
REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF EDUCATION LEEDS

EXECUTIVE BOARD: 21 July 2010

SUBJECT: Outcome of statutory notices for changes to primary age provision in Horsforth for September 2011

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

- 1 In April 2010 the Executive Board approved the publication of linked statutory notices on prescribed alterations to change the age ranges and admissions limits of Horsforth Featherbank Infant School and Horsforth Newlaithes Junior School from September 2011. The changes would establish the schools as through primaries, and create a further 30 places per year group in the area.
- 2 This report details the representations received in response to those notices, and recommends a final decision be taken to make these changes.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3 The notices ran from Friday 16 April to Friday 28 May 2010. Under the Education and Inspections Act 2006 the Local Authority has until 28 July 2010 to make a final decision on the expansion proposals.
- 4 There was one response to the statutory notices, which opposed the change. The Executive Board is the decision maker for these proposals. It has chosen to set up the School Organisation Advisory Board (SOAB) to consider school organisation proposals and make recommendations to the Authority when objections are received. They met on 1 July 2010 and considered the proposals. The meeting minutes containing their recommendations are in Appendix 1. Copies of the Statutory notices are in Appendix 2.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 5 The high level estimates for the two schemes are currently £800k, and will be subject to review and development. Further reports, seeking financial approval for specific schemes will be brought to the Board.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6 The Executive Board is asked to:

- i) note the response to the statutory notices;
- ii) note the views of SOAB in regard of the proposals;
- iii) approve the proposed alterations to:
 - a. decrease the lower age range of Horsforth Newlaithes Junior School from 7-11 to 4-11, with an admission limit of 60, and with an overall capacity of 420 children **and**
 - b. increase the age range of Horsforth Featherbank Infant School from 4-7 to 4-11, and decrease the admissions number from 60 to 30, with an overall capacity of 210 children.

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF EDUCATION LEEDS

EXECUTIVE BOARD: 21 July 2010

SUBJECT: Outcome of statutory notices for changes to primary age provision in Horsforth for September 2011

Electoral Wards Affected:

All

Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality & Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

Eligible for Call-in

Not Eligible for Call-in
(Details contained in the Report)

1 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

- 1.1 In April 2010 the Executive Board approved the publication of linked statutory notices on prescribed alterations to change the age ranges and admissions limits of Horsforth Featherbank Infant School and Horsforth Newlaithes Junior School from September 2011. These changes would establish the schools as through primaries, and create a further 30 places per year group in the area.
- 1.2 This report details the representations received in response to those notices, and recommends a final decision be taken to make these changes.

2 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 In January 2010 the Executive Board approved a formal consultation on proposals for changes to Featherbank Infant and Newlaithes Junior Schools. These proposals form part of Education Leeds plans for ensuring sufficiency of provision across the city in the context of a growing pre-school population.
- 2.2 The consultation period for the proposals ran from 11 January to 26 February 2010. The consultation documents include detail of the demographic demand for

places, and are available at www.educationleeds.co.uk/schoolorganisation. Hard copies have previously been supplied to all ward members, and were made available to SOAB.

