

Report of Director of Children's Services

Report to Executive Board

Date: 4 January 2012

Subject: Basic Need Programme 2013 – Outcome of consultation on proposals for expansion of primary provision in 2013

Are specific electoral Wards affected?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Morley South, Horsforth, Gipton and Harehills, City and Hunslet, Beeston and Holbeck, Guiseley and Rawdon, Otley and Yeadon		
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number:		

Summary of main issues

1. Leeds City Council has a statutory duty to ensure sufficiency of school places. The basic need programme represents the Council's response to the demographic pressures in primary school provision. Through this programme it has delivered 675 new reception places since 2009. In July 2011 the Board agreed to hold a public consultation on four statutory proposals, including competitions for two new schools and two expansions of existing schools. It also agreed to earmark land at Florence Street in Harehills, and the site of the former South Leeds Sports Centre for the new schools. In addition it agreed a third expansion proposal should be included in the annual consultation on admissions arrangements as it did not require a statutory process. These proposals would create a further 120 reception places for 2013, and 60 in 2014. This report details the outcome of those consultations, and makes recommendations as to the next steps for each proposal.
2. The July report also identified areas where further work was required to meet anticipated further need for 2013. This report provides an update on that work.

Recommendations

3. Executive Board is asked to:

- 3.1. Approve the publication of an 'invitation to bid' statutory notice for a proposed new 420 place school with 26 place nursery on land at Florence Street to serve families in that area.
- 3.2. Approve the publication of an 'invitation to bid' statutory notice for a proposed new 420 place school with 26 place nursery on land at the former South Leeds sports centre to serve families in that area.
- 3.3. Approve the publication of a statutory notice for the expansion of Morley Newlands Primary School from 420 pupils to 630 pupils
- 3.4. Note that the authority will commission temporary increases in a number of areas whilst further evidence is gathered to identify permanent expansion proposals.

1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 This report describes the outcome of public consultations on the expansion of primary provision across the city, and makes recommendations for the next steps for each of the proposals.

2 Background information

- 2.1 At its meeting on 27 July 2011 the Executive Board considered a report requesting permission to consult on a range of proposals for the expansion of primary provision in 2013 and 2014, and approved those consultations. They included the creation of two new schools and expansion of two existing schools. It also agreed to earmark land at Florence Street and at the former South Leeds sports centre for this purpose. The proposals were brought forward as part of a range of measures to ensure the authority meets its statutory duty to ensure sufficiency of school places. Under the Education and Inspections Act 2006 these proposals all constitute prescribed changes requiring a statutory process, the first step of which is public consultation.
- 2.2 Subject to Executive Board approval, the new schools require a competition to be held. The consultation formed the first part of that process, and the next stage would be the publication of specification alongside an 'Invitation to Bid', a statutory notice inviting those interested in running the school to submit bids against that specification.
- 2.3 The expansion proposals require a separate process, and subject to Executive Board approval, the next step would be the publication of a statutory notice before a final decision is made.
- 2.4 The July paper also noted further work was ongoing to identify further actions needed to address any remaining shortfall in 2013. This report describes the outcome of that work.

3 Main issues

- 3.1 The consultation was conducted from 12 September 2011 to 21 October 2011 in line with government guidance and local practice, and ward members in all wards were consulted during the formal consultation period. A number of public meetings were held, and information distributed widely including through schools, early years providers and websites, post offices, libraries, doctors surgeries, community groups and area management officers. A summary of the issues raised follows, and copies of the verbatim responses, public meeting notes and additional analyses referred to can be found at www.educationleeds.co.uk/schoolorganisation , or requested from the school organisation team via educ.school.organisation@leeds.gov.uk
- 3.2 **Proposal one. Creation of a new 420 place primary school through competition in the Harehills planning area** with 26 place nursery, on land at Florence Street to serve families in that area.
 - 3.2.1 There were 11 written responses, five for the proposal, four against, and two neutral. There was a positive engagement with the existing learning community and community representatives, but relatively low attendance from members of the

general public at the public meetings, despite a range of times and venues being offered. Additional meetings were therefore set up with the help of Harehills Youth In Partnership (HYIP) which provided some additional participation. A counter proposal to expand Harehills Primary School by using the land at Florence Street was received.

