

Report of Director of Children's Services

Report to Executive Board

Date: 4 September 2013



Subject: Part A: Outcome of Statutory Notice on proposals for the expansion of primary provision in 2014

Part B: Outcome of consultation on proposals for the expansion of Pudsey Primrose Hill Primary School from September 2015 and Guiseley Infant and Nursery School and St Oswald's Church of England Junior School

Part C: Permission to consult on the expansion of Broomfield South SILC and West Oaks SEN Specialist School and College

Part D: Outcome of the Targeted Basic Need Bid for additional capital funding

Are specific electoral Wards affected?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Part A – Ardsley & Robin Hood, Bramley & Stanningley, Kippax & Methley, Morley North, Morley South Part B – Calverley & Farsley, Guiseley & Rawdon Part C – Middleton Park, Hyde Park and Woodhouse, Wetherby Part D – Ardsley & Robin Hood, Morley North, Otley & Yeadon, Hyde Park & Woodhouse, Kippax & Methley, Middleton Park, Wetherby		
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: Appendix number:		

Summary of main issues

Part A:

In May 2013 Executive Board considered the outcome of public consultation on five statutory proposals to create additional reception places for September 2014 and a further proposal to lower the age range of Hollybush Primary School, and gave permission to publish a statutory notice. The five expansion proposals were brought forward as part of

the Council's basic need programme, to meet the statutory duty to ensure sufficient school places in response to the growing pre-school population.

The notice in relation to Hollybush Primary School was published on Friday 7 June and the notices in relation to the expansion of five schools were published on Friday 21 June 2013. All notices expired on Friday 19 July 2013. A final decision must be made within 2 months of the expiry of the notice, therefore by 18 September 2013. There were no responses to the notices, and therefore, part A of this report seeks a final decision from Executive Board on the proposals.

Part B:

In May 2013 the Executive Board gave permission to consult on a further three statutory proposals to create additional reception places for September 2015. Part B of this report presents the outcome of statutory consultation on these proposals and seeks permission to publish a statutory notice in respect of Pudsey Primrose Hill.

Part C:

Leeds has been successful in bidding for funding for proposed expansions to two Special Inclusive Learning Centres, Broomfield South SILC (50 places) and West Oaks SEN Specialist School and College (150 places) for children and young people with Special Educational Needs (SEN) from across the city. The proposed expansions would make a significant contribution to plans to address an identified shortfall of places for children and young people with SEN both in the current year and in the years ahead. Part C of this report seeks permission to start that consultation.

Part D:

The outcome of Leeds Targeted Basic Need bid to secure additional government funding to deliver school places in Leeds resulted in an allocation of £13.8m capital funding. This is specific to 7 schemes, including the two referred to in Part C which now require public consultation.

Recommendations

Part A

Executive Board is asked to:

- Approve the expansion of Allerton Bywater Primary School from a capacity of 210 pupils to 420 pupils with an increase in the admission number from 30 to 60 with effect from September 2014;
- Approve the expansion of Asquith Primary School from a capacity of 210 pupils to 420 pupils with an increase in the admission number from 30 to 60 with effect from September 2014;
- Approve the expansion of Morley St Francis Catholic Primary School from a capacity of 154 pupils to 210 pupils with an increase in the admission number from 22 to 30 with effect from September 2014;

- Approve the expansion of East Ardsley 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;
- Approve the expansion of Robin Hood 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;
- Approval to lower the age range of Hollybush Primary School from 5 to 11 to 3 to 11.

Part B

Executive Board is asked to:

- Approve the publication of a statutory notice to expand Pudsey Primrose Hill from a capacity of 315 pupils to 420 pupils with an increase in the admission number from 45 to 60 with effect from September 2015.
- Note the further work to be undertaken in the Guiseley area.

Part C:

Executive Board is asked to:

- Give permission to consult on the expansion of Broomfield South SILC from a capacity of 200 to 250 pupils with effect from September 2015 using a site adjacent to the school, Broom Court (Broom Place, Leeds, LS10 3JP)
- Give permission to consult on the expansion of West Oaks SEN Specialist School and College from a capacity of 200 to 350 pupils by the creation of an additional site for 150 children and young people aged 2 to 16 on the former Blenheim Centre (Crowther Place, Leeds, West Yorkshire)with effect from September 2015;

Part D:

Executive Board is asked to:

- Note the allocation of capital funding through the Targeted Basic Need bid.