- 2.3 Full details of the consultees and the responses to these consultations can be found in the Executive Board reports of 17 April 2010 - Outcome of statutory consultation changes to primary provision in Horsforth.
- 2.4 Following consultation, Executive Board approved the publication of statutory notices on the proposals at its meeting in April 2010. The notices ran from Friday 16 April to Friday 28 May 2010. Under the Education and Inspections Act 2006 the Local Authority has until 28 July 2010 to make a final decision on the expansion proposals.
- 2.5 There was one response to the statutory notices, which opposed the change.
- 2.6 The Executive Board is the decision maker for these proposals. It has set up the School Organisation Advisory Board (SOAB) to consider school organisation proposals and make recommendations to the Authority when objections are received. SOAB considered the proposals. Statutory guidance requires the decision maker to consider four key issues:
- Is there any information missing?
 - Does the published notice comply with statutory requirements?
 - Has the public consultation been carried out prior to the publication of the statutory notice?
 - Are the proposals 'related' to other published proposals and should therefore be considered together?
- 2.7 The SOAB met on 1 July 2010 and considered the proposals, and the meeting minutes containing their recommendations are in Appendix 1. Copies of the statutory notices are in Appendix 2.
- 2.8 The decision on the proposals is the responsibility of the Local Authority. The Authority must have regard to the Guidance issued by the DfE. A full copy of the Guidance has been given to members of Executive Board. The Executive Board may:-
- Approve the proposals
 - Reject the proposals
 - Approve the proposals with a modification (e.g school closure implementation date) but not so as to in effect substitute new proposals.
 - Approve the proposals subject to them meeting limited specific conditions as set out in the statutory regulations by a specified date
- The Executive Board must give reasons for the decision irrespective of whether the proposals are rejected or approved indicating the main factors/criteria for the decision. If the Executive Board does not make a decision on the proposals within 2 months of the end of the statutory notice that is by 28 July 2010 the Authority must within one week refer the proposals to the Schools Adjudicator for a decision. The Schools Adjudicator has no time limit within which to decide the proposals but has indicated a general target of 6 weeks.

3 THE MAIN ISSUES

- 3.1 The local authority has a duty to ensure sufficiency of school provision. These proposals have been brought forward in response to a sustained increase in the pre school population in the area. They are brought forward as permanent changes in the belief that they are sustainable in the long term.

- 3.2 The proposals are supported by the schools. Initially both had strong concerns about the proposed transition arrangements. These were changed as a result of the consultation, and now have the support of the schools. There are remaining issues concerning the funding required to set up a new key stage, and the desire to add a nursery at Featherbank, both of which are being explored.
- 3.3 Following a final decision on the proposals, project managers will be assigned to work with the schools to agree the details of the building and remodelling work which will be delivered to meet these needs. They will be initiating early discussions with the schools, council officers and other stakeholders to ensure a range of issues raised in consultation are addressed, including
- traffic and site access issues
 - protection of green space and play areas
 - infrastructure needs over and above basic classroom provision
 - allowing flexibility for the transition arrangements agreed through consultation
- Detailed planning applications will then be submitted in due course for consideration by the relevant agencies and statutory consultees.
- 3.4 Discussions regarding the use of buildings on the Featherbank site, currently used by Park Lane College are ongoing and may influence the final scheme for Featherbank. Education Leeds and Early Years are continuing to explore the possibility of a nursery as part of the Featherbank scheme. This needs to be considered more broadly, balancing maintained and PVI sector early years provision in the area.
- 3.5 The concerns raised in the sole objection to the statutory notice are summarised in the following paragraphs.
- 3.6 **Objection:** The authority wishes to change outstanding schools into ones which are 'fit for purpose', which is wrong from an educational perspective.
- 3.7 **Reply:** The proposals are brought forward to meet the long term needs for sufficient provision in the area. The schools have both very recently been judged as outstanding by Ofsted, and have excellent leadership and a strong capacity to deliver these changes and continue to be outstanding. The schools themselves support the proposals, believing that it will enhance their overall offering.
- 3.8 **Objection:** Children and families in the schools at present actively chose an infant and junior system, and will only see disruption. Transition between schools is not an issue.
- 3.9 **Reply:** It is recognised that the school currently manage this transition well, and that some parents feel it can provide the children with a sense of progression and prepare them for a transition to High School. The change to through primaries does offer other benefits, including removing the risks associated with transition. It can provide greater stability for the schools managing the overall numbers of pupils and staff and balancing budgets, and offer access to a wider range of staff and extra curricular activities. It can offer greater career development for teaching and non teaching staff, making it easier to attract and retain staff, in turn bringing benefits for the pupils. Whilst the choice of infant and junior schools will be removed, families will have the choice of two different primary schools with their own distinct ethos. Current pupils will face some level of disruption, however they will have increased choice, as they will be able to transfer to Newlathes as expected when they entered school, or stay at Featherbank. All pupils joining either school from 2011 onwards would join a primary school where they would

stay until transition to High School. The buildings works associated with these changes will be managed to minimise disruption to the schools and their neighbourhoods. The proposals provide a long-term, flexible, sustainable solution to ensuring local children can access local schools.