- 3.2.2 **Concern:** That the site was not satisfactory, with contamination, traffic and access issues, proximity to the existing refuse site, and nature of the surroundings all raised as concerns. It was felt to be too small. That it was at best 'good enough' and not what we should aspire to.
- 3.2.3 **Response:** It is acknowledged that the site has contamination issues to address. Screening of the adjacent waste site will be important to ensure a suitable environment for the school, including outdoor play areas. This applies to other inner city sites, and we have experience of managing such projects. We have investigated the suggestion of previous explorations making the land unusable, and have not found this to be the case. A high level cost estimate for decontamination has been included, but this would need to be refined if the project progresses. Screening would be required for the refuse site, and initial conversations with highways officers have identified options to explore to address traffic and site access. Parking would be provided inline with current Planning policy, which is 1 space per 2FTEs. Traffic impact would be minimised because of the proximity of the site to the population; more than enough families live within half a mile of the site to fill it without undermining existing schools, increasing the likelihood that families will walk to school. The site would be considered a confined site under current guidance, as are many of our inner city schools. Any planning process required will address the sufficiency of school sporting provision via Sport England in their role as a statutory consultee. Children would not be in the wider surroundings unsupervised, and safeguarding measures would ensure safety in the school environment. The potential benefits seemed to outweigh any concerns for many local residents who participated in the meetings.
- 3.2.4 **Concern:** That the use of the site for other community facilities, most notably public green space and play area should be prioritised over school use.
- 3.2.5 **Response:** Over a number of years there have been proposals and ideas to develop this land, but none have been developed. Whilst the detailed plans for any school have not yet been developed, any options for allowing managed community use of the site will be explored. Aspirations for community use of the school facilities would be an element of the specification against which proposals would be evaluated. Those local families who participated in the consultation saw this as an important benefit. In particular they felt it offered an opportunity for local employment, which would ensure the school was truly central to the community. Overall, this presents an opportunity to improve the presentation of the site, and explore options for local community use of the asset.
- 3.2.6 **Concern:** That other sites have not been fully investigated, may be better suited and should be reconsidered. Specific sites raised included the expansion of existing schools on their current sites including Woodlands, Harehills and Shakespeare, the former Primrose High School site, the former Roseville School site, and the former Compton Arms pub site for expansion of the Children's Centre to deliver the nursery

places. Others were suggested that may become available in future, notably Archway.

- 3.2.7 **Response:** To deliver places for 2013 any site must be available now, so that the relevant statutory processes and build programmes can be completed in time. This rules out speculative sites such as Archway, but they could be considered at a later date should they become available and should there be continued need for further places. Compton Arms pub site and Roseville School site are not in council ownership. Aside from any land acquisition costs this may entail, site acquisition is contrary to council policy at this time. Existing schools have been extended as far as possible at this point in time, though the circumstances for all schools are constantly reviewed and proposals will be brought forward if this changes. Woodlands could not be expanded on its current site, and certainly not by 2FE. Shakespeare is on a constrained site, and land adjacent to it is protected N1 green space so would not be suitable for use. Land adjacent to Harehills Primary is not in council ownership. Other sites meet the demographic need less well, with only half the number of children living within half a mile of the former Primrose site compared to Florence Street (see appendix 1). Several participants noted and accepted these practical constraints. Land adjacent to Harehills Children's Centre could be considered for the nursery provision if this proves prohibitive at the Florence Street site, however there are benefits to the inclusion of an integrated Early Years Foundation Stage unit within the new school, which also offers the opportunity to design an integrated building solution rather than adapt a current site.
- 3.2.8 **Concern:** A counter proposal for a split site Harehills Primary School was received. This would utilise the Florence Street site, and be managed with Reception to Year 3 at the existing site, and Years 4 to 6 at Florence Street (full response available with all consultation responses at www.educationleeds.co.uk/schoolorganisation).
- 3.2.9 **Response:** The response was detailed and considered, and had several strengths to it. Most notably it would build on existing leadership and teaching practices and community relationships, and avoid any concerns about the isolation of pupils during the opening stages of a new school. It described ideas for management of a split site. This would undoubtedly reduce some of the risks compared to starting a new school. It would however, mean a very large school, with concerns about the impact on a very large number of children should there at any stage be any difficulties at the school. Whilst there was a clear view at the main public meeting that overall size was not a barrier, it is known to concern many parents, and must bring with it a different style of management and leadership. A new school offers the opportunity to increase choice and diversity for the community, which the authority had legal duty to promote, and which many of the families attending the additional meetings saw as a positive opportunity to shape something for their needs.
- 3.2.10 **Concern:** That the demographic information is not reliable: that it has changed in the past, and that housing plans for the area were not taken into consideration.
- 3.2.11 **Response:** Whilst it is clear birth rates will fluctuate over long periods of time, they have seen a sustained increase for over 10 years, putting them at record high levels. All available analysis suggests a continued upward trend to the end of the decade. This has resulted in a considerable mismatch in the places available in the local community, and the number of children requiring places. Historically much of

this has been compensated for by families choosing to travel out of the area for school places. This proposal provides an opportunity to put provision back into the heart of the community, and for that community to have a voice in shaping that provision. There are no confirmed current demolition or rebuilding plans for immediate area, although it has been the subject of regeneration plans in the past. The Strategic Housing and Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) represents long term housing aspirations, and does not guarantee development. Should it's proposals come to fruition, the need for further new provision does not remove the need for this proposal. Further demographic analysis is in Appendix 1.