Purpose of this report

- 1.1 This report contains details of proposals brought forward to meet the local authority's duty to ensure sufficiency of school places. The report is divided into four parts - Part A describes the outcome of statutory notices in relation to the expansion of primary provision across the city for September 2014, and seeks a final decision on these proposals. Part B seeks permission to publish a statutory notice in relation to the expansion of Pudsey Primrose Hill Primary School and summarises the consultation and next steps in Guiseley. Part C seeks permission to consult on the expansion of Broomfield South SILC and the expansion of West Oaks SEN Specialist School and College. Part D describes the outcome of the Targeted Basic Need bid.

2 Background information

- 2.2 In May 2013 Executive Board considered the outcome of public consultation on five statutory proposals to create additional reception places for September 2014 and a further proposal to lower the age range of Hollybush Primary School, and gave permission to publish a statutory notice.
- 2.3 In addition, permission was sought to consult on a proposal to expand Pudsey Primrose Hill Primary School from September 2015. Permission was also sought at May 2013 Executive Board to consult on linked proposals to expand Guiseley Infant and Nursery School from a capacity of 270 pupils to 420 pupils and raise the age range from 3 to 7 to 3 to 11 and expand St Oswald's Church of England Junior School from a capacity of 360 pupils to 420 pupils and lower the age range from 7 to 11 to 5 to 11 with effect from September 2015.
- 2.4 The Targeted Basic Need programme was launched by the Department of Education in March 2013 to provide additional funding for school places in areas where they are most needed. Local authorities were invited to bid for funding for new schools, or to expand existing outstanding and good schools. Leeds has been successful in bidding for additional funding for seven schemes. Five of these schemes are for primary school places that have been through public consultation and two are the proposed expansions to two Special Inclusive Learning Centres, Broomfield South SILC (50 places) utilising the Broom Court site and West Oaks SEN Specialist School and College (150 places), to be located on the former Blenheim Centre, Crowther Road, for children and young people with Special Educational Needs (SEN) from across the city
- 2.5 The proposed expansions would make a significant contribution to plans to address an identified shortfall of places for children and young people with SEN both in the current year and in the years ahead. Under the terms of the funding, proposed expansion works must be completed and the buildings open and operational, by September 2015.
- 2.6 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 the proposals described in part A, part B and Part C of this report constitute prescribed alterations requiring a statutory process.

3 Main issues

Part A - Outcome of Statutory Notice on proposals for the expansion of primary provision in 2014

- 3.1 The statutory notice is the final step of the statutory process. The notice in relation to lowering the age range at Hollybush Primary School was published on Friday 7 June 2013 and the notices in relation to the expansion of five primary schools were published on Friday 21 June 2013. All notices expired on Friday 19 July 2013. A final decision must be made within 2 months of the expiry of the notices, i.e. by 18 September 2013. There were no responses to the notices, and this report seeks a final decision on the proposals.
- 3.2 The public consultation ran from 25 February to 29 March 2013 and from 25 February to 12 April in respect of the Hollybush proposal. The report to the May 2013 meeting of the Executive Board considered the responses received and approved the publication of the statutory notices.
- 3.3 Responses received during the public consultation focussed on several issues, with particular concerns around increased traffic and cars parking/dropping off, the size and design of the school building and the impact on external space, as well as potential disruption during building works. Other respondents felt that the expansions would undermine other schools in the area. The previous report to Executive Board articulated how these concerns may be addressed and there was confidence that the issues raised could be addressed and therefore approval to publish a statutory notice was given.
- 3.4 There have been no further representations received in response to the statutory notice.

Part B – Outcome of Consultation on the expansion of primary provision from September 2015.