- 3.10 **Objection:** The same families will face further disruption throughout their education, what has been done to ensure they are not negatively impacted later?
- 3.11 **Reply:** The comment seems to refer to an associated need to expand secondary provision when these increased primary numbers reach year 6. The use of space in secondary schools is currently being influenced by 14-19 reform, with increasing numbers educated at remote locations, through partnerships with other schools, colleges and other providers. We have several years to implement any overall expansion of provision in secondary schools, and Education Leeds is planning for this.
- 3.12 **Objection:** The proposals will not benefit Horsforth children as claimed, and the majority of local children will be out of the catchment areas of the schools, which only extend to Hall Park.
- 3.13 **Reply:** The admissions policy of the local authority does not use catchment areas. It does give priority to children applying to their nearest school, and use distance to prioritise places for oversubscribed schools. A map showing which school would be the nearest under the proposals are in Appendix 3. Parents are free to express a preference for any school, and may prefer a school other than their nearest. The proposals are therefore intended to provide sufficient capacity for the families in the area to access a place in one of their local schools, whilst building on popular and successful schools, and offering choice and diversity of provision within that locality, with 1FE schools, 2FE schools, Community, Catholic and Church Of England provision all within the area.
- 3.14 **Objection:** The fairest solution is to increase the provision at all the Horsforth schools (or even wider throughout the North West) by a smaller amount. The respondent alleges nimbyism.
- 3.15 **Reply:** The infant class size pledge legislation means that you cannot have classes of more than 30 in the reception, year 1 and year 2. Schools funding is based around class sizes of 30, allowing for staffing levels to meet this. Schools are therefore generally planned around multiples of 30, or multiples of 15 with vertical grouping to achieve classes of 30. To create the same 30 places offered by the proposals across the 7 schools in Horsforth means adding 4 or 5 places at each school. This would result in the schools having to manage infant class sizes of 17 or 18 without sufficient funding for this level of staffing or classrooms. Vertical grouping to offset this may be possible, but this would depend on the exact numbers in each year group. Schools would be unable to defend appeals to go above their admission limit, as there would be space in a class of only 17/18 for more pupils.

In effect this creates significant surplus places, which far from sharing the issue fairly amongst the schools, would serve to undermine perfectly successful and sustainable schools. Significant numbers of children would be likely to get a place through appeals. This is unnecessarily stressful for families, and risks undermining the schools that are losing pupils, as well as creating uncertainty for schools and families alike.

In Key Stage two, schools would no longer be bound by the class size pledge, and

so would face either a funding issue for smaller class sizes or larger classes. Planning around multiples of 30, or 15, is the most sustainable model.

It is not clear what the respondent means by nimbyism. It is not appropriate to resolve a Horsforth issue elsewhere in the North West and force children out of their locality, so there is no undue protection from change presented there. The proposals focus change on these two schools to ensure sustainability and deliverability, and are not avoiding other schools within Horsforth for any other reason.