3.2.12 **Specification issues arising:** Specific suggestions for the specification upon which bids would be invited were:

- Describing how the buildings and play area would be made available for community use
 - Including single sex changing facilities for community use
 - Describing how the school would offer local employment opportunities
 - Describing how it would serve the local community through its admissions policy
- There were also some views that the authority should submit a bid to run the school. Concerns were also raised that the school should be held accountable ongoing regarding those specification details. There would also be further work required to analyse and address the issues regarding screening of the adjacent waste site.

3.3 **Proposal two. Creation of a new 420 place primary school through competition in the Beeston and Holbeck planning area** with 26 place nursery, on land at the former South Leeds sports centre to serve families in that area.

3.3.1 There were 9 written responses, 7 opposed the proposal, 1 supported it and 2 were neutral. There was a relatively low attendance from members of the general public at the public meetings, despite a range of times and venues being offered. There was widespread acknowledgement of the need for more places, and the debate focussed almost entirely on the relative merits of different sites and their uses.

3.3.2 **Concern:** Many respondents felt very strongly that the sports centre, and in particular the swimming pool should be re-opened, and this was a priority over a school on that particular site. Some felt sports use should be resolved first. Many thought the proposal meant demolition of existing buildings or building on the playing fields.

3.3.3 **Response:** The sports centre was closed prior to any proposal for a new school, and this proposal did not influence the closure in any way. At this stage there are no viable proposals for sports provision for that site, although have been ongoing discussions with at least one provider. The overall site size is large enough to contain both sports provision and a primary school, however delivery of both would be complex and would require some compromise. Whilst the respondents expressed some strong views about the future of a swimming pool on the site, these have been considered in the extensive consultation that took place about the closure of the leisure centre. It is possible, in bringing forward a specification for a new primary school, to include an aspiration that a viable business plan to also run, and refurbish, the sports centre would be favoured. Should no such bid be

forthcoming priority could be given to bidders supporting continued community access to the sports pitches on the site. The potential exists for both uses although delivery of a primary school that provides value for money, where there is no viable business case for continued use of the sport centre, would only be achieved as the only building occupying the site.

- 3.3.4 **Concern:** Relative merits of the site and other sites. In addition to the competing interest for use of this site as sports provision, concerns about this site included: proximity to other schools, over provision in the immediate area, implication should numbers decline in future, air pollution, and impact on traffic congestion at peak times. Lack of investment and need for places in the Holbeck area, i.e. other side of motorway was also commented on.
- 3.3.5 **Response:** This site is the only available site large enough to provide for a primary school that is in council ownership, not already earmarked for other uses or occupied by existing users. This site is located close to a large number of families homes, and so should minimise traffic impact by allowing for walking to school. Demographic pressures do change over time, and the authority would seek to work flexibly with partners in future to meet the demand for places in the long term. Pollution levels don't cause undue issues for other schools or housing in the area, or indeed for the former sports centre. The site is located at a dead end which also forms access for other schools in the area, and traffic management issues would be addressed through the planning application. The school would be required to create a green travel plan. The former Matthew Murray site was suggested, but in addition to its very close proximity to Ingram Road Primary School, has also been identified for commercial developments. On balance, the creation of a new 2FE school on the former sports centre site allows for greater choice and diversity of provision, flexibility for the future, and a strong sustainable school without damaging other schools. Other sites identified as owned by the council and available were the Parkside Road site, Brown Lane West, and Thwaite Gate. Parkside Road is separated from the area it is intended to serve by industrial developments, Brown Lane West is surrounded by industrial developments and also close to Ingram Road, and Thwaite Gate is further into Hunslet where the places are not needed. Data on children within 0.5 miles of these sites is in appendix 1. Maps showing the site are available on request, or from www.educationleeds.co.uk/schoolorganisation.
- 3.3.6 **Concern:** Demographic justification and sustainability; existing schools have spare places, and the authority has closed schools in the area in the past so there is concern about the ongoing need. The motorway was noted as a significant barrier to travel.
- 3.3.7 **Response:** The birth rate in the area shows there is a need for these places, and Office of National Statistics projections suggest this upward trend will continue to the end of the decade. The proposal is to build capacity for that rising demographic, and not add to capacity in existing year groups. Existing schools have capacity in higher year groups only, and we are already finding it harder to offer places to Reception children within reasonable distance of their homes. Whilst there may need to be change to capacity in future the authority would seek to do this in a manner which retained flexibility and choice and diversity of provision. One respondent challenged whether the data really showed a need in Holbeck rather

