

**Report of Director of Children's Services**

**Report to Executive Board**

**Date: 12<sup>th</sup> December 2012**

**Subject: Basic Need Programme 2014 – Outcome of consultation on proposals for expansion of primary provision in 2014**

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Are specific electoral Wards affected?   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No            |
| If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Hyde Park and Woodhouse, Guiseley and Rawdon, Yeadon and Otley, Middleton Park, Temple Newsam |   |  |
| Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input 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:<br>Appendix 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 approved 830 new reception places since 2009. In July 2012 the Executive Board gave permission to consult on four statutory proposals. These proposals form part of the Council's Basic Need Programme that embeds the 'one council' approach that has achieved shared ownership of proposed solutions. This approach agrees the overall best use of Council assets and delivers holistic solutions for community improvements.
2. This report presents the outcome of statutory consultation on the proposals to increase primary provision from September 2014 and seeks permission to publish statutory notices for three of these proposals and outlines further work to be completed prior to making a recommendation with regard to the remaining proposal.

**Recommendations**

Executive Board is asked to:

3. Approve the publication of a statutory notice for the expansion of Little London Primary School from 210 to 630 pupils by increasing the reception admission limit from 30 to 90 with effect from September 2014.

4. Approve the publication of a statutory notice for the expansion of Rufford Park Primary School from 210 to 315 pupils by increasing the reception admission limit from 30 to 45 with effect from September 2014
5. Approve the publication of a statutory notice for the expansion of Sharp Lane Primary School from 420 to 630 pupils by increasing the reception admission limit from 60 to 90 with effect from September 2014
6. Note that further work be carried out in relation to the Tranmere Park proposal prior to being brought back to a future meeting of Executive Board.

## 1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 This report describes the outcome of the 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 the meeting on 18 July 2012 the Executive Board considered a report requesting permission to consult on a range of proposals for the expansion of existing primary provision in 2014 and approved those consultations. These 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 constitute prescribed changes requiring a statutory process, the first step of which is public consultation.
- 2.2 Subject to Executive Board approval, the expansion proposals would be followed by the publication of a statutory notice before a final decision is made.

## 3 Main issues

- 3.1 The consultation was conducted from 10 September 2012 to 19 October 2012 in line with government guidance and local practice, and all ward members 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 and area management officers. A summary of the issues raised follows and copies of the written responses, public meeting notes and additional analyses referred to can be found at [www.leeds.gov.uk](http://www.leeds.gov.uk) or requested from the capacity planning and sufficiency team at [educ.school.organisation@leeds.gov.uk](mailto:educ.school.organisation@leeds.gov.uk)
- 3.2 **Proposal one. Expansion of Little London Primary School** from 210 to 630 places, by increasing the admission number from 30 to 90 with effect from September 2014. A proposal was brought forward in 2011 regarding the expansion of Little London Primary School utilising the site of the Blenheim Centre and land off Cambridge Road. At that time the Governors made a counter proposal to expand the school on or adjacent to its existing site however the land proposed was not feasible for expansion to the required size due to site size, drainage and planning issues.
- 3.3 This revised proposal addresses the need for school places due to the increasing demographics in the area, at the same time recognising the regeneration requirements for the area adjacent to the school known as the 'community hub', This includes the shops, a housing office, play space and a community centre. The community hub project seeks to maintain and improve community facilities in the locality and explore how the local retail offer can be refreshed and improved.
- 3.4 Working together, officers from Environments and Neighbourhoods, City Development and Children's Services have developed a proposal that could

deliver the required primary school expansion, upgrade the retail provision and improve the community centre facilities and services as part of an integrated community hub solution. This is co-ordinated with the housing PFI that is proposed for the area.

