environments. Due to the early start time my child would be unable to get a bus and I would not want him walking the distance in the dark. Many parents would be happy to contribute to the travel costs to enable transport to be arranged. Short sighted and unfair to dictate 'suitable school' too this does not allow choice for both children and parents - very archaic.

Settle college offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in his areas the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle college caused by such a severe drop in numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after- effects of this decline on the local area.

As the population is so spread out in this area I feel that it would be unlikely to save a large amount of money as the travel time for most children affected would be lowered only marginally rather than reduced significantly or eliminated, this seems to be a poor economy if it will reduce options open for individuals education and potentially reduce the quality of schools in the area. Indeed one child having to be moved to a further away school for support, special needs or just "fit and feel" will negate marginal savings made. I feel that Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.

I can understand a desire from the authority to impose a common sense policy which is looking to save the tax payer money. However, this has to be balanced with the impact to the families involved - and also, as all good policies do, have an exceptions process for common sense and established precedent to kick in. (Redacted) is in the catchment area for Helmsley Primary School and currently there are 4 children going there. By the time that they are old enough for Secondary school, they will all have siblings at Ryedale school because Helmsley is an established feeder school for Ryedale - and in our case - that was a determining factor in us choosing our house, in this village and the primary school for our children. Because there are already children in the village that go to Ryedale on free school transport - and this will continue once the younger siblings start.....there is literally a bus already coming. If the proposal is put in place then a second bus will be required to come up Sutton Bank to pick children up.....consequently costing the authority and the tax payer more money rather than creating a saving. It will also cause significant grief to the families involved because we all feel very strongly that we want our children to go to the same secondary school as their siblings. So in summary, the proposed policy - in the case of (Redacted) - is a spectacular own goal if implemented as planned without the facility for sensible exceptions. Many thanks for considering this feedback.

School transport i paying 8.00 pounds a day's that's to much for me.thats is 160.00 a month's. 😞

I feel concerned that schools like Settle College, with wide catchment areas will be adversely affected by the change to funding only being available for the geographically nearest school. This could adversely affect student numbers and removes choice for families. Should settle college close due to lack of students this would have a hugely negative effect on the town.

This would crush local communities and make life very difficult for working parents

This could negatively affect so many people and whole communities if it went through

Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.

The changes to the nearest eligible school criterion is very poorly thought through. This could be a disaster for families who will end up with children in different schools in different counties, with all the logistics and social disadvantages that would bring. It makes no sense at all not to fund transport to a pupil's catchment school; in such a large rural area differences of a few miles are immaterial. This policy will have a negative effect on Settle college, which has a number of pupils for whom the nearest (out of catchment) school is technically closer. I suspect this will be used as a back door excuse to reduce funding to small rural schools, with the excuse that pupil numbers are dwindling (because parents cannot afford to pay for transport, despite it being their catchment school and preferred school).

I am concerned that the transport policy is not following the catchment school. Catchment schools should be the nearest to the home and if they are not then catchments need reviewing. Going to your catchment school with peers is important for children and I feel that not using this as the benchmark for travel provision is unfair on pupils and schools. Catchments should be changed to be the nearest school or travel should be provided to the catchment school.

Parent choice is essential and the fact we offer selective schools should be taken into account. This change to the policy is clearly going to impact the ability of children and parents to strive for the best education possible. This policy will clearly negatively impact the population of North Yorkshire who can not afford to pay for transport. No surprises from a Conservative run council that this has not been thought of. Futhermore there is no clarity over whether buses that are going to have to be provided for the next 7 years will allow parents to pay for their children to travel on them.

'Settle College offers young people a broad and balanced curriculum, alongside excellent pastoral support. The proposed transport change would cause a significant reduction in student numbers and therefore a potential impact on this offer. The savings would not be realised in this area as the students would still require transport to their nearest secondary school, with little change to actual distances travelled. There is serious concern in the community about the potential impact on Settle College caused by such a severe drop in pupil numbers both immediately and in years to come, and the after-effects of this decline on the local area.'

I would like to see our children accompanied on the school bus by an additional adult - with authority - so that the bus driver can drive - without the need to manage the behaviour of poorly behaved children

It will take away my child's choice of school they wish to attend. I could have 2 children at 2 different schools. I will not be able to afford to send my children to the same school if I have to pay for transport. It takes away my child's choice.

The change to nearest school only is, in my view, objectionable. Secondary schools allocations are prioritised on a catchment area basis. Myself and others may find themselves allocated a secondary school we are in the catchment area for, but not receiving transport as it is not the nearest. I believe this should remain as nearest or catchment. On a wider point, we are comfortable paying for school transport, provided NYCC is working with providers to ensure bus timetables are sensible compared to school start and finish times, and the provision is safe for secondary school students.

removing "free" transport to and from school is simply a bad idea. It will have a negative impact on schools, communities and the future of the entire area.

In the area with which we live Settle College/High School is integral to our community. It is the main town which brings together all the smaller neighbouring villages. That school community continues into later life and now all our children go to school together. We still live in a community where everyone does still know and support eachother. If the decision to change transport eligibility is put into action we risk losing our closest high school within at least a 30mile radius. My children live in (Redacted). It would mean a (Redacted)commute to the next nearest school. I appreciate this may work in some parts of North Yorkshire. But i feel very strongly that in our very rural area it will have a negative impact. I would sooner pay for my child to go to our nearest school (which is Settle), rather than lose our school. Make all transport, to any school, cost and offer support to those who cant afford it.

When small local schools are closed it seems harsh not to transport these pupils to a local school even if the schools are within 2/3 miles. The policy should specifically address this, and perhaps give a time limit to support families with transport. If you bought a house in a village with a school, you may not anticipate your need to transport your future children to school and could be inconvenienced.

We live in Tockwith. Our nearest Secondary school (different LA) is Wetherby. Currently, almost all children in Tockwith attend either Tadcaster or Knaresborough. Having to pay to travel to either of these is going to have huge and negative knock on consequences.

We are concerned that families from Bentham and Ingleton will not be able to attend their first choice school - this will significantly reduce income for Settle College and this will equate to a drop in provision standards affect all children attending Settle College.

The proposed policy is not to the interest of Settle College and its families - the North Craven Area is frequently overlooked when it comes to planning and taking the interests of local schools inot their decision making. We only have ot see all the school closures in the last ten or so years. My family is concerned that families from Bentham and Ingleton will not be able to attend their first choice school - this will significantly reduce income for Settle College and this will equate to a drop in provision stanadards affect all children attending Settle College. We are against the propoal and are alarmed that the public consultaion has been planned before parents have had a chance to grasp the meaning of the proposals.

Time for a re-think and to scrap this policy. My family is concerned that families from Bentham and Ingleton will not be able to attend their first choice school - this will significantly reduce income for Settle College and this will equate to a drop in provision stanadards affect all children attending Settle College. The proposed policy is not to the interest of Settle College and its families - the North Craven Area is frequently overlooked when it comes to planning and taking the interests of local schools inot their decision making. We only have ot see all the school closures in the last ten or so years. My family is concerned that families from Bentham and Ingleton will not be able to attend their first choice school - this will significantly reduce income for Settle College and this will equate to a drop in provision stanadards affect all children attending Settle College. We are against the propoal and are alarmed that the public consultaion has been planned before parents have had a chance to grasp the meaning of the proposals.

The proposal disadvantages Settle College and the families who attend this school in the future - it will lead to the school's demise and possible closure like as has happened to other schools in the area following the North Craven Review where we lost Middle Schools and orimary schools. We know the authority have blown their transport budget and need to recover costs but these proposals are disadvanatgeous to the College and need to be reconsidered.

The policy could lead to the demise of Settle College. Is this intended? What about free choice of schools for families at Bentham and Ingleton. If Settle College is adverely affected then this affects the life long learning of pupils at Settle Primary and Giggleswick too. In this economic climate reduced numbers and income for Settle College could be disasterous. It scould lead to reduced provision - such as the sixth form not being viable, less subject choice, reduced staffing, less choice for students when choosing options. At worse t could make the College unviable.

I am against the Porpoed changes. My family is concerned that families from Bentham and Ingleton will not be able to attend their first choice school - this will significantly reduce income for Settle College and this will equate to a drop in provision stanadards affect all children attending Settle College. Settle Primary pupils will be affected when they transition to the College as its provision will have been affected by a potentially huge drp in numbers affecting provision. I am concerned that there have been enough closures of schools in this area already. Rural areas such as ours are at risk of seeing a secondary school closure if these proposals go ahead.

We are aginst the proposals and its impact on rural secondary schools such as Settle College which will lose children as a result and see families not able to afford to attend their first choice of school.

Disadvantages Settle College if no one from Bentham or Ingleton can afford to go there - the potential drop in numbers will undermine this great school.

Nearest school is fine in principle but need to consider the safest routes etc... in this. If getting to the nearest school means having to go on a bus over a narrow moortop road rather than follow a more main route down a valley (could be further distance but quicker/larger roads) then this needs to be considered on each geographical location not just pin & radius approach on a map.

I feel fewer children will be able to get to Settle College; this will negatively affect my children in the long term and our ability as a community to fully educate children locally.

Concerned about pupil numbers dropping at Settle College as a result of the proposed travel policy and the effect of subsequent reduced funding on the secondary school provision in the Settle area

We could loose a valuable school in our area, having a negative impact on a lot of children and their families. Removing the choice for a school is unacceptable, many families have different reasons for chosing different schools and shouldn't have this choice taken away from them, many (like ourselves) wouldn't afford to pay for transport. It's so sad that we could loose the school so close to us because people can't afford the travel costs. It's a wonderful school and it would be such a shame to see it struggle with it not being the nearest school for a lot of people that use it.

As school is a requirement by law I think it is hugely unfair to charge for the access to school. The Council's proposal will negatively impact on the parents' and child's choice of where to send their child for families in areas such as Bentham, Clapham, Ingleton etc. Additionally, Settle Collage will lose future pupils due to this proposal as families will have to take into account the impact that the additional cost of travel to their preferred school will make on their finances. This will especially affect families with lower wages or more children.

I live in Tockwith and chlidren here have a catchment of Tadcaster or King James in Knareborough. Our 'closest' school is Wetherby, which is not our catchment school and in a different LA, and not as good a school as Tadcaster or King James. Children would still go to King James or Tadcaster as the better schools, adn catchment schools but would now have to pay for transport - families with 2-3-4 children would have to pay thousands on transport to get their children to their catchment schools

I am upset that we will be made to pay for our child's transport. The closest school is in a neighbouring LA. We are not permitted to use the local services within that LA as we are 'not part of it' for instance using the waste disposal (tip) in the neighbouring LA. Yet we will now be expected to send our children here for free transport that was previously provided . Also because the nearest school is within a different local authority - term times are often different . We could potentially have one child in North Yorkshire (Whitby) for one term and another in guisborough (Redcar and Cleveland) for another . Paying for transport would be another expense, in what is already an uncertain time financially for parents . We are really disappointed and feel let down .