than Beeston, this confusion is in part due to the use of Super Output Areas in describing planning areas, and in fact the Holbeck planning area covers both sides of the motorway including the area east of Cross Flatts Park.

- 3.3.8 **Specification issues arising:** Specific suggestions for the specification upon which bids would be invited were:
- Describing how the site could also provide sports usage, in particular a swimming pool
 - Describing how the school would facilitate ongoing community access to the sports pitches
 - Describing how it would serve the local community through its admissions policy
- 3.4 A number of people also expressed the view that the authority should submit a bid to run the school. Concerns were also raised that the school should be held accountable ongoing regarding those specification details.
- 3.5 **Proposal three. Expansion of Morley Newlands Primary School** from 420 places to 630 places, that is an admission number of 60 to 90.
- 3.5.1 Eleven written responses were received, ten in favour and one against. The governing body fully support the proposal, and other local schools are supportive provided the proposal does not undermine them. The responses were broadly supportive, including those of local members.
- 3.5.2 **Concern:** Impact on class size, staffing and funding. Concerns this would mean bigger class sizes and have a negative effect on overall funding.
- 3.5.3 **Response:** The proposal would not increase class sizes, which would continue to be based on classes of 30 in line with funding models and current infant class size legislation. All schools receive funding based on the number of children attending, thus ensuring the required level of teaching a non teaching staff can be recruited in a phased manner. The school would introduce an appropriate management structure, and are confident they can deliver high quality provision with appropriate support and nurture as a larger school. Some respondents also noted the positive benefits of a larger staff body with an increased range and depth of expertise and skills.
- 3.5.4 **Concern:** Effect on learning environment. The proposal was recognised as presenting a positive opportunity to rationalise existing temporary and modular units, and create a more efficient and appropriate learning environment. There were concerns that the built solution should not compromise the play area and open space on site, and a strong body of opinion that the overall solution should consider the best long term value for money when considering full or partial rebuild options. There were also concerns about management of the site and pupils during the construction phase, and concern about phasing of the project. Some felt their support was conditional on the appropriate capital funding being available.
- 3.5.5 **Response:** The detailed building design will be managed in parallel with this process, with some detailed work carried out at risk in recognition of the complexity of any scheme at the site. This will reflect consideration of value for money and overall budget constraints, and will deliver a high quality, fit for purpose solution, however the detailed design is not part of this consultation. It is anticipated that the

rationalisation of existing individual units as part of the project will ensure outdoor play space is not adversely impacted, and this will be addressed in any planning process. The Children's Services delivery team have considerable experience of managing such projects, and health and safety and wellbeing of children during the build will be paramount. The use of modular units constructed off site minimises the disruption on site. We aspire to deliver the project in as few phases as possible to minimise disruption, however the detail of phasing is subject to confirmation. The school have noted the likely improvements in energy efficiency of any new building.

- 3.5.6 **Concern:** Traffic, access and highways issues. The roads were felt to need traffic calming measures, and requests were made to look at the pedestrian and vehicular access routes.
- 3.5.7 **Response:** These issues will be considered through the design and any planning process. At this stage we believe the issues can be addressed.
- 3.5.8 **Concern:** Importance of ongoing community use of the buildings, and any new facilities.
- 3.5.9 **Response:** Although no additional dedicated community space is being planned as part of this proposal the head teacher and governing body have indicated their desire to continue to make the school accessible to the community.
- 3.6 **Proposal four. Expansion of Rawdon St Peter's Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School** from 315 pupils to 420 pupils, that is an admission number of 45 to 60.
- 3.6.1 There were 34 responses, 20 of which opposed the proposal. Approximately 50 people attended the public meeting. The school governors, staff and school council of Rawdon St Peter's were very supportive of the proposal but did have some concerns around increased traffic and parking. The governing bodies of Rawdon Littlemoor and Rufford Park Primary schools have both submitted counter proposals to expand those schools instead of Rawdon St Peter's. The responses below therefore include some of the key comparisons between the schools, and the full details of the counter proposals are with all of the consultation responses at www.educationleeds.co.uk/schoolorganisation
- 3.6.2 **Concern:** Traffic, access and parking issues. Concerns were raised about the volume and speed of traffic on Rawdon Town Street which is also used as an alternative route to the A65 (Leeds Road). The safety of the children getting to school has been a concern for a while and it was felt that expanding the school will increase this issue. Residents have complained previously about parents parking in side streets and blocking access to properties. It was felt that additional parking and/or drop off areas should be made available.
- 3.6.3 **Response:** The Highways department are aware of the issues on Rawdon Town Street and have been consulted with as part of this process. The school are responsible for a green travel plan, and do promote a park and walk scheme for parents who are able to use the local pub car park. Early consultation with planning and highways has confirmed that creation or expansion of parental drop off zones are discouraged at any school as a general principle. The other schools submitting