- 3.5 The consultation was conducted from 3 June 2013 to 12 July 2013. This is in line with government guidance and local practice, and ward members were consulted during the formal consultation period. Public meetings and drop-in session were held, and information was 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 the public meeting notes can be found at www.leeds.gov.uk or, along with the responses received, can be requested from the capacity planning and sufficiency team at educ.school.organisation@leeds.gov.uk.
- 3.6 **Proposal One: Expansion of Pudsey Primrose Hill 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 2015. As well as an increase in the birth rate over the last four years, Pudsey schools have also historically drawn children from surrounding areas, namely Bramley, Armley and Farsley. The expansion of this school would provide an additional 15 places in an area of Pudsey where there is particular demand for places and allow some flexibility to be able to

manage the admissions system, and offer choice and diversity to parents. The school has taken additional children into reception over the last four years.

- 3.6 During the consultation phase, 11 written responses were received, all in favour of the proposal. The governing body have indicated their full support for the proposal. The following issues were raised in the responses received and in the meetings:
- 3.7 **Concern:** that the expansion would have a detrimental effect on staff, children's attainment and resources.
- 3.8 **Response:** Additional pupils would generate increased pupil funding to purchase additional resources. Infant class size legislation requires one qualified teacher per class of 30 children in Key Stage 1. The school leadership team would determine whether additional staff were required to support learning as pupil numbers increased. The proposal would remove the need for mixed aged classes and provide certainty around pupil numbers. The governing body and Senior Leadership Team would work to ensure the expansion did not have a detrimental effect upon standards and attainment.
- 3.9 **Concern:** that the building work would be disruptive and that the expansion would impact on the current play space.
- 3.10 **Response:** Health and safety issues are paramount in any expansion. Wherever possible work would be carried out in school holidays but it is likely that some work would have to be carried out in term time. The Built Environment team have extensive experience of managing building projects on school sites. There is guidance regarding the amount of soft and hard play space and this would be taken into account. If the proposal progresses, colleagues in the Built Environment Team would liaise with Sport England regarding the existing space to determine whether there was an option to build on the existing green space which is not used by the school.
- 3.11 **Concern:** that traffic will increase and the lack of parking currently available.
- 3.12 **Response:** The proposal is designed to provide local places for local children, providing the opportunity to walk to school. If the proposal progresses, there would be a need to liaise with Planning and Highways regarding any measures required to manage the expansion. It is not possible to say what these would be at this point. Currently there is an informal agreement with Marks and Spencer whereby parents can utilise the stores own car park when dropping off or collecting children.
- 3.13 **Proposals Two and Three: to change the upper age limit of Guiseley Infant and Nursery School from 3 to 7 to 3 to 11 with an admission limit of 60 in reception from September 2015 and to change the lower age limit of St Oswald's Church of England Junior School from 7 to 11 to 5 to 11 with an admission limit of 60 in reception in Year 3 and to expand its capacity from 360 to 420 pupils from September 2015. The school would cease to admit pupils directly into Year 3 in 2017.**

- 3.14 There were 397 responses in total, of these 381 were from those objecting, 16 in support. Of the total number of responses 238 were on forms created by the GINS action group. 302 of the total number of responses were in response to the proposal at Guiseley Infants, 18 related directly to St Oswald's. Two public meetings and three drop in sessions were held. The public meetings were very well attended, with over 120 people at the Guiseley Infants public meeting and over 100 at the St Oswald's public meeting.
- 3.15 The governing body of Guiseley Infant and Nursery School have indicated that they do not support the proposal although the Headteacher does support the proposal. The governing body and Headteacher of St Oswald's Church England Junior School have indicated that they support the proposal. The local ward members and MP do not support the proposal.
- 3.16 **Concern:** that the consultation was not sufficiently wide, residents were not informed and that the consultation period was not long enough and that a list of options should have been presented in the consultation process. In addition the consultation booklet and FAQs contained some references to the word 'will', suggesting that the consultation was not genuine.
- 3.17 **Response:** The statutory guidance recommends a minimum of 6 weeks consultation in the case of proposals to change the age range of a school and this was followed. This is in line with all other consultations of this type that have been taking place to meet the rising demand for places. Whilst it is acknowledged that not all residents were informed, information was displayed on the council website, on the Aireborough Neighbourhood Forum website, posters were displayed in Morrisons, in the local doctors and post office, at the local churches, on lamp-posts near the schools. A leaflet drop was also carried out in the neighbouring streets of the schools.
- 3.18 The consultation booklet did not describe a series of options as the consultation process requires us to be clear about which proposal we are consulting upon in order that the consultation can focus upon the merits of the proposal. Whilst some of the FAQs used the word will, the opening statements of the booklet described the proposal, using the word 'would' and the public meetings and drop-in sessions were clear that the consultation was seeking views and no decision had been made.
- 3.19 **Concern:** That the council have acted too late in bringing this proposal forward and that they do not address the potential demand for new places linked to housing detailed in the Site Allocations Plan and that it does not address the housing allocations described in the Site Allocations Plan. That Guiseley has been over-developed with planning permission being granted for housing without meeting local infrastructure needs.
- 3.20 **Response:** This proposal is to address demand from the existing population and those known to have been born in the Guiseley area rather than to address a future need/houses building not yet underway. The housing referred to in the Site Allocations Plan outlines site allocations for the use of land to 2028, in conformity with the Core Strategy strategic targets and policies. As development of these