- 3.5 The other elements of the regeneration initiative are subject to their own consultation processes, and this has been co-ordinated with the public consultation to expand the school. Consultation on the approach to the whole community hub, including school expansion, community facilities, neighbourhood housing office and retail provision took place on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2012. The outcome of the consultation was supportive of the principles for the regeneration of the community hub. Ward members have also been briefed and are broadly supportive of the proposals subject to detail of the retail offer being confirmed.
- 3.6 Feasibility work is progressing to consider a range of facilities as outlined above for the Community Hub. A further report will be presented to a future Executive Board meeting.
- 3.7 The subject of this paper is the outcome of the consultation process in relation to the expansion of the primary school. It should also be noted that the school agreed to take, for the second year running, an additional 30 pupils making a total intake of 60 into reception last September. If this proposal proceeds the school will work with the authority to admit extra pupils again in 2013 to ensure continuity for the community and school, and to meet the need for places prior to any permanent solution being agreed.
- 3.8 During the consultation phase, 24 written responses were received, 19 in favour 4 against and 1 was neutral. The governing body are fully supportive of the proposal, although they did stress the view that they wished to continue to explore the need for nursery provision at the school. Those who attended the public meeting were very supportive of the expansion of the school. The following issues were raised in the responses received and in the meetings:
- 3.9 **Concern:** Whether there is sufficient early years provision in the area, particularly in the context of the increased need for primary places.
- 3.10 **Response:** There are currently sufficient early years places available in the area, see data table in Appendix 1. The demand for early years places will however be kept under review and the need for additional places addressed as necessary. This may mean the creation of additional early years places. The governing body have acknowledged that they are happy with this response.
- 3.11 **Concern:** Whether the new housing proposed for the area has been taken into account in the planning of school and early years places.
- 3.12 **Response:.** When planning school places a range of information is taken into account. The primary data source is the births and under 5's information received from the local health authority. This information was published in the consultation document. Housing is another major consideration, but can be difficult to model precisely when it may be built or occupied, or by whom it will be occupied. Working closely with colleagues in City Development, planning applications and

long term housing plans are considered as additional demand for places, using a locally agreed pupil yield formula and are factored into decision making. Other additional local intelligence which may affect demand is also considered. In this area the plans to increase the amount of family housing will support the sustainability of the proposed increase. All these elements are taken into account when planning school places.

- 3.13 **Concern:** That pupil numbers can increase and also decrease. Concern was expressed regarding the impact upon the expanded school should numbers fall in the area, making reference to school closures in previous years.
- 3.14 **Response:** Whilst schools have previously been closed due to falling roles, the birth data available, and long term forecasts from the Office of National Statistics indicates the numbers are increasing and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future. The evidence indicates that places created will be sustainable and are required long term. The expansion of existing primary schools creates a range of options within the area and provides flexibility should numbers diminish in the future.
- 3.15 **Concern:** The increase from one to three form entry creates a significantly larger school. Some expressed concern that this may adversely change the nature of the school.
- 3.16 **Response:** A maximum of 630 children would be on roll once the school has grown over seven years. The proposal would not increase class sizes, which would continue to be based on classes of 30 in line with current funding models. Schools of this size are not uncommon, and there are local examples of very popular and successful three form entry primary schools. Larger schools can offer a greater range of activities, staff expertise and career development for staff. One respondent noted the creation of a larger school was a positive benefit where it enabled whole local communities remain together.
- 3.17 **Concern:** That the area that the school serves would increase when the school expands increasing the distance from home to school for some children and reducing choice.
- 3.18 **Response:** Children would continue to receive priority based on distance to school and their nearest school. There are sufficient children in the area of the school to fill it with local children without the need to draw from further afield, although parents remain free to exercise their preferences to do so.
- 3.19 **Concern:** That the changes, including both increased pupil numbers and also building work would be disruptive to the children's education.
- 3.20 **Response:** Whilst the school would undergo many changes, should the proposal go ahead, support would be available to manage the transition. The change would be incremental. The Local Authority Built Environment team have extensive experience of managing school build programmes around the delivery of the school curriculum and would work very closely with the school during the building design and delivery stages. The School Improvement Team would also work with the school to help manage the process. The school itself has already reorganised

to accommodate additional reception children and has demonstrated the capacity to embrace change.