counter proposals also face similar issues, although Rufford Park does have more options for parking away from the school, and Littlemoor has an existing drop off area. Although pupils typically travel a slightly greater distance to St Peter's, the average travel distance for all 3 schools is less than 1 mile, which is a reasonable walking distance.

- 3.6.4 **Concern:** Condition of the current building and impact of adding extra accommodation. In particular concerns that the hall, ICT suite and outside play area would not be able to cope with the increased pupil numbers, and the relative quality of new accommodation and need for improvements to the existing buildings.
- 3.6.5 **Response:** Rawdon St Peter's has the most appropriate infrastructure for the expanded size of the three schools. If the proposal is agreed the authority would look closely at current space utilisation internally and externally in determining the project requirements. Extra classrooms and toilets are expected to be the main priority at this stage. There is no additional funding to cover the upgrade of existing buildings through basic need. However the new units would be of a high standard and very energy efficient, offering an enhancement to the overall buildings. Planning regulations and any planning process required would address impact on outdoor play and green space, and in this regard the impact at St Peter's is likely to be the least of the three schools.
- 3.6.6 **Concern:** Lack of engagement with Rawdon Littlemoor and Rufford Park Primary Schools prior to the public consultation. Both schools felt that meetings should have taken place with them to discuss the proposal and obtain their views before requesting permission to consult.
- 3.6.7 **Response:** Permission to consult was not agreed until 27th July, which fell into the school summer holidays and made it difficult to meet with schools during this time. Meetings with both Rawdon Littlemoor and Rufford Park schools took place during the 6 week consultation period to remedy this. Although all options have been considered equally, it is acknowledged there should have greater engagement with the schools during the proposal development phase.
- 3.6.8 **Concern:** Demographics do not support the expansion of Rawdon St Peter's, but suggest the real issue is around Rufford Park. New housing was more likely to be around the Rufford Park area than in Rawdon. Concern over accuracy of preference data. Belief that Rawdon Littlemoor and Rufford Park have been unfairly excluded from consideration due to their PFI buildings, without full reflection of the issues.
- 3.6.9 **Response:** There is significant mobility across the areas where Rawdon St Peter's, Rawdon Littlemoor and Rufford Park primary schools are located, and any of the schools could therefore be reasonably considered for expansion. Across the 3 schools there are currently 120 reception places, and 176 children living in these combined areas that will be eligible to start school in September 2013. Of these, 88 have Rufford Park as their nearest school. Both Rawdon St Peters' and Rawdon Littlemoor have been oversubscribed for the past 2 years and many parents request St Peter's school as the only Church of England primary school in the whole Guiseley / Yeadon / Rawdon corridor. At present there are no confirmed housing applications for the area, and we continue to work closely with planning colleagues

to understand any likely future impact. The preference data presented in the booklet was at offer day, and thus relevant to parents applying on time in the normal cycle. It was acknowledged that there are often additional preferences expressed for school later in the year.

3.6.10 The PFI status of the other two schools is not sufficient reason on its own to rule out expansion of any school, it is one of the many factors taken into consideration. Whatever the capital costs of delivery at a PFI school, there will be increases to the annual charges which must be considered. In this instance early high level estimates suggest this to be of the order of £0.75m over the contract lifetime, but this would be subject to further investigation. Although both PFI buildings were designed with possible expansion in mind, the practical delivery carries some planning risks, which affect the delivery timeframe. The proposal was initially brought forward after balancing all of the risks and benefits, and value for money was one of the considerations.

3.6.11 **Counter proposal:** Proposals for Rawdon Littlemoor and Rufford Park to be expanded instead were received.