There are many assumptions which suggests the report lacks substance and fact-based evidence. The analysis makes assumptions on a number of choice patterns which also could change, based on charges which change with every tender term. The proposed saving on the consultation is based on unsupported long-term suggestions which the report acknowledges could change and would therefore produce a different result and possibly might not make any saving at all on a different day so this is not a true and acute picture of any saving/costs that may be incurred as a result of the changes. The survey was conducted on a single snapshot of the county and as a single overview does not accurately represent and termly or yearly pattern, without any substantive evidence to support further saving on a term or yearly basis. I would go as far as to suggest that this survey is not fit for purpose to future project any savings and further snapshot over a year with an average saving would better reflect any potential costs/saving that may be achieved. No reference is made as to whether any other surveys were carried out which might have produced a less favourable result. In summary, the consultation is poorly represented and heavily biased with an analysis based on a series of possibly, maybes, could be, There are too many assumptions without any evidence to support the results and the future of our children and the nation's prosperity and development cannot and must not be based on a spurious analysis which itself states would produce a totally different outcome on a separate day and therefore can't be relied upon for an accurate projection of future savings. I would suggest the council would be negligent and wholly irresponsible to risk the future of our children, both educationally and their emotional wellbeing and future health, based on these spurious and unsupported projection.

transport is poor, there is poor communication and they do not take into account my child's additional needs and instead place him on a bus with lots of other children with SEND and no or poor training for the transport staff. transport arrive early most of the time to collect and not very helpful if my child is struggling that morning. i find the drivers and escorts rude. i do not understand the routes the bus takes either and how my child can be on transport for so long. it is ridiculous to know that some children in my childs school travel for almost two hours one way to school

Based on current numbers we would see a drop in student numbers of 73 students, should similar patterns of admissions continue; this drop in numbers would cause us significant financial detriment.

Policies like these are not family friendly- they are difficult to follow for anyone with send and give little thought to families on low income, with send children and make it harder for single parent families to work as they are so restricted by lack of transport to school for their children

This policy will only exacerbate the issues with falling pupil numbers for schools in which there is little/no house building. This, in turn, will make financial challenges even greater, thereby increasing costs for NYCC too.

The example bubbles at the end need to include an example where.... Student X lives near a co-ed school which is 3 miles from their house. They have been successful in gaining admission to a Grammar school which is 8 miles from their house. (it's unclear for parents who may skip to this section if this is funded or not). If there is any reduction in funding there will be an impact on schools like Upper Wharfedale. The policy isn't clear with regards to the grammar school system. Are students who live nearest Upper Wharfedale but get into grammar school receiving free places?

Lack of suitable SEN provisions is the reason transport is needed unfortunately the closest SEN school is 90 mins away

1 of our children is SEND. And currently travels an hour each way. We are unable to afford to pay for this and your proposal could mean us potentially paying. We have no choice as the schools themselves choose if they can meet need. However if the school has places but can't meet need your proposal doesn't make clear if that is where the travel provision would end? Would we then have to pay for transport as a school 20 mins away has places but as they won't accept the child they end up an hour away and the parent and family is penalised? I hope this is understood when amending proposals. Thanks

Settle College has been the first choice for a growing number of families in Ingleton when choosing a secondary school. North Yorkshire Council is now proposing that families who do choose Settle College in the future will have to pay for their own school bus, potentially costing a family with two children going to Settle College over £2,000 every school year. Many families will not be able to afford that kind of extra spending. They will be forced to send their children to their second choice school, which will be outside North Yorkshire, just because it is a couple of miles closer. For every child that does travel outside of North Yorkshire, the council will pay for a bus and so will save nothing, but Settle College will lose about £30,000 from the Government – money that is no longer going into education in North Yorkshire. In short, families will either have to pay or lose their first choice of school. Families will lose out and Settle College will lose out: losing income and missing the brilliant contribution that pupils from Ingleton can make. The headteachers of the primary schools in North Craven have always worked closely with Settle College headteacher to ensure that every aspect of transition is smooth for pupils going into Y7. This partnership between Ingleton, Bentham and Settle College will cease to exist if all the pupils in these two villages are forced to choose QES because of this new proposed policy. It will be the end of an era and the end of a successful model of collaborative working.

Consideration of road suitability, particularly in winter months, must be taken when putting forward the amendments. A school may be deemed as closer in terms of distance, but practicality makes it unsafe for travel in winter. If amendments were to go ahead, I can only assume that the local authority will commit itself to ensuring roads will be priority for gritting and will be well maintained to ensure safe travel for children.

I feel that , from a distance and without the lives experience of certain geographic localities , the policy may seem appropriate and the rationale fair. However , the way it would affect my family and those in the village in which I live would be disproportionately negative . As defined by route finder and therefore I can only assume your GIS system , our 'nearest' secondary school provision is in York , 8 miles away , in a different local authority and which a very small minority , if currently any of the children attend . The mileage discrepancy between this school and the 'catchment ' school is a matter of yards but the enactment of this policy would adversely affect the families within the village . Im unsure how this new policy aligns with school admissions policy as in 'reality' it could mean that parents have no choice but to send their children to the nearest catchment school under the terms of school admissions policy but under the terms of your policy this is no longer a 'suitable school' . I find this viewpoint challenging as the council is making the decision around school suitability based on an arbitrary measure of length . This measure of length fails to take into account communities needs and needs a more nuanced approach. It does appear to be a paper exercise in cutting costs to LA , which I appreciate is necessary , but not to be achieved by passing this cost onto parents who often have little choice as to the school they access.

It isn't clear from the policy whether children with SEND who are to attend a specialist school will remain eligible for home-school transport. My child with SEND and an EHCP will be attending a specialist secondary school In September 2024, the travel distance for him is over an hour each way and he has had transport confirmed. This however wouldn't be his "closest school", there are multiple mainstream schools much closer as well as several SEN schools who do not have a place available for him. He will therefore travel from our home in (Redacted) to Harrogate to access a school which can meet his needs. It would be advantageous to have some clarity over whether this would still meet the threshold for home-school transport in the revised policy as this is ultimately out of our control (we would prefer a closer school if one was available). In future would this be required to be included within his EHCP as a request or be automatically available as it is now? Having to justify the need for transport in these circumstances, at an already stressful time for SEN parents would be unreasonable in my opinion.

It is not safe for my children to walk to school. There is no footpath and too many inconsiderate irresponsible drivers.

My oldest child was sent to catchment school (my youngest will follow this year) this is not our closest school, we also had no say. I would like to be reassured that my children will not be adversely affected. There was no clause in draft policy that says something like "changes will ONLY affect those changing schools beginning school year 25/26" or similar. All the parents who have been awarded school places for 24/25 could be concerned. All those applying for schools FROM this September could then be made aware BEFORE choices and subsequent results.

I think it is ridiculous that a council would suggest this when it means people living in North Yorkshire wouldn't get free transport to a North Yorkshire school. We live in Bentham and it means we wouldn't get free transport to Settle College.

Much of the county has a network of RoW which would NOT be suitable routes to school pupils of any age, due to ground conditions, darkness etc across rural areas. Simple distance on foot by RoW would be incorrect. NYC should implement what IS a safe route to walk/cycle, and then assess if this is available from a location (eg village)

Severe weather affects our local high ground routes to school. Roads are often impassable in winter due to floods, snow and ice. The nearest school will often not be the safest route to school to/from Swaledale and Wensleydale.

Not sure how it fits with policy but increase in before and after school provision, means buses are part full and many parent car journeys too from school is a problem I can see increasing.

I worry about the safety aspect under section 5. The route from my village to Bedale High is extremley dangerous. There are no footpaths, poor visibility for drivers and blind bends. I hope that the bus route is not taken away. As a single parent, who works full time with absolutley no benefits- I'd have to make my child walk to school as there is no adult to take them or accompany them on the route. My son also plays a brass instrument, which is heavy; he is expected to carry a PE kit, and at several points across the year, needs a cookery kit as well. It's not physically possible to carry what is expected of them for nearly 3 miles! I have a(Redacted) going to (Redacted) in Sept and that's going to be £650 for transport, this bill is going to be difficult to pay- I can't find the same for a just under 3 mile journey for my son to attend high school. It's unreasonable.

Removes choice, adds anxiety, changes villages

I'm all for reducing the cost of school transportation, and I appreciate that this might lead to a reduction in parent choice. However, it seems utterly preposterous that despite living in North Yorkshire the proposed new policy would force my children to attend a school in West Yorkshire!

I dont believe that the impact of the proposed changes to the policy fair. There are plenty of additional areas that saving should be made before impacting the children & families that depend on these services. It appears that the selection criteria for children being accepted to individual schools can change significantly when the council thinks it can save money

Currently it won't affect us due to the system not being fit for purpose for my daughter due to special educational needs which aren't being met. If it was I feel that if we had to only attend a school which was classed as the closest for transport needs then that takes away a child's right to a positive education. A child needs to attend the best possible school for them irrelevant of Sen needs as there are various reasons that children attend which school they do. I agree that the 50/50 addresses should be improved but general school transport shouldn't be impacted.

Another nail in the coffin of our children's education, parental choice and putting money before education. Hopefully a change in government will enable education to rise back up the priority list.

Send provisions should not included in any proposed changes. Send children should get transport to the school that WILL provide the best care for that child. And its not always the catchment school

All children should be entitled to free school transport to their school of choice. I don't believe that North Yorkshire Council, in their ivory tower, should be allowed to discriminate when they have no idea of the geographics of their own county. It's as bad as London dictating to Yorkshire, which is what the devolution was trying to tackle in the first place.

If my child has been excepted in a school out of my region, do they still qualify for the free transport. For example, living in Catterick but been excepted for a Richmond School? Thank you

For three years I have struggled to get my children to school. We live in the middle of two catchment areas. My children used to get on a bus to Richmond school. This was then stopped and we were told that they could no longer get on the bus. One child about to go into his GCSE year. The bus still goes passed the stop they used to get on and another child from a house further away is allowed on. I had to live my job due to this and it has had a significant effect on both children, my mental health and our financial situation due to jobs and not being having to work around them not being able to get to school unless I drive them. There is no public transport where we live. The nearest catchment school is half a mile closer than the one they attend and was/is in special measures by Ofsted.