- 3.21 **Concern:** That the proposal would impact on the nearby retail development and would impact negatively upon the community and reduce space available to the community.
- 3.22 **Response:** The expansion of the primary school is an integral part of the community hub project, which aims to improve and maintain the community offer in the vicinity. Within the hub, retail and community facilities and services would be maintained, if not enhanced. A further report will be presented on the Community Hub in early 2013. There is no intention to remove any existing community provision.
- 3.23 **Concern:** That land is available on the Blenheim Primary School site to expand that from a two to three form entry primary school rather than Little London.
- 3.24 **Response:** Blenheim Primary School was extended from one to two forms of entry in 2010. Whilst the site is relatively large, the majority of it has protected playing pitch status and therefore further physical expansion of the school buildings is not considered to be achievable. The data available indicates greatest demand for places is for children living closest to Little London Primary School.
- 3.25 **Proposal two Expansion of Tranmere Park Primary School and proposal three expansion of Rufford Park Primary School.** Previous reports have identified a shortage of places in the **Guiseley / Yeadon / Rawdon** corridor. It has been previously reported that there is particularly pressure at the extreme edges of the area of Guiseley, leading to the development of two proposals for this area. The pressure was evidenced on primary offer day this year, when for the second year running it was not going to be possible to make reasonable offers to all children within the area, with many of those affected having Tranmere Park as their nearest school. For this reason, a temporary agreement was reached for Tranmere Park to take 15 additional pupils into reception in 2012 and again in 2013 to provide sufficient capacity in the area.
- 3.26 A previous public consultation was undertaken in September and October 2011 in relation to the proposed expansion of Rawdon St Peters C of E Primary School from 45 to 60 places. Considerable concern was raised that this would create significant traffic and highways problems, which would be exacerbated because the children do not live in Rawdon but close to Rufford Park. The Executive Board agreed in January 2012 to gather further evidence to identify appropriate permanent expansion proposals for the whole area. This further work resulted in the current proposal to expand Rufford Park and Tranmere Park.
- 3.27 **Proposal two: To expand Tranmere Park Primary School** from a capacity of 315 pupils to 420 pupils with an increase in the admission number from 45 to 60 with effect from September 2014. There are more under 5's children with Tranmere Park as their nearest school than places available, and so this proposal would address the need at the far end of the planning area

- 3.28 123 responses were received, 68% from local residents, 12% from parents of children at the school. The remaining responses were from staff, governors and councillors. 95 respondents disagreed, principally on the grounds of traffic and highways issues. Those who supported the proposal argued that children should be able to access their nearest school and that the expansion provided an opportunity to remove mixed age classes. The governing body have indicated their support for the expansion.
- 3.29 **Concern:** That this is not a genuine consultation as the decision has already been made and additional children have already been admitted this year.
- 3.30 **Response:** The school has already agreed to take another additional 15 pupils in 2013 and again in 2014 as a short term measure to meet the need for places whilst consultation on the long term permanent solution takes place. The measure this year was necessary to be able to offer local places to 14 local children who would otherwise have been offered places more than 2 miles away. The measure was agreed for two years to allow the school to manage the bulge cohort through the school more effectively, as it will form a whole class cohort of 30 rather than 15. The two temporary increases can be accommodated in the current school buildings, and so do not require a statutory process. To increase the school size on a permanent basis would require significant additional capacity and therefore this statutory consultation process is needed. The temporary and permanent measures are independent.
- 3.31 **Concern:** Many of the local residents who responded expressed concern regarding the additional volume of traffic which would be generated by the expansion of the school. They expressed concern regarding parking, safety and highways issues and access for emergency vehicles. In addition they argued that the unique nature of the estate, the local design statement, and the position of the school within the estate meant an enlarged school was not appropriate.
- 3.32 **Response:** It is important to note that this proposal is designed to cater for children for whom this is their nearest school, living within walking distance from the school, so minimising any traffic impact. Initial discussions with residents and ward members have highlighted parking/access as concerns. The main issues are the lack of staff parking within the school site and pupils having to walk in the carriageway around the school due to the lack of footways. Initial measures would include the provision of sufficient staff parking within the school site; the provision of a footway along the frontage of the school on Ridgeway and Ridge Close; improvements to the footpath adjacent to the school access which heads northeast; and a 20mph speed limit within the entire Tranmere Park estate and amendments, where necessary, of the existing Traffic Regulation Orders including the formalisation of the existing informal drop-off point on Ridgeway.
- 3.33 **Concern:** That the site is not big enough to accommodate an enlarged school, any expansion would limit the amount of play space and dining/hall facilities.
- 3.34 **Response:** The site, whilst challenging, is sufficiently large to accommodate the expanded school. Additional classrooms would be provided to accommodate the additional children on roll, and the out of school club and other community space can be protected, which are important caveats to the governing body's support.

Play space would be difficult to expand, but can be maximised by managing split play times. Our private sector design partners have indicated that the site is expandable.