3.6.12 **Response:** The original proposal would not resolve all sufficiency issues in that wider area, and would represent one part of an overall solution. In July, a need for a further 30 places was identified in the Guiseley / Yeadon / Rawdon corridor for 2103. Option appraisal work has been conducted for the area, however a number of risks have been identified that may make it difficult to deliver permanent places for 2013. A new Admissions Code was published in November, which will have implications for determining the appropriate size of any expansions. In the light of the consultation feedback, counter proposals and emerging new options, it is recommended that further work be conducted before making any decisions on proposals for this area to ensure the best holistic solution is found. This will mean a temporary solution will need to be found for 2013, as any permanent solution could only be delivered for 2014.

3.7 **Outstanding issues in the South area.** The previous report identified proposals for Beeston / Holbeck, and Morley, and noted there remained some concern about places in Temple Newsam and Middleton wards.

3.8 Colton remains a particular pressure point within the Temple Newsam ward. It has not been possible to offer places to all children for whom it was their nearest school this year. Its geography means that some 'village' residents receive priority for Whitkirk as their nearest school, which is a difficult journey from Colton. New housing in the area is likely to add to this pressure. It was previously reported that the school could not be expanded to deliver 30 additional Reception places. This work has been reconsidered and a possible scheme has been identified which could deliver 15 extra reception places. The scheme does carry some planning risks, and there would be issues to resolve around the appropriate size for expansion and potential impact on neighbouring schools. It is therefore recommended that a temporary cohort be admitted for 2013, whilst the option of permanent expansion is evaluated further.

3.9 Within the Middleton ward there is significant pupil movement between Belle Isle and Middleton. There is also continued pressure from new housing in the area. Having concluded the investigation into potential additional sites in the Middleton area, it has

not been possible to bring forward a proposal for expansion of provision in that area. It is therefore recommended that a temporary cohort be admitted to one of the schools for 2013 if the admissions data supports this, and that the option of permanent expansion be evaluated further.

3.10 Outstanding issues in the East / North East. There is considerable pressure in the inner east and inner north east, and high levels of pupil movement between the areas add a degree of uncertainty to place planning for the area, particularly between Harehills and Roundhay. There is a proposal under consideration for a new school in Harehills which is intended to serve one of the highest pressure areas. A proposal for new provision at Roundhay was approved for 2012, but a proposal for 2012 to create primary provision at Allerton Grange was brought forward and paused following traffic, highways and site access concerns raised during the consultation. Having investigated the site issues at Allerton Grange it has not been possible to identify a solution to these issues, and the proposal is now being withdrawn. It is proposed to wait until the outcome of Harehills proposal is known before bringing forward any further proposals for permanent expansion in this area, to allow the collective effects of these changes to be understood. Discussions will be held with the schools in the area about the possibility of temporary cohorts being admitted to cover any shortfall which emerges.

3.10.1 Outstanding issues in the West / North West. A proposal for the expansion of Little London Primary School for 2012 was put on hold following a counter proposal from the governing body for expansion on their existing site. The Little London area is subject to regeneration, and officers from various council departments have worked together to identify all options to meet the overall needs of the community, including for school places, and the preference to expand on the same site. At this stage it is not possible to finalise details of such a proposal, and it is therefore recommended that temporary solutions be found at Little London for 2013 while a permanent proposal is developed for 2014.

4 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

4.1.1 The consultation has been managed in accordance with all relevant legislation and local practice. Ward members in all wards city wide were formally consulted at the public consultation stage, both individually, and through area committee meetings to ensure awareness of all proposals city wide and improved understanding of the impact of proposals in adjoining areas. The use of the Family Hub website was successfully piloted, and awareness was promoted through various community groups particularly for the Harehills proposal. These avenues will be used in future.

4.1.2 We routinely ask all respondents for their views on how we can improve the consultation process. Since we seek to apply lessons learned to all future consultations these have been addressed in some detail in Appendix 2.

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

4.2.1 The EDCI assessments were completed and are available from the Capacity Planning and Sufficiency Team.

4.3 Council Policies and City Priorities

4.3.1 The proposal is brought forward to meet the Council's statutory duty to secure sufficient school places. In providing places close to where the children live the proposals will allow improve accessibility of local and desirable school places, and thus reduce any risks of non attendance. Energy efficient modular buildings close to the centres of population will minimise the carbon footprint of any new provision associated with increasing capacity.

4.4 Resources and Value for Money

4.4.1 The high level estimated cost delivery of the proposals is £18.91m which will be funded through the education capital programme. This has increased from the initial estimates due to the inclusion of nursery provision in the two new school proposals. This is based on modular accommodation and will be subject to significant development through detailed design. It includes only high level estimates for the Harehills remediation costs, and otherwise no provision for any site specific conditions, risk or abnormalities.