Unless the council are planning to grit high moor roads daily in winter this is a completely ridiculous situation.

Elective travel to the non-nearest school isn't something that the council tax payer should be funding in the current climate.

The provisions for free home to school transport are already far too restrictive and unfairly applied. All children (up to the age of 18) should have the right to free home to school transport regardless of the school they attend and whether this is the nearest available school. Potentially the cut off point for free transport to and from school could be a distance of around 20-30 miles. Many families have to pay thousands of pounds a year in transport fees to ensure that their child/children can attend a decent school where they will achieve and be appropriately supported, a cost which is prohibitive for many and significantly affects quality of life for those who have to pay it. Once again there is little consideration given to pupils living in more rural communities who may live almost equidistant from two or three schools but would only be provided free transport to one of the schools despite the travel distance difference often being less than one mile. With more and more failing or inadequate schools parents should be free to select the best school in the area for their child and should not be prohibited in doing so by the huge financial cost of paying for transport if they do not attend their nearest school.

I disagree with the proposed changes. Our taxes should continue to cover free travel to and from a school as many parents can not afford the additional costs. This proposal will likely result in the numbers of students attending schools in further away locations to drop, meaning the schools have less funding to be able to provide good facilities. Other schools, and smaller schools may then struggle to accommodate larger numbers of students. This change will have negative affects and should strongly be reconsidered.

Again, my Parents are being penalized for living in a remote location. Why should any parents have to pay for us to go to school. I'm going to sixth form next year and they have to pay for pass for that, even though government rules we have to stay in education.

I feel this is an unfair decision. We live in the Reeth area and the proposed change of school is not good- the roads to get there are terrible on a normal day let alone in bad weather. The current option of Richmond school is working fine. The roads are still not the best but they are a better option than the new proposal. It feels we are been penalised for living in the countryside. Also I understand people on low incomes can't afford to pay but neither can working parents now with the cost of living crisis. Working families get no subsidies on anything - we barely have anything left at the end of the month ! I think majority of working parents will agree. If it was to go ahead they should reduce the bus fare to go to preferred choice to a few hundred pounds not the extortionate price currently at over £600 ! This is far too expensive for everyone.

I was open minded about unitary authority until this. no understanding of local communities or roads in winter. Decisions made far away with no knowledge of splitting up communities. A prime example. I live in Swaledale. It isn't even an option on the questionnaire. I ticked Richmond. This needs a rethink

The economic reasons to seek change have been clear. Here are two points to consider: (i) The proposals may not, in practice, bring the hoped for economic benefits. Whilst, for example, all school traffic heads from the end of Swaledale down towards Richmond, the proposals will see this split in different directions, with additional vehicles required, and some journeys travelling over difficult cross-dale roads. On paper this looks sound but the practice could be very difficult and potentially costly. (ii) The proposals seek to address economic issues but there are other issues to take into account. These include (a) The environmental cost of additional vehicles, some of which climbing up and down cross-dale roads. (b) The cost of time to some students. Their new journey may be shorter in miles but significantly longer in terms of time. (c) The damage to attendance figures. Students are likely to have more days when they are unable to attend due to winter weather. (d) The health and safety of students may be jeopardised when school days are cut short in an emergency and students must be transported home. This is rare and normally only happens when winter weather worsens suddenly and unexpectedly during a school day. Transporting students back 'up dale' is challenging enough as it is. Transporting them from one dale to another brings a whole new dimension of risk and danger. I do think we are facing the need to make savings and these will not be popular. I think, however, any proposals that stick to a crude 'nearest school' in terms of miles risks costing more money, not less. And it brings other additional costs and risks as described above.

Catchment based transport, as the current situation, is most suitable for our location. The move to a nearest school, regardless of location would be very detrimental to the delivery of high quality education in the area. The category missing is for those living under the mileage threshold, but without a suitable walking route to school. This current facility needs to continue and also be clarified within the documents. The proposal is wholly unacceptable on many fronts, driven by cost, and not the best outcome for children in education.

We live in a rural location and nearly all the children at my daughter's school use school transport at some time during their primary education. Our school currently pay for transport from home to our nearest school, geographically, and then the County pay for transport on to her taught school. The cost to the school is huge. I would like to see the County paying for all transport that is required to get my daughter to school. Then for secondary education our nearest school geographically would not necessarily be our first choice due to their reviews. However we may not be able to afford the transport pass for her to get to our preferred school so she may be limited to attending the nearest school just because of our income. I completely understand that the county need to make cuts to their expenditure but feel that this issue needs to be addressed by central government and the County need to stand firm in that every child deserves the best education they can access regardless of their family's income.

The removal of 2 transition days for SEND students is awful and puts SEND students at a significant disadvantage relative to their peers. Also, changing to nearest school should not happen for residents of Swaledale. They currently travel to Richmond school on the safer lower road. The nearest school to the is Leyburn on a narrow high road, impassable on wintery mornings. Often foggy and icy. This would increase the risk to schoolchildren as well as putting pressure on Wensleydale school to accommodate the extra students.

I have (Redacted)in (Redacted) different schools, so as a working family the changes to the school transport will have a detrimental effect on our household. We live in (Redacted)and I walk my youngest 2 children to our local primary/nursery provision, my next child has multiple and profound learning disabilities and has a EHCP and attends (Redacted), and my eldest is going in to his GCSE years in September at (Redacted) I would not be willing to change my eldest child's school at this stage in his education and it would be extremely difficult to transport him to school around my other children and attend work on time. Even more so if I have to transport my other children to (Redacted). Meaning I would have to be in 3 places at one time, or pay for breakfast club, where that is available, with loss of earnings. I feel this will also have a huge affect on the quality of education in schools, from either being over or under subscribed. I think the changes to the policy are unrealistic, unsuitable and quite frankly ridiculous. If the council needs to save money I suggest it explores another department for this. Many many families would be impacted in an extremely negative way if the proposed plans are to go ahead.

I think that my child's school will suffer if the changes are made regarding free transportation to the school in the Local Authority catchment area and making children go instead to the nearest school. I think this change could mean a significant reduction in the number of students attending my child's school in the future, resulting in a deterioration to the wide ranging and high quality curriculum currently on offer.

Our nearest school is Leyburn. Our children attend Richmond School. We chose this school on the basis that it offered a far superior range of subjects and extra curricular activities. It also has a sixth form on site. We would never want our children to attend Leyburn school simply because it is the nearest school. We should not have to make this choice because it would be where free transport would be available. I cannot see that the proposed change in provision of school transport is going to be anything other than detrimental to school children in this area. Living in a very rural area we are reliant on school transport to get our children to school. We would be left with no parental choice about which school our children attend. I worry that the resulting drop in pupil numbers at Richmond school would mean a real reduction in the quality of education provided at the school, which can only be detrimental to an already declining rural population.

Don't vote Tory

This new proposal will have an extremely negative impact on the families in Ingleton and Bentham. The demographic and rurality of these areas mean that parents are going to be but in financial difficulty in choosing to go to Settle college the only North Yorkshire school they have available to them. Families will be forced to have to go across county for their education. Causing disruption not only for transport, financial impact and juggling different holidays if families have children and parents working and attending different schools in different counties.

Awful proposal to take away funded travel. Our nearest secondary school isn't always the best choice for our children and doesn't suit their needs.

Why in the world do the council constantly insist on making changes that make life harder for the people living within its district.

Living in Ingleton in North Yorkshire, the proposal of 'amendment to the main eligibility criterion to be nearest school (with places available) would have a huge negative impact on our nearest school in the County, Settle College. This school is a fantastic school that needs pupils from Bentham & Ingleton, to lose these pupils to a school in another county would be detrimental to Settle College's size, funding and future. Living in Ingleton, our council tax is paid to NYC, yet this proposal is setting out a rule that would see both us & the school lose out - madness. I urge you to reconsider this, before many families and a superb school is affected.

That all children are expected to attend school until the age of 18 therefore transport should be funded until the age of 18.

This is wrong, and it takes away a choice for parents and our children for their education! This is a huge set back, and in many cases has no environmental benefits

I am saddened by the new proposal and it will affect my family massively. We are not in the position to afford transport but want the best for my children

I think this will hit families hard financially and mean a lot more school days will be lost due to dangerous roads/winter conditions making travel impossible for those that can't fund a bus pass for the school on the safer route

As working parents we have 2 options, leave employment to transport our children or have them sent to whichever school has places... Freedom to choose the school most suited to your child's needs is being removed. Public transport is not an option as we live in a rural area, potentially our children could spend 3 hours a day on transport to go to a school that does not match their needs, this would not benefit the child, their peers, the school. Yet again budgets before children. It's bad enough that post 16 they can't get to a college (even though until 18 they have to be in education) now you are penalising them for living in a rural area from the outset.

I would like to see better investment in cycle paths across the county to assist children getting to school themselves. Thirsk is a classic example of a recent uplift in house building, increased traffic and yet nothing to facilitate alternative transport options, other than the car. There needs to be more joined up thinking, not just about a simple saving from reducing services, which is short term strategy.

If the proposals go ahead we are concerned that future families are being denied the element of parental choice in selecting the most suitable school for their child as financial costs may influence their decision. The Selby area is diverse, with 3 secondary schools in close proximity - each school has its own strengths and identity which parents consider carefully when choosing education for their child. The new proposals deny this option to parents on the basis of them being able to either use their own transport or pay for transport to and from school. We are concerned that many families currently with children at our Academy will be unable to afford to send siblings to the school this could potentially have a negative impact on family life and children's welfare - school start times, inset days and holidays could be all impacted.

This consultation has been extremely poor. There has been a chronic lack of information provided to all parties. Your modelling of data has been shown to be incorrect and further information has not been received. NYC workers have expressed their own dismay at the plan. This has either been extremely poorly thought-out/ organised, or has purposefully been underhand/ sly in order to get through a cost saving exercise with as little challenge from external parties as is achievable. The plan essentially makes it more difficult for disadvantaged families to choose the education for their child that they wish, compounding disadvantage even further. A poor show on all fronts.