- 3.16 **Objection:** This is counter to LCC's Green Transport Policy, and will increase traffic and parking issues for residents, and will make the roads less safe for pupils.
- 3.17 **Reply:** The proposals may well have some positive impact in reducing local traffic, as many families with siblings at both schools will no longer have to journey between the schools. They aim to provide local places for local children, which minimises the need for travel by car. Parking and road safety issues will be considered by the project managers, and any planning application will then also be formally considered by other stakeholders including Highways.
- 3.18 **Objection:** The capital funding for the schemes could also be shared out amongst the schools which would be fairer.
- 3.19 **Reply:** The capital funding required per place created is likely to be higher at other schools, as they have significant logistical site constraints. The respondent seems to link this to the suggestion of sharing out 4-5 additional places per year group per school. From a capital perspective this also increases costs as the overall number for teaching spaces needed for the smaller classes is higher.
- 3.20 **Objection:** The revenue costs of equipment will come from schools own budgets, which is unfair to load onto two schools and could be shared more equally amongst the schools. It is also detrimental to the children to fund these resources.
- 3.21 **Reply:** Schools are funded based on the number of pupils they have, so the funding follows the pupils to wherever they attend school to ensure they have sufficient resources. The funding levels cover staffing and resources requirements.
- 3.22 **Objection:** The proposals do not secure the future for either school. How can you be sure they will not have to use vertical streaming again, or reduce staffing levels to cope with reductions in class sizes? The proposals are not sustainable. Education Leeds ultimate plan is to close Featherbank.
- 3.23 **Reply:** In the very long term there will inevitably be changes in the numbers of pupils in the area, with populations going up as well as down. These proposals provide flexibility, allowing the possibility of changing the size of the larger schools as demand changes to maintain seven viable schools, without the need to close any school. It is our belief that the places will be needed for the long term, and the changes are being proposed on a permanent basis. Overall the authority believes the proposals are therefore sustainable in the long term. Closing either school would simply remove much needed places, remove flexibility from the system, and take away an outstanding school. There is no intention to close Featherbank.

As population trends change, the smaller numbers can often be focussed in either the infant or junior stage. Having a wider age range of children provides flexibility and means that a school is better able to balance its budgets against the overall

numbers. This will help the schools minimise staffing level changes.

Vertical streaming can be an effective method of meeting pupils' needs and delivering a good education whilst also managing resources efficiently. It may be necessary again if numbers start to decline, and that will be for the schools to manage, as they have done very effectively in the past.

3.24 **Objection:** Why can't you use the capital to reopen the school you closed in Rodley and transport the additional pupils there? (The respondent links this to the concern about certainty of future numbers and implications of this in the point above).

3.25 **Reply:** The old school site has been disposed of, and there is no site available to use. Acquiring another site in Rodley (or elsewhere) and building a new school would cost significantly more than these proposals.

The suggestion also raises a number of other issues. It would be counter to the Green Transport Policy concerns that the same respondent raises, and would not address the certainty of numbers. Valley View Primary currently serves the Rodley area, and has capacity to do so ongoing. Under current legislation it is not possible simply to open a new community school, and the authority would need to run a competition for a new school. The timeframe for this precludes it as a solution for 2011.

3.26 **Objection:** It was an appalling oversight to not write to prospective parents, and this is indicative of poor planning.

3.27 **Reply:** Education Leeds acknowledges its oversight in this case in not writing immediately to those parents who had applied for a place for 2010. This was rectified two weeks into the consultation leaving a further six weeks to respond. They were also written to personally to ensure they were aware of the statutory notice.

The authority has managed many consultations previously, and has established a reliable method of engaging with communities. Each consultation raises specific issues and concerns which require some tailoring of this approach. We did write to Early Years providers directly to advertise the consultation, and existing pupils (many of whom will have pre school siblings). We have taken on board suggestions for improvements from Scrutiny Board, and are also reviewing additional methods of consulting directly with pre school families about generic school choice issues, as well as for specific proposals. We aim to contact a broad audience to gain meaningful input whilst using public resources responsibly.

3.28 **Objection:** The original consultation document was patronising and offensive (refers specifically to wording that one alternative option was complicated for parents and carers to understand).

3.29 **Reply:** Education Leeds apologises for any offence caused. The statement referred to a model of provision which would have been unique to the proposed school. It would have had entry points at both infant and junior stages, but been a through primary. It would therefore not have had any junior school link within the admissions code to give priority for applicants from the infant school. As something not widely offered nationally or locally, this had the potential to be misunderstood by parents. The key reason that it was not adopted as a proposal was that there was not a deliverable building solution to meet such a school structure at the site.