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

4.5.1 The changes described in the proposals constitute prescribed changes under the Education and Inspections Act 2006 (EIA 2006). The consultations have been managed in accordance with that legislation, and local practice.

4.5.2 The Education Act 2011 received Royal Assent in November, and changes the process for establishing new schools. It requires the authority to seek an Academy provider in the first instance. Should this not be possible, a competition may then be held with the consent of the Secretary of State. The local authority cannot bid, and the authority is the provider of last resort should no other providers be found. This legislation will come into force in Spring 2012. Until then, where notices have already been published under the EIA 2006, competitions can continue unaffected. Continuing to publication of notices now would allow the authority to publish an invitation to bid, and conclude a competition under the prior legislation.

4.6 Risk Management

4.6.1 The most significant delivery risks are around the two new school proposals. In the case of the Harehills proposal they surround the decontamination costs, and resolution of the design including traffic and access issues within a relatively constrained site, and may incur some expenditure at risk ahead of any final decision being taken. In the case of South Leeds they surround marrying the timing of any proposals to reopen the site for any sports use with the timing of any school proposal.

4.6.2 Should the proposals proceed, project officers will manage a detailed risk register for each project.

4.6.3 The proposals have been brought forward in good time to allow places to be delivered for 2013 and 2014. Any delay in the process may increase the amount of

detailed planning work required to be done at risk of the proposal not ultimately proceeding.

5 Conclusions

- 5.1 The issues raised in consultation have been considered for each proposal. The sites for the two proposed new school competitions are well located for the populations they are intended to serve, available to the council now, and could deliver places for the required timeframes. Although they each carry some delivery risk, officers believe at this stage the issues can be addressed. Expansions of existing schools in those areas could not deliver the number of places needed, and no better alternative sites which are available in the required time frame have been identified. In order to meet the need for places in time, and to continue under the old legislation with a wide ranging competition, it is therefore recommended that each proposal progresses to the next stage of the relevant statutory process.
- 5.2 The Morley Newlands expansion proposal has been shown to be a strong proposal which would meet the need for the area and is broadly supported, it carries some risk around the complexity of the project, but at this stage officers believe the issues raised can be addressed.
- 5.3 Whilst the proposal to expand St Peter's was brought forward in the belief it offered the best proposal for expansion, in the light of the counter proposals, and the need to ensure the right overall balance of places in the area, it is recommended that further work be conducted to allow consideration of the best holistic solution for the wider area before making any further recommendation. Temporary solutions will be sought to cover the inevitable delay to delivery. Temporary solutions will also be sought whilst further work is completed for Colton and Middleton / Belle Isle.

6 Recommendations

Executive Board is asked to:

1. Approve the publication of an 'invitation to bid' statutory notice for a proposed new 420 place school with 26 place nursery on land at Florence Street to serve families in that area.
2. Approve the publication of an 'invitation to bid' statutory notice for a proposed new 420 place school with 26 place nursery on land at the former South Leeds sports centre to serve families in that area.
3. Approve the publication of a statutory notice for the expansion of Morley Newlands Primary School from 420 pupils to 630 pupils
4. Note that the authority will commission temporary increases in a number of areas whilst further evidence is gathered to identify permanent expansion proposals.

7 Background documents

These documents are available on request by calling 0113 2243867, or from educ.school.organsiation@leeds.gov.uk . Executive Board reports are also available at www.leeds.gov.uk .

Executive Board Reports

- 7.1 17 June 2009 Expanding Primary Place Provision
- 7.2 22 July 2009 Proposed increases in Admissions Limits for September 2010
- 7.3 19 May 2010 Outcome of statutory notices for changes to primary provision for September 2010, 2011 and 2012
- 7.4 21 July 2010 Outcome of statutory notices for proposals for expansion of primary provision for September 2011, and
- 7.5 Outcome of statutory notices for changes to primary age provision in Horsforth for September 2011
- 7.6 15 Dec 2010 Primary provision for 2012
- 7.7 30 March 2011 Basic Need Programme 2012 – Part A Outcome of consultation on proposals for primary provision for 2012 and Part B Request for Authority to spend.
- 7.8 18 May 2011 Basic Need Programme 2012 – Outcome of consultation on proposals for primary provision in 2012
- 7.9 27 July 2011 Primary Basic Need 2012 – Permission to consult on proposals for expansion of primary provision on 2013 and 2014

Officer reports

- 7.10 21 May 2010 and 5 November 2010 SIB reports
- 7.11 7 May 2010 and 17 September 2010 AMB reports
- 7.12 EDCI impact assessments

Consultation Documents and Statutory Notices

- 7.13 Consultation Documents for the four proposals

Other

- 7.14 Maps showing locations of alternative sites and the 0.5 mile radius zones around them.