As a teacher at a secondary school, I find the plan to ENFORCE students/parents to utilise the geographically nearest school to be utterly unsuitable for the needs of our rural catchment. Historically and currently, many parents actively choose to send their children to our school despite living as in distant rural locations in the Dales. This has been a choice of the parents/children who have been able to access the education that their deserve at our school. Your proposal to ENFORCE that students can only be provided with funded transport to the geographically nearest school has MAJOR implications for a range of stakeholders. This includes: 1 - Dividing rural communities, particularly for young children, who share social lives with their neighbours but because of their grid reference on an OS map MUST attend different schools. This feels like social segregation - something akin to what happens in Belfast due to religious background. Villages, who have long had communities of children attend our school, will now see friendships severed as they have to attend separate schools due to geographical location. 2 - By losing, what we estimate to be 140 students over the course of 5 years, it is quite likely that such a loss will have huge financial implications for our school. Teachers will be made redundant, the sixth form may have to close, and financial cuts to the quality of education that ALL students at the school experience will be diminished. This decision WILL DIRECTLY correspond to reduced life chances for young people attending our school - not just those who can't attend. Extra-curricular cuts, subject offer cuts, SEN support - all will suffer as a result of reduced pupil intake. 3 - Implications for other schools - where geographically near schools are at/near full capacity, this change will create issues for other schools in terms of accommodating the increased numbers of students they will receive. Have you even checked as to whether they can accommodate for these extra children? My likely guess will be no - especially as you made NO contact with our school regarding this change. 4 - Diminishing the educational experience for the child - by limiting the choice that parents have in terms of sending their child, you are forcing students to attend schools with lower outcomes. This is purely because of your inability to manage your own finances - instead passing the burden onto schools to deal with. This is typical of a conservative county council. Years of cuts, lack of forward planning and then further cuts to deal with the poor management that you have applied for the last 13 years. Have you considered cuts within the county council itself? Why should our CHILDREN suffer as a result of YOUR poor management of funds. 5 - Have you even consulted with the affected children, parents, schools and bus companies? The lack of information supplied to the general public about this proposed change has been very discrete, vague and somewhat hidden from the public. Furthermore, there is no real specific information about who is exactly is impacted. The way this situation has been handled, from start to now, has been utterly incompetent. How can this go ahead when the level of consultation for all stakeholders has been so poor. I really hope that the public on May 2nd will show to you how utterly incompetent this county council truly is.

When choosing a school each child has individual needs that parents have to consider and the nearest is not always the best choice for that child . At a time where anxiety and school attendance is a huge issue changing the transport to only the nearest school is going to be a disaster for many pupils as parents will have reduced choices in where to send them .

We live on the school route of (Redacted) but our catchment school is outside of the county, (Redacted) goes to richmond but i have to take him to school which is a massive strain on myself and jacks father as we live on a farm and (Redacted) works away a lot . It would be much easier if (Redacted) could get the bus that passes our farm track end!

I think the whole policy is a shambles. The lack of response you have given to schools who are affected by this has been disgraceful. The amount of children and families affected will be huge, and the negative impact this will have is huge.

Do not make this unnecessary change!

If you create a blanket policy that free transport is only provided to the nearest school, children living at the edge of the county will be disproportionately affected. If the policy said that free transport would be provided to either: the nearest school; or, if the nearest school is not in the county, the nearest school in the county, it would make a big difference to children living at the edge of the county and is likely to have a negligible impact on the council itself (as, in reality, the majority of children in the county will have a school within the county as their closest school).

I understand the DoE review and desire to reduce costs, however these reduction will come at the expense of some schools losing pupils making school assets redundant, whilst other schools potentially having insufficient capacity; requiring capex. Each of these have material costs, which when offset against the proposed savings need to be fully understood to assess actual net gain or potential loss. In North Yorkshire, given the county's size and sparse population if implemented there is a wider community aspect to consider and knock on consequences if implemented - which is likely to be a disincentive to young families moving into and those staying in NY, which would be regressive in all areas and increase an already lopsided demographic. I do hope the government has a rethink or provides dispensation for rural counties - one size fits all is too simplistic and seldom achieves (successfully) the desired outcome.

Myself and my family live in North Yorkshire and the catchment secondary school is Whitby. The nearest suitable secondary school is however in Redcar and Cleveland. This school may or may not have spaces available when my children leave primary school. If it does, this document appears to suggest that paid school transport will only be offered to a school out of catchment area. There are three school years between my children, this means that if numbers of the nearest suitable school fluctuate and increase during this time, the catchment school may become the nearest suitable school. Meaning that transport could be provided to two different but both deemed to be 'suitable' schools. This does not provide any sort of certainty for children or families. It also seems unfair that when the decision to send our children to school was made, the catchment school was Whitby and paid school transport would be provided. It is proposed that this decision will change. In my view, this could lead to children moving to secondary school without a group of friends and will be detrimental to the children's wellbeing. All sporting curriculum activities and sporting events are done in the Whitby Schools, to equip children to move on to secondary school there, get to know the school etc. Should the travel policy change, this may mean that children have to attend a different school in a neighbouring authority, due to consideration around travel costs. This does not seem to be fair.

This would remove parental choice and would be divisive as some would pay for/provide their own transport and others would not be able to and so would have no choice.

This is a massive rural county, of course the transport costs are going to be higher. Richmond school is an excellent school but with fewer pupils attending then the funding will go down and so will the standards and opportunities for the pupils of the school. The chill does a great deal for the community and also the members of the Armed forces and their families in nearby Catterick Garrison.

It is outrageous that this proposal is being made with so little time before it is potentially implemented. We purposefully moved in 2021 to a village in the catchment area for our children's future secondary school (which is not the nearest one) aware that their transport would be provided and the cost covered. We selected this secondary school in autumn 2023 for our son to start in September 2024. It is shocking that this proposed change could be introduced after parents like us have made and been granted our school of choice which is in catchment but isn't the nearest. The provision of free transport is an important factor that we considered when making this choice so for the criterion to possibly be changed after this decision has been made is appalling. The burden this will place on our cost of living is significant and an unbelievable pressure when our council tax has already increased this year.

One impact that could negatively affect families is that it may limit their ability to move house within the county while keeping their child in the same school. This could be a particular problem for those in temporary or rented housing, and without long term housing security. Please also consider the impacts for families that have one child already in a secondary school that is not technically the closest suitable with a second child in primary school. Under the new policy, they would be forced to either send the second child to a different secondary school to their sibling or pay for school transport. I think taking an approach of only offering free transport to the nearest suitable school creates potential problems for people that live close to equal distance between two or more schools, as it could force them towards a school that is less suitable or convenient for a variety of reasons. It is not always a case that a school is or is not suitable, there may be differing degrees of suitability. Please consider building in a bit more of a buffer in to this. I suggest adding that, if the difference in distance between the home and two (or more) 'suitable' schools is five miles or less, then free transport would be available to either school.

We feel that these proposals are very concerning to us as a family. School transport has always been provided and our eldest child attends the catchment school of Richmond and we live on the very edge of the catchment. We bought a house to be in the catchment (with free transport to school) so we knew, or thought we knew ...once the children were at secondary school they would be able to get to school without any help from us. We are both working parents, with work commitments and work in the opposite direction to the catchment school, so would be unable to manage transporting our 2nd child to & from Richmond each day. Our 2nd child possibly having to attend a totally different school seems ludicrous as would involve managing the admin for x2 different schools, systems etc, the different holidays (how would this even work for a family?!). The main overall reason for our distress is our children and their happiness at school. This proposal of changing how the whole school place application process should have been planned & talked about years in advance! Not moving children who have been attending a primary school in readiness for them to go on to secondary (friend groups etc) for the system all to be changed for our 2nd child. It would be v distressing for our younger child to leave her primary school friends and have to attend a secondary school in Darlington (not knowing anyone)! I hope there will be extended consideration given for siblings....to continue to have access to free transport for their secondary years. We hope this is reconsidered! If transport will be provided for another school, how is this saving money?! There will still be buses driving between villages/homes to "the nearest school".

Really concerned at the thought of having siblings at different schools in potentially different counties at the same time for following reasons. Different school holiday dates. Different uniforms. Dealing with two different schools at the same time for secondary. We chose to live where we do based on the fact that we could send our children to our chosen catchment school and they would both receive the same standard of education. Or a crazy situation where one child qualifies for free transport at current school due to current set up being honoured but younger child needs driving to the same location. I would prefer to see that younger siblings are part of the same proposed honouring agreement as older siblings. Also another concern in order to get free transport for a younger sibling we would be forced to send them to a school where they know no one without a choice. Very harsh when many of their friends from primary would still qualify for catchment school. Surely a child in middle of primary education should have a seamless transition to catchment school where we have been lead to believe they can attend and still qualify for free transport. Could even end up with situation where two buses arrive in same village everyday to driving two siblings to different schools how is that even saving councils money? The whole situation feels like a complete shambles and poorly considered.

I think that children with an EHCP attending a special school or Post 19 setting should automatically qualify for free transport as they don't have a choice but to attend a college in a different town. For example, my child could not go to our local sixth form college as it does not provide suitable courses for those with learning disabilities. We have no choice in the matter - he cannot walk from Richmond to Northallerton and he does not have the capacity to use public transport. I think parents all parents and carers should be able to choose the right school for their child, within reason. The proposal will mean the children from families with higher incomes will be able to pay the transport fees and attend the school of their choice while those from lower income backgrounds may be forced to choose the nearest school which may not be able to meet their child's needs. Those from lower income backgrounds will be more significantly impacted by this proposal which in my view, is ideologically wrong. I am also concerned about the financial impact on the school where I work. This proposal could result in a significant reduction in numbers which could jeopardise the breadth of the curriculum on offer and result in redundancies across the school.

I understand the need to save money, however you will be putting a very good school in your own county at a serious disadvantage, not to mention removing the element of choice currently available! Moreover, parents are struggling, should the proposals go ahead, parents will automatically choose the school attached to funded transport, rather than looking toward which school may best suit the needs to the child! And our alternative school falls under a different county, are we seriously contemplating going to fund this bus route, which is outside of Yorkshire boundaries? Maybe consider as a compromise, parents pay for the first and maybe second year only! Funded from year 9 and up, and let these other proposals go! Support your own Yorkshire County schools!! Please reconsider this!

The proposals are wholly unworkable and certainly will be detrimental to families living in the remotest rural locations. Merely looking at a map and allocating a school place on distance may very well seem reasonable until you look at the facts. A county boundary, the Cumbria/North Yorkshire roads which are impassable over the winter months owing to altitude and extreme weather. Coupled with it being a dead spot with no mobile coverage will undoubtedly mean that the children are more likely to spend more days at home owing to poor road conditions. There would certainly need to be an effective liaising with a Cumbria council to change the current winter road status of the B6270 and for the winter months a 4 x 4 vehicle. Quite how the safety concerns could be met when a majority of the journey is without any mobile coverage. The practicalities of this recommendation have not been fully thought through. For families with children already attending North Yorkshire schools it would be impractical and rather stupid to have different term times and uniforms....a minor issue you might think but rural hardship is a real problem and this proposal is yet another reason that young families will not remain in Swaledale. Culturally, a traditional rural area such as this will suffer when the social cohesion that has existed for generations is dramatically changed as families and children are split up in this way. We feel strongly that for us the only option would be to home educate our children.