- 3.30 **Objection:** West End proposals should not have been dropped without an explanation for this decision.
- 3.31 **Reply:** The reason was explained fully in the report to Executive Board of 7th April 2010, and considered when making a decision. The proposal was opposed strongly by both the school and community. They did however support expansion by a whole form of entry, but Education Leeds believes that permanent expansion at this time by 60 places across Horsforth would create too much capacity, which in turn could be damaging to the sustainability of other schools. There were also significant concerns about the feasibility of a building scheme to accommodate that solution.
- 3.32 **Objection:** Why can't the schools be amalgamated into one school at Newlaithes?
- 3.33 **Reply:** There is not a deliverable building solution to provide a three form entry school at Newlaithes.

There were additional issues with this option. To amalgamate, one option is to close both schools and open a new school. This involves a competition and was therefore not deliverable in the timeframe needed. Closing Featherbank and expanding Newlaithes would be inequitable, and fail to build on both as successful and popular schools. Federation was explored as an option, but was not supported by the schools. It would compound any traffic and road safety issues which the respondent refers to.

4 LEGAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The high level estimates for the two schemes are currently £800k, and will be subject to review and development. Further reports, seeking financial approval for specific schemes will be brought to the Board.

5 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1 The Executive Board is asked to:
- i) note the response to the statutory notices;
 - ii) note the views of SOAB in regard of the proposals;
 - iii) approve the proposed alterations to:
 - a. decrease the lower age range of Horsforth Newlaithes Junior School from 7-11 to 4-11, with an admission limit of 60, and with an overall capacity of 420 children **and**
 - b. increase the age range of Horsforth Featherbank Infant School from 4-7 to 4-11, and decrease the admissions number from 60 to 30, with an overall capacity of 210 children.

6 BACKGROUND REPORTS

December 2009 Proposal for statutory consultation for the expansion of primary provision for September 2011
January 2010 Proposal for statutory consultation for changes to primary provision at Horsforth Newlaithes Junior School and Featherbank Infant School in 2011
April 2010 Outcome of statutory consultation for changes to primary provision in Horsforth for September 2011

APPENDIX 1
Minutes of meeting of School Organisation Advisory Board (SOAB) held 1 July 2010
to consider proposals for primary age provision in Horsforth.
SCHOOL ORGANISATION ADVISORY BOARD

THURSDAY, 1ST JULY, 2010

PRESENT: Councillor in the Chair
Mr I Garforth in the Chair
Mr C Sedgewick and Mrs T Hagerty

7 Chair's Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone in attendance

8 Election of Vice Chair

The Clerk to the Board sought nominations for the position of Vice Chair to the School Organisation Advisory Board

Reverend C Sedgewick nominated Mrs T Hagerty, the Chair seconded the proposal

RESOLVED – That Mrs T Hagerty be elected Vice Chair of the School Organisation Advisory Board for a one year period

9 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received for Mr D Kenny and Mr J Sutton

10 Declarations of Interest

Mr C Sedgewick declared a personnel interest in the proposals to close Parklands Girls High School, the Diocese of the Church of England having put forward a bid to establish an Academy on the Parklands site

11 Outcome of Statutory Notices for Changes to School Organisation

The Board considered a report by the Legal Adviser to the Board explaining the role of the Board in considering objections to the following proposals and to make recommendations to the Executive Board in reaching a decision in relation to the following proposals:

Statutory proposals to seek the closure of City of Leeds High School, the Closure of Parklands Girls High School, the Closure of Primrose High School and Changes to Primary Provision in Horsforth

Changes Provision in Horsforth

The Board were advised that in January 2010 the Executive Board approved a formal consultation on proposals for changes to Featherbank Infant School and Newlathes Junior School in Horsforth. Statutory Notices were published to decrease the lower age range of Newlathes Junior School from 7-11 to 4-11, with an admission limit of 60 and with an

overall capacity of 420 children and increase the age range of Featherbank Infant School from 4-7 to 4-11 and decrease the admissions number from 60 to 30, with an overall capacity of 210 children. These proposals were formally linked.

There was one response to the statutory notices, which opposed the change.