sites progresses in the future contributions from Developers will be necessary to support the increased demand for school places that arises as a consequence.

- 3.21 **Concern:** that Tranmere Park Primary School, an oversubscribed school should be expanded rather than making changes at Guiseley Infants and St Oswalds' and that the previous proposal there should be revisited.
- 3.22 **Response:** consultation was carried out in September/October 2012 on the expansion Tranmere Park Primary School. The expansion would have brought an additional 15 places. Whilst the school is a popular school, and the proposal would have met local demand and was supported by the governing body, it would not have provided sufficient places in the wider area that led us to look again at an alternative proposal.
- 3.23 **Concern:** that a new school should have been built at High Royds
- 3.24 **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 the number of children living on the High Royds development but by the overall increase in the population. 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. The expansion is proposed to cater for Leeds children for whom the school is their nearest
- 3.25 **Concern:** that a new primary school would be a better long term solution and could be built on the Green Meadows site.
- 3.26 **Response:** To establish a primary school on the site would require us to either close the SILC or remove it to another location. There is a rising need for specialist SEN places in the city and we cannot consider reducing the number of those places at this time. To move the SILC to an alternative location would firstly require a public consultation, including the consideration of the SEN improvement test which considers how any changes would make the SEN provision better than currently exists. This consultation and subsequent statutory notice period would need to be completed before establishing a new academy on the site could progress. This timeframe would preclude us from meeting the level of demand for school places by 2015.
- 3.27 Capital funding would be required to not just build the primary school places necessary, but also to re-provide the special school places. At this time the capital allocation from the DfE to meet the need for school places is not sufficient to facilitate such a proposal. No alternative land in Council ownership can has been identified where a new school could be built.
- 3.28 **Concern:** that the additional children should be shared between the local schools
- 3.29 **Response:** Sharing out the additional children between a number of schools would not create a long term permanent solution. The Infant Class Size

regulations prohibit classes of more than 30, per qualified teacher, being taught other than in a very limited number of exceptional cases. It is unlikely that this could be managed in existing accommodation and schools would be unable to fund the level of staffing required.