I feel that if the council decide to go with the proposed changes, it would affect not only my child having a choice of which secondary school to go to (without a huge financial impact on our family) it would also significantly affect our area of North Yorkshire. I struggle to understand why North Yorkshire Council would provide transport to another County's school, thus reducing the attendance/funding to one of their own schools. Settle has been a fantastic source of education for many years for children from Ingleton, Bentham and surrounding villages.

We have a younger sibling who will be subject to this new policy. However, as parents, our "suitable choice of school" for our eldest child, was made on the grounds of FREE SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION being offered, to that facility, within catchment. We want to ensure that both children attend the same school. However, with the removal of the FREE TRANSPORTATION this becomes a significant challenge. It is UNFAIR and UNREASONABLE for the council to expect siblings to be forced to attend different schools, as a result of this new policy. Currently there is NO OTHER PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION routes or services available from the outer village that we reside in, to my eldest child's school. How are parents expected to ensure that siblings attend school, if there is no other alternate public transport network available, to fulfill this task? Whilst the environmental impact of fewer transport services for the council to manage, will decrease, the overall environmental impact of expecting parents to drive children to school, will rise significantly! This is not a "green initiative!" Had this policy been made clear earlier, then we would have seriously considered where we would have purchased a home! Living in a small outlying village we researched the options available to us in terms of secondary schools and transportation networks and costs. All of these factors were taken into consideration prior to selecting 1st choice of school for our eldest child, with the view that both children would have the same facilities and opportunities made available to them. It appears that the psychological impact on our children's wellbeing based on them potentially now being separated into different secondary schools has not been considered by the council. The nearest suitable school policy would result in 2 siblings being forced to attend different school, which is totally unacceptable. Council tax fees have increased, however, an important council funded service is being proposed to be removed. How and where are these anticipated savings going to be re-assigned? We feel strongly that introducing such a significant change in policy part-way through our children's secondary education, impacting our budget financially, as well as their well-being is unfair and unacceptable and we would request that siblings are allowed to continue their educational journey at the same educational facility.

Bentham secondary pupils are split into two, Settle College and QES. Having a child who is autistic we need to ensure he is able to attend Settle College, as this is our nearest school and the most suitable place for him. He will feel safe, secure and supported there rather than attending a school that is now too big. Road links to Settle are far better than the road links to Kirkby Lonsdale, ensuring the pupils will be safer and have a shorter journey time.

Settle College has been the first choice for a growing number of families in Bentham and Ingleton when choosing a secondary school. North Yorkshire Council is now proposing that families who do choose Settle College in the future will have to pay for their own school bus, potentially costing a family with two children going to Settle College over £2,000 every school year. Many families will not be able to afford that kind of extra spending. They will be forced to send their children to their second choice school, which will be outside North Yorkshire, just because it is a couple of miles closer. For every child that does travel outside of North Yorkshire, the council will pay for a bus and so will save nothing, but Settle College will lose about £30,000 from the Government – money that is no longer going into education in North Yorkshire. In short, families will either have to pay or lose their first choice of school. Families will lose out and Settle College will lose out: losing income and missing the brilliant contribution that pupils from Bentham and Ingleton can make.

The change to the free transport from catchment to nearest school will force us as a family to send our children to be educated outside North Yorkshire. We will no longer be eligible for free transport to Settle College in North Yorkshire as our catchment school and will be forced to accept the free transport (provided by North Yorkshire) for my children to be educated across the border in Cumbria at Queen Elizabeth School in Kirkby Lonsdale. This change removed our choice of secondary school as we will not have the funds to pay for transport per year per child to be educated in North Yorkshire or be able to transport ourselves twice a day. So there is no choice under these new arrangements. Yet we will still have to pay council tax to North Yorkshire for educational services in the county without my children benefitting. The impact on Settle College will be immediate. And once parents start thinking Settle College is a dying school, they will start pulling children out or making alternative arrangements. This change will leave Settle College financially vulnerable as they will lose all the revenue for pupils from the Government. This money will go into QES whilst North Yorkshire will still have to fund the transport of our children. So in North Craven, this proposed policy is going to cost North Yorkshire money not save them money. Please support your North Yorkshire schools and reject this change from catchment to just nearest school because in our rural areas, close to county borders, there is going to be a loss of pupils to North Yorkshire Schools, because parents around here will choose to send their children to a more secure school across the border if we lose our free transport to Settle College.

I have concerns of the dropping number applying to my child's secondary school and what they can offer students in the future.

This may have a huge impact on choice of schools and the routes that the children will have to take to school. In my local areas some of the roads are not really suitable for accessing the "nearest" secondary school. The closest by distance does not always mean the closest in terms of travel time. There needs to be a better look at the impact of small villages and where students will need to attend school. I feel this is a blanket approach that will work better in a large city, but North Yorkshire is a very rural county! Some students already spend a significant amount of time on schools buses, and I am concerned about how well this idea has been scrutinised to best serve the very rural communities. I would also like to know more about the details of where this saving will come from, how this conclusion has been arrived at, how the number of buses required has been calculated, etc.

In Skipton the high schools are very close together. The closest one to us would be Skipton Academy however the bus drop off point for all schools (including Skipton Girls and Ermysteds) would be very close together. Skipton Academy would always be our closest school but could our children receive transport to the other schools as I assume it would be the same bus from our village? The appendix examples do not clarify the position on this.

Completely barbaric and NYCC should be ashamed that their data and correspondence related to such a huge change in policy has been minute if not none. The data provided initially was wrong and you wrongly didn't tell those organisations effected by this change that the data you sent them was wrong. This is a malicious and devious move by NYCC.

Your 'nearest school' policy is a disgrace. Not only is this cost saving measure poorly designed, you cannot implement this for people who have already made decisions based on the current policy. We live in a village where the catchment is Ryedale school, but where this isn't the nearest one. As we're in catchment for Ryedale school (for our child who is currently in year 6) we selected this because transport would be provided and costs covered. Under your new policy this would not be covered, but we have already made the decision!!! You cannot retrospectively apply this for people who have based their decisions on the current policy. This would likely be subject to significant challenges. We strongly oppose this policy, and would be willing to apply whatever pressure we can to ensure it isn't adopted.

Who wrote the consultations? Vogons? It's long-winded, labyrinthine and confusing. Unless you work in Local Government education delivery and transport policy the ordinary North Yorkshire resident will not be able to understand it; was that your intention- thus making the decision already made by obfuscation? I do not think it would pass Crystal Mark accreditation. So the proposal is to FORCE pupils to their nearest school, removing any child/ parent/ family choice? How does this contribute to placing the child centrally to their educational needs and abilities? As for 'Appendix 1'- which school offers >2 languages? It seems they're stuck in the French and German 1980s...where can I access Spanish or other languages, for example? I have already witnessed a pupil compromise due to GCSE choice limitations at 'our' school- this consultation feels like it's shoving people into local schools because of an ulterior motive that isn't placing the child central to their needs and aspirations. I'm really disappointed- almost frightened, in how this consultation reads- it's coercive, feels like this '15 minute town' threat is being imposed upon us, and it's removing freedom of choice for individuals because of a county level policy: HRA, Protocol 1, Article 2: Right to education No person shall be denied a right to an education. In the exercise of any functions which it assumes in relation to education and to teaching, the State shall respect the right of parents to ensure such education and teaching is in conformity with their own religious and PHILOSOPHICAL CONVICTIONS. If it is NYC's intention to remove a family's choice of school and thereby philosophical convictions, you might face some serious push-back- and for disclosure you might want to raise this point to your committee/ make it a matter of public record.

Although it does not impact upon my family directly as our nearest school is our school of choice, it may impact us indirectly. The potential numbers of children who attend our school could be influenced by the changes and this may have effects on finances and provision provided for my children. Transitions from primary schools to secondary schools are also very important for children's well being and removal of feeder school/catchment school choice for children could have an impact upon children's mental wellbeing.

The whole 'consultation' process has been an absolute joke. There has been misinformation, false information and a seriously questionable method of sharing this information with affected parties whether they be parents/cares/staff/pupils. I am fully aware of the difficulties in funding for schools, however this is a complete miscarriage of justice for families in already-disadvantaged positions either financially or because of geographical location and could single-handedly destroy a lot of the Dales communities in which they are dependent on young people remaining in the area. How the council have been allowed to go ahead with this consultation in this way is disgraceful.

The difference will make such a difference to families in Ingleton. You are in effect encouraging them to choose a school in a different county (QES in Kirkby Lonsdale in Cumbria) over a school at a very similar distance which is in the same county, that they live in (and pay taxes to!) (Settle College in North Yorks) This will have a huge impact on the school in NY losing many valuable pupils because families will have to send their children to the school for which they get free transport. Also, considering the school in the different county (QES in KL, Cumbria) is over subscribed, how is this a logical decision by taking away pupils away from Settle college? We live in such a rural area, we can't be categorised like a urban area.

Our current LA school is Richmond. Based on this guidance you are suggesting that my child should attend their nearest school which is in County Durham but the schools admission policy would mean that we would be at the bottom of the list for eligibility. So unless you are proposing changing how the school's admission process works you are discriminating us for applying to our nearest LA school and not battling the appeals process to try and get a place at our nearest school. There has been very little consideration, it appears for children who live in rural areas within the county. In current climate where school attendance is at an all time low and you are struggling to get children into school, it amazes me that you are making it even more difficult for parents to get their children to school.

it is obvious that north yorkshire will have one of the highest school travel expenditure due to the fact of it being one of the largest counties and predominately rural. stipulating that the council will only pay for transport to the nearest school disadvantages people with restricted income.

Living in Reeth means that our nearest secondary school is Leyburn resulting in a journey over the moor. In bad weather, this route is not always gritted and is dangerous to travel on. I have concerns that my children would not able to attend school due to travel disruption in the winter or be faced with a dangerous journey, neither of which is acceptable. The main road to Richmond school is gritted and cleared and a much safer route.

Removal of the free transport scheme for many children including my own will negatively impact household finances. As a single mother on one income and two school aged children I would not be able to afford the cost of a bus service. Pushing myself and many others onto the road to drive. Darlington Road is already congested and it's only a matter of time that a child is seriously harmed. This proposed home to school scheme will see a surge of vehicles driving and dropping children off on that road.