- 3.35 **Concern:** That alternative options have not been given due consideration, and this is being brought forward because of a lack of planning by the authority. Specific alternatives raised were the expansion of other local schools, and use of land at Green Meadows, for which options put forward included relocating Tranmere Park Primary School onto the site, a split site Tranmere Park, and building a new school on the site. Other local schools have all been considered, and there is an ongoing dialogue with Guisley Infant School and St Oswald's Junior School about a role they may play in further expansion needed for the area.
- 3.36 **Response:** The land described above is occupied by the North West SILC which operates from two sets of buildings, one off Back Lane, one off Bradford Road, both part of the Green Meadows campus. The accommodation is currently fully occupied. Whilst the opportunity to relocate the provision merits further detailed consideration, the needs of the young people currently educated there are paramount and must be considered in the context of the SEN strategy for the city. Should relocation be possible and appropriate to progress there remain other barriers. The site is too far away from the current Tranmere Park site to operate as a split site school, and the governing body have expressed their strong concerns about such a model. A new school would be in direct competition with Tranmere Park, which could destabilise an excellent existing school, and presents a far more risky way of establishing additional provision than building on current strengths by expanding existing schools. The green space on the site is designated as protected playing field which would create need to be taken into account in the delivery of any additional buildings.
- 3.37 **Concern:** That a new school should have been built on the High Royds estate to accommodate the children living there, that the increasing demographics were not addressed at this stage and that sufficient planning was not carried out when the new housing has been built, and the authority did not discharge its duty to secure developer contributions or a new school. Menston Primary School was supposed to cater for this but it has decreased in size.
- 3.38 **Response:** The number of homes built on the High Royds estate were not sufficient to generate a new school. At the time the development was brought forward, sufficient places existed at Menston, which was the closest school to High Royds, and so contributions could not be secured. The issue is not caused by High Royds children attending Tranmere Park; currently a total of 5 children who attend Tranmere Park Primary School live on the High Royds estate, and there are enough children with Tranmere Park as their nearest school but not living on the High Royds estate, to fill both an expanded Tranmere Park and Hawksworth. Whilst Menston Primary School in Bradford is the nearest school for children living at High Royds. Leeds as a Local Authority has an obligation to provide places for children living within its boundary. Menston Primary School has decreased its admission limit in response to decreasing pupil forecasts, rather than to deny Leeds children a place.



- 3.39 **Concern:** That the school was originally built for children living on the estate and that the expansion would provide places for children living further afield and that it should not provide places for children living in Bradford.
- 3.40 **Response:** The expansion is proposed to cater for Leeds children for whom the school is their nearest school. The data provided shows how there are more than sufficient local children to fill the places. The admissions policy for the school would continue to prioritise those for whom it is the nearest school.
- 3.41 **Concern:** That the expanded school would be too large, this would impact on educational standards and would lead to increased class sizes.
- 3.42 **Response:** There are many examples of successful two form entry primary schools in Leeds, and it is the model for a third of all primary schools in Leeds. It is acknowledged that should the school expand it would undergo change, however change would be gradual. The school would be supported by officers from the Local Authority. The proposal would not lead to an increase in class sizes, except in reception, which would move from two classes of 22/23 to two classes of 30. The expansion would provide the opportunity to move from 1.5 to 2 form entry and therefore move from mixed aged classes. Some welcome this opportunity.
- 3.43 **Concern:** That it would undermine other schools, namely Hawksworth C of E Primary School and planned building work at St Oswald's.
- 3.44 **Response:** The demographic data shows that there are sufficient children already living in the area to justify these additional places without undermining other local schools, and house building in the area is likely to add to this pressure. Discussions are ongoing regarding the building work at St Oswald's, planned in order to provide accommodation for the children who will move into the school in September 2013. This process is independent of the statutory process in relation to Tranmere Park Primary school.
- 3.45 **Concern:** That the proposed expansion would impact upon the current out of school facilities, or mean it has to close.
- 3.46 **Response:** There is no proposal to remove the out of school provision, which is seen to be critical to the school, and a condition of the governors support. The accommodation needs of the out of school club would be considered alongside those of the school during the design process and the out of school club would be fully engaged in this process.
- 3.47 **Proposal three: To expand Rufford Park Primary School** from a capacity of 210 pupils to 315 pupils with an increase in the admission number from 30 to 45 with effect from September 2014. The school raised this as a counter proposal during the consultation on Rawdon St Peter's expansion, and it would go some way to addressing the immediate demographic pressure.
- 3.48 29 written responses were received, 12 in favour, 15 against and two were neutral. The governing body of Rufford Park Primary School fully support the proposal. Those who are in favour supported the proposal as it provides school

places for those children for whom the school is their nearest. Many of those who objected to the proposal argued that that Rawdon St Peter's Primary School should be expanded rather than Rufford Park Primary School and that the proposal brought forward previously should be reconsidered.