Officers reported that the objections received raised no new significant issues

Members discussed the proposal, concentrating on the following issues:

- Use of site availability
- Concern over transition arrangements
- Risk of negative disruption to education
- A desire for further consultation on the Early years Service in the Horsforth area
- Concern over funding of a new key stage

The Board noted the objections and expressed sympathy to the concerns raised

Closure of Primrose High School

The Board were advised that in October 2009 the Executive Board approved a formal consultation on the proposed closure of Primrose High School on 31st August 2011 to be replaced by an Academy sponsored by the Co-operative Society.

There were nine responses to the statutory notice, which opposed the change.

Officers reported that the objections received raised no new significant issues

Members discussed the proposal, concentrating on the following issues:

- The ability of the sponsor(s) to deliver Secondary Education provision at Primrose
- Insufficient clarity about the links with City of Leeds College
- Early years provision

The Board noted the objections

Closure of Parklands Girls High School

The Board were advised that in October 2009 the Executive Board approved a formal consultation on the proposed closure of Parklands Girls High School on 31st August 2011 to be replaced by an Academy sponsored by the Edutrust Academies Charitable Trust (EACT). A parallel consultation was conducted on the provision of single sex girl's education.

There were seven responses to the statutory notice, which opposed the change.

Officers reported that the objections received raised no new significant issues

Members discussed the proposal, concentrating on the following issues:

- Budgetary implications for the Academy
- The ability of the proposed sponsor to deliver school improvement
- Concern about administration costs for the Academy
- The move away from single sex schools

- The location for the provision of an additional High School to serve the east Leeds community

The Board noted the objections and expressed sympathy to the concerns raised

Closure of City of Leeds High School

The Board were advised that in October 2009 the Executive Board approved a formal consultation on the proposed closure of City of Leeds High School on 31st August 2011.

There were one hundred and seventy five responses to the statutory notice, which opposed the change.

Members discussed the proposal, concentrating on the following issues:

- The viability of the school
- The location of the school was in an area compounded by challenges
- The desirability of maintaining secondary school provision in the City Centre
- A desire for availability of high quality secondary provision for that community
- Acknowledged the commitment of the staff
- To further look at the demographics of the area

The Board noted the objections and expressed sympathy to the concerns raised

Additional comments - Overall Members considered that that proposals lacked a cohesive approach to the needs of the inter-related communities involved and had now been overtaken by the new opportunities for school improvement, in conjunction with the local authority, provided by the change in central government.

In particular, Members were concerned that the location of Parklands Academy was not on the correct site for a new, large school to serve the communities of inner East Leeds.

The Board therefore recommended that an urgent review of all the three secondary proposals should take place with a view to establishing integrated, viable, high quality educational provision for the communities involved at the centre of those communities, as is inherent in the Leeds Schools Admissions Policy

RESOLVED – It was the view of the School Organisation Advisory Board that the Executive Board be recommended to:

- (i) Support the proposed changes to Primary provision in the Horsforth area
- (ii) Support the proposals to close Primrose High School and replace with an Academy
- (iii) Support the proposal to close Parklands Girls High School and replace with an Academy
- (iv) Support the proposal to close City of Leeds High School

12 Future Business

There were no issues raised under future business

13 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Arrangements for a future meeting of the Schools Organisation Advisory Board to be notified to Members in due course

APPENDIX 2 - Copy of the published statutory notices.

Full detail can be obtained from www.educationleeds.co.uk/schoolorganisation as indicated in these extracts.

The proposals would, if approved, establish both schools as age range 4-11. Initially it was suggested that Newlaithes might be established as a 5-11, however the Rose review has now provided the entitlement for children to start school in the September after their fourth birthday, and it is therefore appropriate to make this 4-11. Featherbank's starting age is already 4. The principles of what is being proposed remains to increase the upper age limit of Featherbank and decrease the lower age limit of Newlaithes to become through primaries.

NOTICE OF LINKED PROPOSALS FOR A CHANGE OF AGE RANGE AND ENLARGEMENT OF BOTH HORSFORTH FEATHERBANK INFANT SCHOOL AND OF HORSFORTH NEWLAITHES JUNIOR SCHOOL.