Your 'nearest school' policy is inappropriate. This is clearly a cost saving measure only. The impact of the implementation of this for people who have already made decisions based on the current policy will be detrimental to children and families. We live in a village where the catchment is Ryedale school, but where this isn't the nearest school. As we live in the catchment for Ryedale school (our child who is currently in year 6) we selected this school because of its proximity and because transport would be provided and the costs covered. Under your proposed policy these costs would not be covered. This would have a detrimental income on household incomes and family life. We are also concerned that such a proposal will impact on significantly increased car travel into the village of Nawton to Ryedale School. This cannot be squared with the local authority's Climate Change Strategy 2023-30 which commits: To mitigate carbon emissions from travel and transport we will reduce travel in fossil fuel by iii. Enable and support people to choose multi person travel options, such as public transport (buses and trains), community-based transport, demand responsive travel, car share and car clubs. We strongly oppose this policy and will be making representation to elected members to that effect.

I think free school travel to a school you choose is very important. I think local community is important

There may be issues as the bus companies do not currently run services with enough places for people who already pay, so once the free taxis are taken away families will find it even harder to get their children to school in an affordable and sustainable way. Please don't leave any decisions in the hands of transdev. They are truly incompetent and if we had any other option we would pay it. If North Yorkshire ran their own paid for bus scheme we would pay.

We moved to the area for a specific school (Settle) and we meet almost all the criteria to access free transport, however the new proposal will mean we are unable to access free transport to the most suitable school for my child with SEND needs. Not only, separating children from their peers, support systems and trusted adults will have a huge negative impact on their mental health, especially for my daughter. As a family with 2 children attending primary school for another 6 years at least, makes our choice for secondary school impossible, even though it is our nearest catchment school. I think it's disgusting that such a proposal is even allowed to take place, which just shows the lack of thought or care that goes into the children of our county. This will make the quality of many families lives incredibly poorer, especially those unable to drive/accommodate such travelling, in order to give our children the best quality of education and mental health. We as a family feel incredibly let down by this proposal and sincerely hope more thought is put into this decision on the councils part. A council that only repeatedly lets down their SEND children in multiple ways already regularly, this is just another issues to add to an already disheartening list.

I currently have one child in year 7 at our catchment school, however this is the 5th closest school (according to admissions). This means my 2 other children will have to be refused a place at 4 other schools (3 of which are out of area) before being offered free home to school transport. There is currently transport arrangements from my village to my catchment school and my nearest school (also in North Yorkshire), however no transport to the other 3 schools, and as such I was advised by admissions that were the policy to be implemented, and I was offered a place at one of these 3 schools, that free transport would be provided at additional cost to the council, rather than allow my child to access the current transport in operation to my catchment school free of charge. This makes no sense in a time when cost saving is a priority. As far as I understand it, the transport to my catchment school will continue to run and if I wish my other children to use this service I may potentially have to pay upwards of £700 per year to access it, assuming she was to be offered a place at a 'nearer' school. Therefore this is not a cost saving but rather a cost making exercise. We chose our catchment school for my eldest child as we didn't want to worry about whether he would be offered a place, or not and we are very happy with the school, in addition I do not want my other children to go to a different secondary school. Had I known that we may not be eligible for free transport to our catchment school I may have made a different choice for my first child. Whilst I appreciate funding is limited and difficult decisions may need to be made I do not believe restricting free home to school travel to nearest school only is the answer. By excluding catchment schools you are increasing administration costs, as I will have to apply to 4 other schools, increasing stress levels for parents, waiting to find out where their child will get a place, and finally increasing costs of transport by having to provide additional transport to schools where currently there is none, rather than allowing children to use an already existing service.

As governors of Richmond School we are deeply concerned by the potential impact of these new proposals. Richmond School is a highly successful rural school with strong parental support . The current number of students on roll mean the school is able to offer a wide ranging broad and balanced curriculum and outstanding enrichment activity beyond the school day. Richmond School has a national reputation for music and sport. This is a significant factor which influences parental support. The school is highly effective at keeping all young people, including those with significant challenges in the learning environment. Furthermore the transition to 6th form study is seen as a highly desirable option for students from Richmond and wider North Yorks schools. We have real concerns that the potential drop in numbers could result in the 6th form provision being unavailable. There is little doubt that some of the more highly qualified teachers are attracted to North Yorks because of the opportunity to deliver post 16 courses. In our regular discussions with parents it is overwhelmingly clear that Richmond is a first choice for their children because of the reputation it enjoys in the wider community. Dales parents for example state that Richmond has always been the school of choice for generations of families and thy expect that to continue. Richmond School understands it's community which is broader than the immediate town and encompasses students from rural farming areas as well as military families.The recent service childrens' school awards recognised the contribution and quality of provision at Richmond School. In the next phase of this consultation we would suggest that the question of split villages and therefore additional transport to the nearest school is costed. This may be significant cross county. Equally has the journey for buses from the Upper Dales to Leyburn or Kirby Stephen been analysed for suitability for bus routes and lack of access in the winter months? The breadth and quality of Richmond School's offer to all families within the current catchment area will be severely impacted by the new transport proposals. Despite a number of requests we have still not received answers to important questions we have pursued with the LA. For example why has the impact of these proposals on all North Yorks schools not been shared widely? Have the other local authorities affected understood that their transport costs may rise as North Yorks fall? This lack of transparency coupled with the consultation period falling across the Easter holiday has restricted the school leaders opportunity to fully engage with parents, staff and partner primary schools. Families we reach out to on an individual basis are still unaware that despite having older siblings at Richmond their younger children will have to attend a different secondary school. For example Croft, Barton, Brompton on Swale, Gunnerside, Reeth, Hunton and Arrathorne etc Whilst we understand the need to cut budget costs we strongly feel that the negative impact of these proposed changes on a highly successful, well regarded school by the community it serves and Ofsted ,are unacceptable.

The Second Home Policy is a shambles. I co-parent and my children are with me 2 out of 5 school days Even with the option to pay for a bus place - I was told there were no spaces. Now you are removing this option completely this results in my situation where my Step daughter gets a bus and gets dropped off at home and I follow the bus driving my daughter to the same school for the same time - the same thing happens after school How does any of this policy also tie in to any Green and environmental policies you should be adhering to by trying to reduce the amount of parents having to drive their children to schools

N/A

As parent I believe I should have the right to chose the best school for my child - not purely based on distance. Perhaps funding should be opened up to the nearest 2 schools to at least allow parents the choice. Also, if funding for school transport was to be reduced and therefore more children are not eligible then you will find more traffic and accidents on these already congested residential streets near the schools. For example, Richmond School and SFX school are already extremely busy with cars and no where to park. I dread to think of the situation if less students are getting buses and more parents will drive. The complaints will be through the roof as the roads are already packed with cars!

As a resident of Reeth and knowledge of Swaledale and Arkengarthdale roads in winter it is alarming that NYCC are prepared to compromise the education and/or safety of local children by forcing transportation over roads which are untreated and vulnerable to extremes, because of altitude and remoteness. Have you carried out risk assessments for e.g. travel from upper Swaledale to Kirkby Stephen or Arkengarthdale to Barnard Castle via the Stang? The rush to save money would indicate otherwise. The road from Buttertubs and down Swaledale is a priority gritting route to keep the dale as accessible as possible and enable school transport to function. Do you intend to extend the priority gritting status through Swaledale and with co-operation from the neighbouring council into Kirby Stephen or in the other direction to Barnard Castle? Are you prepared to compromise the safety of school children on their provided transport and the drivers of those vehicles when the weather closes in and in 20mins elevated roads become impassable or extremely slippery. Some common sense needs to be applied. You will know the demograph of dales residents. You will know that working families are rarely in a financial position to fund the transport of their children to their chosen school. Much better understanding by NYCC is required instead of looking for opportunities to charge for transport services that are at odds with actual practicalities. Does NYCC understand the financial and practical implications on the schools themselves. Some schools it would seem potentially will suffer a drop in pupils whilst others would see an increase. Can either absorb those changes. What financial impacts are there for both. Are there enough transport providers who can or are able/prepared to support the new transport structure you propose. They after all have a duty of care to their staff as well as their passengers. Whilst I understand financial pressures ideas that are conceived in an office environment with the application of a spreadsheet miss the bigger picture. I do hope that common sense will prevail and the anxiety that young families are feeling with these proposals as they stand will be alleviated. I look forward to being kept informed.. Thank you.

I have one child currently attending Richmond School and using free transport. If these changes go ahead my other child would not be eligible for free transport to the same school. It would also require the council to provide an additional service to provide the existing service to the school for those children already attending and a separate service to the nearest school for the younger children!

You have completely removed the choice. Living in a rural area the route to the closest school is a terrible journey particularly in winter. In fact - in winter months the school bus would have to do a round trip which is probably the same distance as the school that is further away. The standard is also not as high to the school I would choose two miles further away! If my child goes to the school closest he will not have the same opportunities. It's much further away from my work route making school appointments much more difficult. It also will reduce the intake from the school that is classed as the better school reducing their income and will therefore be of detriment to their future pupils. The school closest to my home does not offer the same opportunities, does not have the same standards, is harder to get to and doesn't have a sixth form. This is taken away the free choice of school and is a detriment to my child, family and other schools - families on lower incomes - how is this fair?

I moved to my current home address based on the fact it's in the Richmond catchment area. The closest schools are in Darlington. I do not wish to send my children to a Darlington school but you are leaving me with no option. It's disgraceful

We are a rural county, the fact that this is even being discussed and raised is appalling. Let's say we had to send our children to a school in Darlington because of your proposals I would question whether we should be paying our council taxes to North Yorks. Penny pinching exercise that actually deters young families from living in rural communities. How about the local authority saves money in its systems and processes of work instead of levelling it at our young people.