Appendix 1. Additional demographic analysis.

Numbers of under 5's living within 0.5 miles of sites in Harehills and South Leeds

Site	Under 5s by year they enter Reception			
	2011	2012	2013	2014
Florence Street	386	454	439	473
Former Primrose High School	145	208	220	250
Former Roseville School	232	310	284	335
Former south Leeds sports centre	129	131	131	160
Former Mathew Murray site	70	91	88	112
Brown Lane West	49	76	73	97
Parkside Road	88	102	91	97
Thwaite Gate	23	28	22	30

Appendix 2. Consultation Improvements

Changes to consultation implemented this time.

- Member engagement was improved to include both email and hard copy notification of the consultations and documentation. In addition, a paper and officer attendance to discuss all the proposals to all area committees city wide was made. This has ensured the impact of proposals in adjacent areas is fully considered. Both these measures will be adopted ongoing.
- The family hub website was used to promote the consultations for the first time, targeting the young families for whom future provision is intended. This had a positive impact, with over 120 viewings of the page from a front page link. This is something we will seek to develop ongoing.

Process concerns raised for future consultation.

- Several respondents noted a concern that there should have been a wider debate about the alternatives, especially for the sites of new schools. This process would constitute an informal consultation, which must be concluded prior to the statutory consultation phase. Whilst this can assist in making the process feel more transparent, it also increases the time taken to deliver the final proposal, and adds to the costs. This work is conducted by officers, and reported during the public meetings, and forms part of the report on the outcomes of consultation.
- There were comments that the meetings were not advertised well enough, and that the low turnout at some meetings was evidence of this. It is impossible to be sure of the reasons why people do not turn up to consultations, and unwise to draw any conclusions about the level of support or otherwise for proposals from this. The meetings were offered at a range of times and days to maximise opportunity for attendance, and were advertised in the usual manner to schools, early years providers and families of children in school or early years settings in the area. They were also advertised in post offices, doctors surgeries and libraries, and other community venues through area management officers. We will continue to work with those partners to ensure the information is displayed prominently. We also worked with a local community group in the Harehills area to promote the consultation and offer additional meetings, which drew a modest attendance. We constantly review our methodology to ensure the widest possible audience in the most cost effective manner, and implemented several new measures as outlined above. We have explored the use of local radio, a range of local press options and the use of public transport advertising space, but all has proven prohibitively expensive. Many commented that local press publications are not widely read anyway, supporting the view they would not be efficient use of public money. We will look again at advertising in supermarkets, and other locations at the immediate sites. Other methods suggested are very resource intensive without guaranteeing any better response. One respondent suggested the use of drop in sessions for those who may feel intimidated by the impersonal surroundings of a large meeting. These have been trialled previously, and not attracted large numbers of participants. At the one meeting where half a dozen or so people turned up, it ended up being a group meeting anyway as they all turned up at the same time, all had the same questions, and none could wait. We will continue to review whether these may have a place on a case by case basis. Some

suggested the use of door to door canvassing. This is not targeted at pre school families, very time intensive, and could be perceived as intrusive.

- One respondent suggested there should have been public meetings in the adjoining ward. There was no conscious policy to exclude the ward; rather venues were selected on proximity to the proposed site, and availability cost and suitability of venues. All were close to the proposed site, and reasonably accessible to residents from that ward.
- There was a suggestion that demographic information was not up to date. The data used in the consultation document was for the population snapshot and birth cohort to September 1 2010. During the consultation an update for the year to September 2011 was published. Although not available in time to use in the consultation it has been considered in forming these recommendations. Although there has been a slight levelling off of the birth rate city wide, the details in each of these areas do not suggest any of the proposals should not proceed.
- Some respondents were unhappy with the level of detail supplied, particularly around the buildings plans for the site. There is always a tension between providing sufficient detail for the consultation to be meaningful and have a degree of certainty about its deliverability, against not wasting public money developing proposals that may not proceed. The main focus of the initial consultation phase is to test the proposal from an educational perspective, not approve the buildings plans. Full opportunity to comment on any buildings is provided through any planning process required. We review the wording in future to add clarity about what is outside of this process and why as one respondent suggested.