- 3.49 **Concern:** The Governing Body of Rawdon St Peter's Primary School have submitted a counter proposal arguing that their school site presents a better solution in terms of available space, would address long term building issues and provide enhanced accommodation for pupils including those attending the partnership with the North West SILC and remove mixed age classes. Other respondents commented that Rufford Park, as a PFI school, was already a new build and therefore should not have been selected as a school for expansion.
- 3.50 **Response:** Whilst the previous proposal would have addressed some of the condition issues in the finished design for the expanded school, the school have worked hard to address some of the condition issues within the school since 2011 and benefited from capital maintenance funding to address mechanical issues during summer 2012. The proposal also offered an opportunity to remove the mixed age classes, meet parental demand, and maintain the proportion of CE places on offer in the Rawdon / Yeadon / Guiseley corridor to allow parental choice. The consultation process however brought forward serious concerns about the traffic issues around the school, and highlighted that whilst Rawdon St Peter's may be popular, the bulk of the demographic pressure was actually focussed around Yeadon, and Rufford Park in particular. With many of the children likely to be travelling longer distances to take up the places in Rawdon, an enlarged school would bring with it an increased likelihood of families arriving by car, adding to the traffic problems described. It was on this basis and due to the presentation of a counter proposal by Rufford Park Primary School that a new proposal was developed.
- 3.51 The revised proposal addresses the need to create additional school places to meet the rising demographics in the area, i.e. those children live closest to Rufford Park Primary School and therefore reducing the journey to school. All factors are taken into account when developing proposals particularly the demographic demand and the deliverability of the project. The building work which would take place if this goes ahead would focus on providing the additional class space required rather than creating improvements to the existing building at the school. The existing site has the capacity to be expanded and the fact that it is managed as part of a PFI contract presents no barrier to developing it.
- 3.52 **Concern:** The site is not sufficiently large to accommodate the additional build and that building work would be disruptive to the education of the children.
- 3.53 **Response:** The work undertaken to date indicates that the site is sufficiently large to accommodate the indoor and outdoor space required for the additional children. Local Authority officers have extensive experience of managing building projects on school sites and health and safety issues are paramount at all times.
- 3.54 **Concern:** That when previously built new housing was planned, schools should have been expanded at that point.

- 3.55 **Response:** When house building takes place, the need to create additional school places is always considered and contributions sought from developers as necessary. At the time when the houses were built, sufficient places were available in local schools and the building of a new school could not be justified.
- 3.56 **Concern:** There are already existing traffic and highways issues, parental parking requires improvement, that traffic calming should be introduced and that crossing needs to be improved near the school.
- 3.57 **Response:** By creating the additional places where the children live, traffic would be minimised and children would have the best opportunity to walk to school. Initial concerns about potential increase in on street parking on Rufford Avenue have been raised particularly near the bend in the highway north of the school. Initial measures would include a 20mph speed limit on Rufford Avenue and other adjacent roads to the school including Henshaw Avenue and Henshaw Oval. These would probably require physical traffic calming measures within the 20mph areas; and amendments, where necessary of existing Traffic Regulation Orders and the possible promotion of new Traffic Regulation Orders
- 3.58 The issues raised would be addressed in the planning process. All schools are required to have green travel plans which consider the journey to school. In the case of Rufford Park Primary School, over 70% of children walk to school and the governing body are committed to continuing to encourage this, should the school expand. A number of options are available locally to help facilitate parental drop off. Where parents dropping off children park over resident's drives, enforcement action can be taken by the appropriate officers on the request of local residents.
- 3.59 **Concern:** The community has a right to a smaller school, the previous infant and junior schools should have been retained.
- 3.60 **Response:** There are already schools of varying sizes in the area, including two one form entry schools, one of which is a Catholic school, which provides choice and diversity.
- 3.61 **Concern:** Class sizes would increase due to the proposed expansion.
- 3.62 **Response:** The proposal would not increase class sizes, which would continue to be based on classes of 30 in line with current funding models and infant class size legislation. In reception, there is likely to be a reduction in class size, as there would likely be two classes of 22/23, then the remainder of the school organised into classes of 30.
- 3.63 **Concern:** The expansion of the school would lead to mixed aged teaching which would be difficult to manage and detrimental to the education of the children.
- 3.64 **Response:** Whilst the expansion would lead to mixed aged teaching, the school is confident that this would be well managed. There are many examples of successful 1.5 form entry primary schools. Larger schools can offer other benefits such as wider range of staff expertise, increased curricular and extra curricular activities, flexibility in managing classes and greater staff development.