PART 1

Notice is given in accordance with section 19(1) of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 that Leeds City Council intends to make a prescribed alteration to Horsforth Featherbank Infant (Community) School, Featherbank Avenue, Horsforth, Leeds, LS18 4QP from 1st September 2011.

Horsforth Featherbank Infant School (Featherbank) will change from an age range of four to seven to an age range of four to eleven to become a primary school, and will enlarge its capacity to accommodate 210 pupils.

The additional year groups resulting from the proposed change in age range will be established by pupils who complete Year 2 (aged seven) on 31st August 2011 staying on roll and progressing through the year groups up to Year 6 (aged up to eleven) at Featherbank if they wish to do so, before transition to High School. All year groups will be established in the school in September 2014.

Pupils on roll at the school on 31st August 2011 will be entitled to stay and progress at the school until transition to High School. They will also still have the opportunity to transfer to Horsforth Newlaithes Junior School (Newlaithes) when they reach the end of Year 2 (aged seven).

All pupils entering Reception Year in September 2011 (aged four on 31st August 2011), and each year after, will be entering a primary school and will stay on roll until transition to High School.

The current admission number for the school is 60 into Reception Year (aged from four) and the proposed admission number for Reception Year is 30 (aged from four). There will be no other additional admission points.

The current capacity of the school is 180 and the proposed capacity will be 210. The number of pupils on roll at the school in January 2010 was 177.

PART 2

Notice is given in accordance with section 19(1) of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 that Leeds City Council intends to make a prescribed alteration to Horsforth Newlaithes Junior (Community) School, Victoria Crescent, Horsforth, Leeds, LS18 4PT from 1st September 2011.

Horsforth Newlaithes Junior School (Newlaithes) will change from an age range of seven to eleven to an age range of four to eleven to become a primary school, and will enlarge its capacity to accommodate 420 pupils.

The additional year groups resulting from the proposed change in age range will be established by pupils (aged four on August 31st 2011) being admitted into Reception Year in September 2011, and those pupils staying on roll at the school and progressing through Year 1 and Year 2. All year groups will be established in the school in September 2013.

Pupils on roll at the school on 31st August 2011 will stay on roll until transition to High School.

All pupils entering Reception Year in September 2011 (aged four on 31st August 2011), and each year after, will be entering a primary school and will stay on roll until transition to High School.

The school will also continue to offer an additional 60 places in Year 3 in September 2011, 2012 and 2013. This will provide the opportunity for all children already on roll at Featherbank on 31st August 2011 to still transfer to Newlaithes when they reach the end of Year 2 (aged seven) if they wish to do so, before transition to High School. They will also have the opportunity to stay at Featherbank.

The current admission number for the school is 60 into year 3 (aged from seven). The proposed permanent admission number will be 60 into Reception Year (aged from four), with an additional admission number of 60 into Year 3 (aged from seven) until September 2013. From September 2014 Newlaithes will no longer offer places in Year 3.

The current capacity of the school is 240 and the proposed capacity will be 420. The number of pupils on roll at the school in January 2010 was 180.

ALL PARTS OF THE PROPOSAL

No new or additional site is required for these changes, and both schools will expand within their existing premises. Some additional building and/or remodeling of existing buildings will be required within the existing sites. This will be phased in agreement with the school, and be subject to the normal planning permission process.

This Notice is an extract from the complete proposal. Copies of the complete proposal can be obtained from: School Organisation Team, 9th floor west, Merrion House, 110 Merrion Centre, Leeds LS2 8DT or from www.educationleeds.co.uk/schoolorganisation, or by phoning 0113 2243867.

Within six weeks from the date of publication of these proposals, ie by 4pm on Friday 28th May 2010, any person may object to or make comments on the proposal by sending them to The Chief Executive, c/o School Organisation Team, 9th Floor West Merrion House, 110 Merrion Centre, Leeds LS2 8DT, or to educ.school.organisation@educationleeds.co.uk