How you can decide this based on an as the crow flies calculation mwnajng it will actually take longer o the bus for childrent to attend the school that you deem nearest baffles me

We cannot meaningfully respond to the consultation, as we have not been provided with key information requested- this information was first requested in March and has been requested on multiple occasions (including in public meetings) throughout the consultation. Whilst officers were working with us initially and agreed to extend the consultation period when they accepted that their modelling (the basis of this consultation) was wrong, they latterly failed to respond to emails and share additional information requested. Without the information requested, we cannot meaningfully respond to the consultation as we have no idea as to how it will impact communities in NYC. Stakeholders that have provided feedback have unknowingly based their feedback on, at best, limited information and at worst, inaccurate information. The current position: - we only received accurate data modelling for our schools on Monday 15 April (the consultation commenced on 19th February) - schools in NYC have not been issued with the data modelling unless they requested it. Many schools and communities have no idea how the proposals being consulted on will affect them - schools/stakeholders were not informed that the consultation had been extended (until it went out in the red bag after a meeting we had with officers on Friday 12 April) - stakeholders were not been informed that the consultation was extended due to the mistakes identified in the data presented at the start of the consultation period (we have noted that a comment has recently been added under the FAQ section of the website -around challenge received- re the extension) - data modelling for all schools has not been provided to us and all stakeholders (this was requested on two separate occasions in mid March) - NYC have not updated or shared any revised financial modelling that reflects the revised data modelling. Therefore, we are not aware of the potential financial savings based on the accurate data modelling Whilst we understand that NYC need to save money, it appears that this consultation was merely a box that NYC had to tick to change their current school transport policy- it certainly does not feel like a genuine and transparent consultation process. Therefore, we ask that councillors give all stakeholders the information they require to meaningfully respond to this consultation and that this consultation process is rerun.

I have to pay over £600/year for my child to attend the school that is the closest secondary school to his primary school (which was also the closest primary school to our home) simply because it is not the closest secondary school in North Yorkshire, by 2miles. His school bus place is only guaranteed if there is a space. So I pay for what would otherwise be an empty seat on a bus already travelling to QES. Effectively, this is the situation that many parents will find themselves in if they live in Bentham or Settle but wish to send their children to Settle College. In our rural communities, nobody wins, neither schools nor pupils or parents, by changing the criteria of 'closest school' only for funding of school travel.

We as a family have chosen to live in North Yorkshire and part of that was that we want to be involved in everything that North Yorkshire has to offer. we pay council tax to not to Yorkshire. It feels like you are trying to punish the children for living in a rural place and sending them out of area for schooling is really not fair for them. If we wanted to send out children to school in a different county we would have moved or indeed stayed were we were previously. I feel so strongly against this proposal to send children to their nearest school if this means they have to go out of area as it would be for our children. It also is a form of discrimination as parents that can pay have the choice to let their kids go to the school in North Yorkshire rather than the majority that won't be able to afford this. Kids from the same village will get split up with regard schooling and potentially just because parents can't afford to pay for the bus just to send their child to the school in the same county as we live. Please please please keep our children being able to access the secondary school in the same county as we live.

We have emailed H2Stransportreview@northyorks.gov.uk to provide substantive views on this consultation. Contact details for the substantive response are: John Furlong LeaP Project Cerebra johnf@cerebra.org.uk

Please see all emails from (Redacted) to email address H2S... and you will have all of my comments, queries and questions. Quite frankly the 4000 characters you have provided won't provide enough space for what me or a lot of parents or carers have to and want to say! Kindly address the points raised in my emails. Best regards (Redacted)

Completely unacceptable to suggest that children will be obliged to attend their nearest school simply because of this massive change in transport policy. No regard is being taken with respect to the current circumstances of nearest school (always oversubscribed) no regard is being taken of children having a sense of the next stage in their school career as they will feel certainty will be lost. No regard to the concept of effective transition from Year 6 to Year 7 . If the Council really cares for the children and young people of North Yorkshire they will reconsider the whole scheme.

There is currently a bus running to our local North Yorkshire school that passes where I live. If the 'nearest school' rule was to take effect the nearest 2 schools would be out of county, but they are not big schools. So potentially the one bus would be replaced by 2 buses as the schools may fill up, and then maybe a third to go to the original school tripling the cost. This is something you may have to face county wide, not a saving at all!

I think it's absolutely disgusting that as a parent you aren't able to send your children to a school of your choice if you can't get the child to said school on your own. There are many working families who struggle on a day to day basis and taking this away means more children will be sent to underprivileged schools and that not by choice. Taking this away will put families into more poverty. Instead of paying the fat cats at the top all the bonuses how about working for minimum wage like everyone else does and see how hard it actually is without raising council tax or taking more help away from families who want better for their children. Don't pay out our hard earned money on bonuses for people who sit at a desk all day doing nothing. Give back to the community and stop taking everything away. Kids suffer already more than anyone

The proposed changes will cause huge disruption, anxiety and financial issues in our family. We will have one child in secondary school in Richmond and one forced to go to Hummersknot in Darlington as we will not be able to afford to transport her ourselves. We will have no choice of schools. In addition, the schools in 2 different local authority areas have different holidays which will cause issues financially, will mean family holidays will be very difficult to plan and the children will not be able to attend after school activities as we will not be able to pick them up from 2 places at once. This policy will also cause numbers to drop in Richmond school, affecting its finances and risking the quality of its offering. I disagree with this proposed change so strongly on environmental grounds too, we will be taking one bus off the roads and instead putting 30 or 40 cars out instead. I believe this proposal has been made by simply considering financial benefits and has totally disregarded the needs of the young people the local authority is tasked with providing for. Once again, I strongly disagree with this policy proposal and would consider it discriminatory to my children as they are having reduced choice and forced apart from siblings.

I strongly oppose the change of eligibility to the 'nearest' school only even if it's in a different local authority. I don't drive which isn't an issue at present my younger child attends primary school in our village but elder child gets the school bus provided to our nearest secondary school in North Yorkshire. Should this proposal go ahead, there would be no service bus, there are no safe footpaths and I cannot drive so are the council going to pay for individual taxis to transport youngest child to the 'nearest' School

The consultation does not consider the impact the changes the proposed policy will have on schools and the communities they support (page 19). Many schools are the hub of the community, where children and their families come together to build local, often isolated, communities. Some communities will be split by the fact some children live at one side of the village to their friends. Some schools will also have to reduce staff if they are adversely affected by this change. At a time of challenging recruitment in schools, to lose excellent teachers and support staff seems counterproductive to supporting young people recovering from the setback of the pandemic. The proposal also seems to be directly opposed to supporting disadvantaged students and closing the gap. If they are lucky enough to live in the right place they gain the challenge and support they need, if they don't then they will attend schools that are not as able to support their needs, therefore the disadvantaged gap widens further. Choice of school seems to be selective as it is only available to those who can financially afford it.

I think it would be very detrimental to our children to expect them to go to a different county to school potentially going to have children in schools in different counties (primary and secondary) which will have a huge affect on the family. Schools in different counties have different holidays, can't expect parents to have to sort childcare for different county holiday provision. It is a very bad proposal and really hope it doesn't go through.

It is a disgrace that as a household of two working parents who contribute a significant portion of our wages to income tax, that free transport to our chosen secondary school may not be provided. It is another example of working people being put upon while other groups who do not contribute to society are looked after left right and centre. Transport to a suitable and desired site of education should be an inalienable right and not be treated as a privilege.

How do you identify closest school - as crow flies or miles eg on Google?

As a resident living in Swaledale I think the roads network from Swaledale to Cumbria and Wensleydale are dangerous so secondary age children in Swaledale should still be able to go to Richmond regardless of where in the Dale, the B6270 is gritted up the Cumbria and Teesdale border to allow people and parents to get their children to school safely. Primary school children in Swaledale it is ridiculous when most parents that have 2 cars that a minibus service is put on for them to drive half a mile to school. Most have to drive past or to where the school is to get to work etc. it is a luxury to have the minibuses in my opinion and massive waste of money.

We live in Ingleton. Our eldest child attends Settle College and we are very happy with the excellent provision for lots of reasons. If the proposed amends go ahead nyc will still be paying for pupils to be transported to the "nearest@ school which is QES. So they would not be saving money at all. There should not be a blanket policy. If the Ingleton is in a unique situation. The proposal is ridiculous.

I understand that the proposed new policy does not have regard to the travel time or potential difficulties with some of the routes to the "nearest" school locations. For example I understand that, whereas children from Swaledale and Arkengarthdale generally go to Richmond after Year 6 at present, some may now be expected to go to Leyburn, Barnard Castle or Kirkby Stephen instead. This is notwithstanding that travel to and from those locations may in practice take longer and involve higher level routes on narrower roads which can often be difficult, problematic and dangerous particularly in winter and other unpredictable or adverse conditions. I therefore request that this element of the proposed new policy should be reconsidered

Significant school traffic increases through new outing villages including the bottleneck at Skeeby will significantly increase risks to pedestrian and road traffic safety due to an increase in private use vehicles required to transport children to school along an already congested route

I think your questionnaire is misleading. Trying to establish if we have understood your proposal as opposed to getting views on whether we agree with your proposal! Offering transport to our nearest school which isn't our catchment school is totally unacceptable. What if our nearest school has no places?? How do we get our child to school then? You are basically forcing parents to either pay for the transport (which is yet ANOTHER financial burden putting on families) or take our children to school ourselves therefore causing traffic chaos as hundreds of other parents do the same! What you are also yet to disclose under this new proposal is the cost of the transport should we chose to send our child to our catchment school?? This as a minimum should have been highlighted so we know what we are dealing with and are fully informed to make choices. Under the new proposal you would be dividing families based on what they can afford. For example, you would send a bus to my village to collect a child going to the "nearest school not in catchment" which would be free. Another bus will come along to collect a child going to the catchment school which the parents have had to pay for. Then another parent will jump in the car and take their child to the catchment school because they can't afford the bus and their child didn't get in to the "nearest school not in catchment". It all sounds such a mess!

Quite frankly, I think this will be of huge detriment to our area. Myself & husband both attended Settle College and have always intended on our children attending there too - it is our nearest high school IN North Yorkshire after all...! To think this option may now be taken away from us because of the new council set up is utterly ridiculous and very very sad. We as a family, amidst the cost of living crisis which many many families are suffering with also, will not be able to find an additional £2k every SINGLE year (for potentially 7 years for each child) to fund our children to go to the nearest high school within our district. How utterly ridiculous, discriminative and above all, a very selfish, money orientated move by NYC.

Yes. We live (Redacted) miles from Settle school and (Redacted) miles from Skipton secondary schools. We are not in the catchment for Settle, but we are for Skipton. Your proposed policy on distance calculation is opaque and does not provide us with any insight into what would actually be considered our nearest suitable school. We assume Settle, but that is not necessarily going to be the nearest, dependent on the preferred transport route which may not utilise minor roads. The different schools that we will consider for our children also includes Upper Wharfedale (about 8.5 miles away). We are not in catchment for this school. The proposed policy creates uncertainty over whether transport could be provided, even if we wished to and were capable of funding it ourselves. The proposed policy pushed the onus onto families to find transport solutions at their expense, with the only gain being that of a saving in expenditure for the authority. This is short sighted, and does not take account of the associated structure of the schools admittance and applications approach (i.e. why allow pupils to apply to a school that they could not realistically get to?)! This places pressure on families in both social, wellbeing, and economic terms. A better way would be to ask for contributions to transport costs from families that can afford to do so and allow families and their children the opportunity to apply to and attend the school of their choosing. The policy also does not allow for parents / carers contractual employment situations, and it will be a lottery regarding whether we could transport our children to school or not dependent on what kind of job we have. The policy is not therefore in keeping with the essential and priority aim of government that those capable of employment should be in employment. We strongly object to the proposed policy as whilst it may save financially for the authority in the short term, it will be damaging to the success and wellbeing of schools and pupils and their families.