- 3.65 **Concern:** The nursery provision currently on site would not be retained.
- 3.66 **Response:** There are no plans to remove or replace the existing nursery provision. The accommodation needs of the nursery would be considered alongside those of the school during the design process with nursery staff fully engaged as appropriate.
- 3.67 **Concern:** That there is a lack of accessible Church of England primary places in the Yeadon/Rawdon/Guiseley area.
- 3.68 **Response:** There are two Church of England Primary Schools in the area, Rawdon St Peters and Hawksworth C of E and one junior school, Guiseley St Oswalds. A previous proposal to expand Rawdon St Peter's Primary School encountered a number of planning and technical issues that have to be overcome. Hawksworth CE Primary is located on a very constrained site and would be difficult to develop. Options for a proposal at Guiseley St Oswalds are currently under discussion with the Governing Body and the diocese.
- 3.69 **Proposal four: Expansion of Sharp Lane Primary School** from 420 to 630 places, by increasing the admission number from 60 to 90 from September 2014.
- 3.70 There were four written responses, one strongly agreed, two strongly disagreed, one neither agreed or disagreed. The governing body fully support the proposal conditional upon the acquisition of access to the playing field adjacent to the school and the development of a whole school building solution. The public meeting was well attended with views and concerns raised. The following issues were raised in the responses received and in the meetings:
- 3.71 **Concern:** Some local residents expressed the view that a new school should have been built to accommodate the new housing in the vicinity of the Sharp Lane Primary School.
- 3.72 **Response:** There are a number of reasons why a new school is not the best solution in this instance. There is a lack of available land locally to build a new primary school. The expansion of existing primary schools provides flexibility, and builds on existing successful primary schools rather than a creating new school in the area. Clapgate and Windmill Primary Schools have been expanded from 1.5 to 2 forms of entry to accommodate demand from additional housing across the wider area.
- 3.73 **Concern:** The expansion of the school would undermine other local schools, namely Clapgate Primary School. The governing body at Clapgate Primary School expressed the view that the expansion of Sharp Lane would have a detrimental effect on their pupil numbers and that in addition children from the new housing would access Sharp Lane rather than Clapgate, impacting upon their pupil profile.
- 3.74 **Response:** The underlying demographics of the area demonstrate that the additional places are required to provide sufficient places for the children living closest to Sharp Lane Primary School. The demand for places would continue to be carefully monitored to ensure that sufficient places are available and we are

confident that the additional places at Sharp Lane would not undermine other schools; this will remain under ongoing review.

- 3.75 **Concern:** The larger school would provide places for children from the new housing estate and that they would receive priority over children living in local authority housing.
- 3.76 **Response:** Children would continue to receive priority for places according to the admissions policy. For Community schools, this means those who have it as their nearest school receive priority, and then on straight line distance. Nobody who currently has the school as their nearest would cease to have it as their nearest.
- 3.77 **Concern:** Some expressed the view that the expanded school would be too large and would be overwhelming for the pupils and that the small family ethos would be lost.
- 3.78 **Response:** Leeds has several popular and successful three form entry primaries, including Westerton Primary School, a South Leeds School rated as outstanding. These all provide a safe, friendly environment for their pupils. The Head Teacher, leadership team and governing body of Sharp Lane Primary School are keen to ensure that the ethos of the school is retained. Larger schools may require a different management approach, but can still retain a friendly, welcoming environment for young children.
- 3.79 **Concern:** The field adjacent to the school was felt to be critical to the successful delivery of a building solution. Some expressed the view that the field should be fenced off and be incorporated as part of the school grounds, but be available for community use on evenings and weekends.
- 3.80 **Response:** It is agreed that the field should be secured in order to provide additional recreation and play space. The field is in Leeds City Council ownership and discussions are ongoing with relevant Council departments to ensure safe access for the school. Community access requirements would be considered through the design and formal planning processes. Consideration would also be given to how pedestrian access across the field to local amenities would be managed.
- 3.81 **Concern:** Some expressed the view that that the feeling of being a single school could be lost due if the building was not designed properly. In addition, some expressed the view that the building work would be disruptive and that the non teaching space, such as the playground, dining room etc would not be sufficiently large.
- 3.82 **Response:** The building scheme would be project managed by the Built Environment team who have extensive experience of managing similar projects. They would ensure it is safe by design, and that the school functions as a whole school. This means all factors would be considered; classrooms play and hall space would be all taken into account as part of the design process. Every possible measure would be undertaken to ensure that building work has no detrimental impact on the education or working environment of children or staff currently at the school. The school staff and governors would be consulted as

part of the design process and their views would be integral in the development of the design for the new school extension

- 3.83 **Concern:** That an enlarged school would bring with it increased traffic, and access and highways issues. It was felt that improvements and/or traffic calming measures would be needed on the roads, and that pedestrian and vehicular access should be taken into account.
- 3.84 **Response:** There are current issues related to the parking of vehicles on the grass verges on Sharp Lane in the vicinity of the school. Initial measures would include hardening the verges to formalise lay by parking areas; amendments, where necessary of existing Traffic Regulation Orders and the possible promotion of new Traffic Regulation Orders; and a 20mph speed limit on Sharp Lane in the vicinity of the school in addition to the existing traffic calming measures.

## **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.
- 4.1.2 All respondents are routinely asked for their views on how the consultation process can be improved. The issues raised are summarised in Appendix 2. The cost benefit of these suggestions will be analysed prior to public consultation on any future proposals. Opportunities for increased communication via the local press and through community groups/publications in particular those distributed to local residents are being investigated, taking account of the different communities across the city.

### **4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration**

- 4.2.1 The EDCI assessments have been completed and are attached.

### **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 children live the proposals will allow improved accessibility of local and desirable school places, and thus reduce any risks of non-attendance.

### **4.4 Resources and value for money**

- 4.4.1 The high level estimated cost delivery of the proposals is £ 9.4 million which will be funded through the education capital programme. Feasibility studies have been commissioned at risk for all projects and the outcomes of this are expected during January 2013. Early highways design work has commenced with the outcomes of this also expected during early 2013

#### **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. The consultations have been managed in accordance with that legislation and with local practice.

#### **4.6 Risk Management**

4.6.1 In terms of managing highways issues, work is currently being undertaken at risk. An initial Transport Statement is currently being prepared by Highways colleagues for each site. The Transport Statement will provide a full assessment of the existing site and the proposed development and will identify the highway implications of the proposals and the necessary mitigation measures. This will be included with the Planning Application documentation when the proposal is submitted. Together with the Project Brief from Children's Services the Transport Statement will form the initial Highways brief for the preparation of a preliminary design of off-site highway works together with a robust estimate of the cost of the works required.

4.6.2 The Highways Brief will instruct the Councils Highway Design Team to undertake a preliminary design and cost estimate for each site. This will consist of internal consultation with teams within the Councils Highway Services. Specifically with Traffic Management, Road Safety, the Schools Travelwise team and Transport Development Services, although other teams may be consulted if necessary. This will determine any existing issues that have arisen regarding road safety, parking/access, etc. and assess the potential traffic and road safety implications of the proposals.

4.6.3 A plan will be prepared showing the proposed off-site highway works required to address the issues raised together with a robust cost estimate.

4.6.4 This preparatory work is expected to take approximately 3 months from the date of the Highways Brief, and subject to consultation with local Ward Members and Highway Board Approval the design and implementation of required traffic measures can be completed in advance of September 2014.

4.6.5 With all four schemes, early discussions were entered into with planning officers at regular liaison meetings. In terms of the Little London development, planning workshops have been held which have included planning and urban design officers. Ward members and communities will be fully involved in the pre-application process.

4.6.6 The most significant delivery risks are linked to the Little London Primary School proposal. The compatibility of the timeframe for the improvements to the community hub and the building solution required to deliver the additional classroom accommodation is a potential risk. A temporary solution would be required to accommodate the additional children in the short term until the new build is complete. It should be noted however that the school would expand gradually however from reception onwards rather than fill to full capacity immediately, thereby reducing the scope of the temporary solution. A detailed risk register will be kept for each project.