Adjust the criteria to nearest school and school within x miles tolerance of another school in the catchment area. For example, Upper wharfedale is our closest school (Redacted) away, but our preferred school is Skipton girls high which is (Redacted) away. So its effectively penalising parents for living a few miles to one school or the other.

The fact that children could be forced to go to a school where no other friends could be attending will have a negative effect on childrens mental health. They have formed relationships which will help them transition into secondary and you will be removing this. Children in different schools with different holidays will be a logistical nightmare for single parents.

I think provision of school transport still needs to be the catchment school, not just to the nearest school. We live on the border of North Yorkshire and West Yorkshire- on the the north side, our catchment secondary school is King James but the nearest school is Wetherby High. There is no point in having transport to Wetherby High (as the nearest school) as my children will be going to King James and therefore provision should be made for that. I live in (Redacted), and the other 20 children who get on the bus in our village to get to King James will I am sure feel the same.

In my circumstances, without the provision of free transport i would struggle to safely get my children to school and back every day. We live in an area where they would be required to walk along an A road without adult supervision and as shodt workers we simply cannot escort them to school every morning because of work commitments. We have no family in the area to help with getting them to school and financially would struggle to add the cost of two bus passes to our outgoings. The children attend our closest geographical school for these reasons and the provision of free transport when living in the catchment area is important when you consider their safety without it. I believe that without it it is wholly probable that a child would be injured or killed whilst walking along a 60mph road to school. There is no alternative route that is safer for them and it is poorly lit, uneven under foot and involves crossing the railway. The safety of the children who live in the catchment area is paramount and should be seriously considered when making these changes. In my opinion the provision of transport for children attending a school many miles from their home and not their catchment area is where costs should be incurred for parents as this is a choice they make and commit to when not selecting their closest school

I don't really know how to describe the way in which this consultation has been managed other than to use the word 'shocking'. Every part of the process has been poorly executed, leaving schools and local families largely 'unaware' of the impact of the proposals. The following issues have arisen for us and by implication other schools: There was no 'easy to understand' information available for schools/ families. The consultation was emailed to a member of staff in charge of buses rather than the Headteacher directly and did not arrive via The Red Bag. No impact data was provided unless requested and even then, a very basic error was made and we received data that was entirely inaccurate. This will have been the case for other schools. We had to wait a long time for updated data and the opportunity to discuss our concerns with NYC officers, rendering a large part of the consultation process 'useless'- how can we respond to a consultation when we have no accurate facts to work on? The extension to the process was not shared until we raised this issue at our meeting on Friday 12 April (we were informed of this in the week before the Easter holidays. We were told the extension was in the Red Bag. We had already received the Red Bag that day and it was not included. The extension information was then emailed out via a second Red Bag later in the day. The extension information did not include the reason ie that the initial data shared was flawed and so if a school had asked for data and had not realised errors were made, the school would be responding based on inaccurate facts. Schools have not been made aware of the impact on other schools either- something we have repeatedly asked for. There has been no updated financial modelling completed, based on the revised impact data. We have therefore been unable to work effectively across our primary schools to ensure a joined up understanding of the future situation for our school (which will affect all parents with children in Y5 and below) and to respond as a group. I have also been unable to ensure our parents have an accurate shared understanding of the situation as we have had to wait so long for any clarity. I am absolutely sure that the vast majority of parents still have no idea of the implications of this as NYC has failed to work in a transparent way- certainly parents I have spoken to recently from our school and others had little, if any idea, until I sent a letter out this week explaining the changes in the simplest of terms. In terms of the proposal itself, due to the rural nature of North Yorkshire, travel to school should, by necessity be different to the minimum statutory requirement. If the proposals go ahead, and we do indeed end up with 140+ students fewer on roll, our offer will by definition be reduced. Staff will be made redundant and our curriculum and rich extra-curricular offer will shrink. Lots of families choose us because of these- especially those where the students have additional needs. I also have grave concerns for the future of a school based sixth form provision for the children in The Dales. Maintaining a Sixth Form is extremely difficult and with potentially 30 fewer students in each year group, it is hard to see how we can continue to sustain what we now offer and indeed at a certain point, any education offer can become unviable. As very little that we have said to date appears to have been listened to, it is with heavy heart that I fill this in. We have spent days and days working on this matter behind the scenes as the information from NYC has been so poor. I urge officers to listen to the responses to the consultation and make the decision to treat this unique situation in the 'exceptional' way it requires.

I have a child currently accessing transport provided by NY to attend our catchment area secondary school. We also have a further 3 children at primary school who wish to attend the same school in future. Our nearest school is out of our catchment area and I would feel uncomfortable making applications to this school if the eligibility criteria for applications does not change in line with transport policy. In addition, this school is about, but could possibly be less than 3 miles away based on the policy. The route is unpopulated with national speed limit routes which would not be safe for my children to walk unaccompanied, but could be deemed safe to walk with an adult which would leave us having to provide our own transportation. There is no service bus route. This would negatively impact the attendance of my children where any siblings are at primary school. We would have to be in two places at once. Currently my child at secondary school can safely walk to a bus stop for her NY transport from our home. This may also impact the earning ability of my family as one of us would need to reduce our working hours or cease work completely if reduced hours were not possible in demanding careers in order to be available to transport our children to their nearest school on time in absence of any provision or public service bus routes. I also note that it is very difficult for me to verify the costing information you have supplied in relation to transport costs of the county and these compared to other costs due to the delay in publishing audited accounts. There is no indication of how this policy could impact the numbers attending different schools and the pressures and outcomes this could cause in terms of under and over subscriptions - has this been considered? Has any consideration been given to whether cuts to public transportation could be reversed to compensate and alleviate any problems accessing alternative arrangements? Has any consideration been given to the interaction with school place eligibility which is heavily based on catchment area so at odds with this policy? Where will the savings be directed? Are funds to be reinvested in children's services or taken away from children? How would this impact council tax payments?

This seems like a poor proposal, removing choice for parents and also students. This also affect schools such as Richmond School which has a very proud and ancient history of serving the rural and local community. If these changes go ahead, the school role will be significantly affected, removing curriculum choice and taking jobs out of the local economy.

I strongly disagree with the nearest school not being in catchment. It's going to end up with children not getting places at their nearest choice and then not getting transport to their catchment school. It would also involve changing bus routes sometimes to pick one child from a family up when the others get a different bus to the catchment school. Either redraw the catchment areas so children attend the nearest school or keep transporting children to the catchment school. Changing the policy discriminates against rural children and adds to rural deprivation

Settle college could lose pupils and therefore funding if Bentham pupils have to travel to QES in Cumbria. QES is way too big. Settle college is a better school and shares holiday dates with the local primary schools, an important factor for families. Residents should not have to pay to send their children to the better, in county school.

My children attended Settle College and were eligible for free transport as were many other children in Bentham. I firmly believe that free transport should continue for future Bentham pupils. Settle College is the closest school in travelling time and it is in North Yorkshire, and provides quality education for the children of our community. Withdrawing free travel will mean that local children will have to travel outside North Yorkshire and will have a significant negative financial impact on the school.

It seems that, unfortunately, finance seems to take precedent over what is right and best for children, young people and their families. This proposal could mean that siblings attend different schools for a time and it would also mean children moving to a school in a different county to the one they are currently in. The larger issue here is that very good schools will lose pupils to schools that are not as suitable or effective which makes this whole scenario morally abhorrent. I do not know why an LA would want to take students out of a strong improving school and put them in what could be oversubscribed weaker provisions. The modelling and planning around this whole agenda has been poor - inaccurate and not fully thought through. In all honesty, this is a consultation regarding a not fully formed idea rather than an actual proposal. Has it been confirmed that other schools have the facilities and staffing to cater for these children? In some cases - we are talking about huge changes for the sake of 1-2 miles on a journey. The upheaval would be huge and we could end up with a big school having empty space and then the cost of upgrading the other schools (at a cost) with temporary buildings in order to facilitate the moves. School places should not become a postcode lottery otherwise deprivation increases as do life chances. People will start to sell perfectly nice homes and move just to be nearer the school of choice as was the case in years gone by. A review of transport arrangements was always inevitable however clear planning, timely consultation with actual evidence of impact and mapping and a graduated approach would be far more appropriate. Or just increase council tax a little in order to spread the cost burden without the drastic action here. I think most people would rather pay a little more council tax and maintain the status quo. We hope the council will reconsider this rushed decision and spend more time planning and ensure that, at the heart of this, young people are taken into consideration and what is best for them. We are a very good school who deserve to maintain the students we have and look after well. We have a long history of providing a good education to young people in the local community and to reduce this capacity would be detrimental to our school, the young people and the local area.

MY child currently attends St Hilda's primary in Ampleforth (Redacted). Should this school close (which is under consultation at the same time), we would be forced to our nearest school, which is being defined as St Benedict's RC school. St Benedict's is not designated as a rural school it is not a village school, and has a selective admissions policy based on religion. How can we, as parents who are expected to work to create more taxes for UK wealth (government recent policies, for example the additional free school hours for <3 year olds, are wholly designed to make more parents work to ultimately contribute more in tax), be expected to have to reduce our hours to be able to send our child to an inclusive school (e.g. Helmsley). This is leaving us with no choice but to give up/reduce work hours - ultimately, it may mean we leave a currently thriving service village. I can understand how this policy is suitable for more urban areas where there are several schools within small radius areas and therefore catchment areas are relatively arbitrary, but in a rural area we could be in a situation where our nearest school is not suitable on religious grounds (would you send a Catholic child to a Jewish or Islamic school for example?) and does not have a catchment so does not have to take us. Or a catchment school (Husthwaite) that we are within the admission area, but could not travel to, or the nearest inclusive school (Helmsley) but we are not in catchment and so could easily get turned away (in 2027/28 they are currently expected to be at maximum capacity). This policy does not work for rural communities where there are several near schools, which allow parent choice. This is actively removing choice heavily from working parents and is discriminatory towards those of either a none or different faith.