## **5 Conclusions**

- 5.1 The proposals for Little London, Rufford Park and Sharp Lane remain strong ones, which address sufficiency needs in their immediate areas. Whilst there are a number of challenges presented by each of the proposals, information to date suggests these can be addressed satisfactorily. The Little London proposal is widely supported but carries some risk around the complexity of the project, in particular linked to the community hub aspects of delivery. The proposal to expand Rufford Park Primary School remains strong as long as traffic issues can be managed. The proposal in relation to Sharp Lane also remains strong, although again traffic and highways issues would need to be addressed, and inclusion of the field adjacent to the school to provide additional play space would need to be progressed.
- 5.2 The proposal for Tranmere Park was also brought forward to accommodate local children, for whom this is their nearest school. Whilst the authority do believe there are measures available to mitigate concerns about traffic and site issues, it recognises that with discussions with other schools ongoing, and further exploration of the options surrounding Green Meadows site possible, it would be premature to progress the proposal at this stage. There are no alternatives which can be delivered for 2014, and so temporary measures will need to be taken until the permanent solution is agreed. Further recommendations will be brought to Executive Board which take into account all the options in the Guiseley area.

## **6 Recommendations**

- 6.1 Executive Board is asked to:
1. Approve the publication of a statutory notice for the expansion of Little London Primary School from 210 to 630 pupils
  2. Approve the publication of a statutory notice for the expansion of Rufford Park Primary School from 210 to 315 pupils
  3. Approve the publication of a statutory notice for the expansion of Sharp Lane Primary School from 420 to 630 pupils
  4. Agree that further work is carried out in relation to the proposal to expand Tranmere Park Primary School prior to further consideration by Executive Board.

## **7 Background documents<sup>1</sup>**

None.

## **Consultation Documents and Statutory Notices**

### **7.2 Consultation Documents for the four proposals**

---

<sup>1</sup> The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.



## Appendix 1 – additional data

### Early Years Provision in Woodhouse Planning Area

| School / Setting                       | No of funded places available for 3 and 4 yr olds | Actual number of claims for Summer Term 2012 |
|--|---|--|
| Blenheim Primary School                | 78  | 51   |
| Kaurtars Kinder Krew                   | 25  | 29   |
| Leeds Thomas Danby Nursery             | 32  | 32   |
| Little London Childrens Centre Daycare | 96  | 78   |
| Quarry Mount Childrens Centre Daycare  | 94  | 69   |
| <b>Totals</b>                          | <b>325</b>  | <b>259</b>                                   |

## Appendix 2 Consultation Improvements suggested

- Some families expressed the view that the consultation booklet should have been sent home to all families of children attending the schools affected by the proposals. Another respondent expressed the view that the booklets should have been distributed more widely in the community and that the consultation should have been advertised more widely and further opportunities sought to engage with the local community. We will review the cost of the production of additional booklets and carry out a cost benefit analysis but are mindful of the effective use of public resources .
- One respondent commented that the booklet did not focus sufficiently on the impact of the expansion upon the community and local environment. Others commented that the document did not provide sufficiently detailed background to proposals or use the opportunity to set out the benefits. We will take these comments into consideration in the preparation of booklets as part of future consultation exercises.
- Some local residents, particularly those living close to Tranmere Park Primary School expressed the view that the public meeting should have been better advertised and all residents should have been written to individually prior to the meeting. The meetings 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 constantly review our methodology to ensure the widest possible audience and will make increased use of local press options to advertise more widely. We will look again at advertising in supermarkets, and other locations at the immediate sites.
- Some respondents commented that they had had difficulty in accessing information regarding the proposal on the website. This has been fed back to the web team.
- Some respondents commented on the lack of detailed design information presented at public meetings regarding school expansion. Another commented on the consistency of delivery of information by panel members at the consultation meetings. There is a balance between the work required and the cost involved in developing detailed designs at consultation stage before the decision is made to proceed. However it is acknowledged that this does cause difficulties for people in terms of feeling that they are able to give an informed response. Pre-application involvement with communities and ward members is recognised as an important part of the planning and development process and it is recognised that this is especially valuable where it is undertaken at an early stage. This will be enhanced in the approach to future school proposals. There are further opportunities for ward members and the community to comment as part of the planning process. Finally, the information presented at such meetings, and the method of delivery by officers is under review to address feedback received.