- 3.30 **Concern:** That the consultation process on expansion does not include the detail of how any new school accommodated would be configured.
- 3.31 **Response:** The consultation process at this stage is upon the merits of expansion rather than upon the detail of the design of any new accommodation. Any changes to the building would be the subject of a separate consultation exercise in relation to the planning process.
- 3.32 **Concern:** that the plans would exacerbate the existing traffic and parking problems in Guiseley, at school drop off and pick up times, specifically that the area cannot cope with more traffic and an increased demand for parking which would cause enormous problems for residents, commuters and local businesses. Concern was also expressed to congestion on the A65, and in relation to traffic issues at West Villa road at the junction of Oxford Road.
- 3.33 **Response:** The proposed school extension will inevitably result in an increase in both pedestrian and vehicle trips to the school. However, the Council is committed to managing any increase in a sustainable and safe manner.
- 3.34 A Transport Statement together with a school parking management plan; a School Travel Plan and a Framework Construction Management Plan would be undertaken to assess the implications of the proposals on the surrounding highway network and any measures deemed necessary to mitigate the impact of the proposal will be proposed as part of the Planning Application.
- 3.35 Many schools successfully operate walking buses to minimise car journeys to school and encourage children to walk to school. In addition, the establishment of two primary schools, once the transition period had been completed, would mean that parents, carers and childminders did not have to travel between two schools in order to collect children from the former infant and junior schools.
- 3.36 **Concern:** The plans do not provide the right places in the right location and that the proposed places are not located close to the new housing and would therefore be filled by children who would be driven to school, affecting children, staff, local residents and businesses.
- 3.37 **Response:** the proposal was drawn up to address the need for school places in Guiseley linked to new housing e.g. in the White Cross Area at Netherfield Road, Cromptons as well as the rising birth rate. It is common practice to increase the capacity of existing schools to manage a rising population from both new housing and a rise in births.
- 3.38 Whilst the birth data indicates an increase in the number of births of children in Guiseley of children who would go to school in 2014, this does reduce in 2015 but then increases again in 2016. There have been additional school places available in Guiseley schools (Guiseley Infants, Hawksworth C of E, Queensway and

Tranmere Park) in 2012 and 2013 due to the temporary increase in the number of places at Tranmere Park, an additional 15 places. The table below indicates the nearest children requiring a school place and the total number of place available. The shortfall column indicating that there is indeed a need for additional school places in Guiseley.

Year	Places available	Nearest children	Shortfall
2013	195	176	0
2014	180	221	-41
2015	180	180	0
2016	180	209	-29

- 3.39 **Concern:** there is not enough space to expand both schools and that the facilities at the new schools will be inadequate for the relevant age ranges, in particular there is a lack of play space at Guiseley Infants.
- 3.40 **Response:** The overall site area is 12,903m². The average size of all Leeds primary schools is 15,660m²; however Guiseley Infant school is 121st largest of 221 schools. This includes all 3FE schools. Building Bulletin 99 recommends a site area of 4600m² - 17320m² for 2FE primary schools. Guiseley Infant school is well within this range. Building Bulletin 99 recommends approximately 2470m² of hard play provision for a 2FE primary school. Guiseley Infant School has in excess of this figure (approximately 2900m²).
- 3.41 Acknowledging that Guiseley Infant, like a number of schools in Leeds, does not have a formally marked sports pitch; Building Bulletin 99 recommends approximately 1440m² - 1850m² of soft play space for a 2FE school. Guiseley Infant School has approximately 1900m² of soft play space to the front of the school and over 2000m² to the rear. When compared with a number of recently expanded 2FE primary schools across Leeds, the school is not obviously deficit in any particular area. The school site is not insufficiently sized to accommodate 2FE.
- 3.42 It is accepted however that some classrooms in school are smaller than average, any new classrooms created would be constructed in accordance with DfE recommendations. It is also acknowledged that more class spaces, 5 in total would need to be created on the infant site to establish the 14 class rooms required for a primary school as it currently has 9 class rooms, whereas the junior school, which currently has 12 classrooms and a 2 form entry primary school would only require an additional 2 class rooms to establish its 14 classrooms.
- 3.43 **Concern:** that there is not enough space at Guiseley Infants to ensure the children's safety and well-being and that the expansion will have a detrimental effect on the children's play area and thereby impact upon childhood obesity. .
- 3.44 **Response:** the site is sufficiently large to accommodate the additional build on the school site. The precise location of any building work has not been determined

however options exist to expand on the front and back of the school. There site can accommodate a two form entry primary school with sufficient play area in line with DfE guidelines.

- 3.45 **Concern:** that the building work required would be disruptive in terms of noise and that children may be required to be educated in temporary accommodation while building work was carried out
- 3.46 **Response:** Council officers are experienced in expanding operational schools with minimum disruption. The safety of the children, staff, parents and local residents are paramount, and all health and safety guidelines would be followed.
- 3.47 **Concern:** that Guiseley Infants is a road side-school and that previous road side schools have been closed due to medical evidence linking roads, pollution and the development of childhood asthma.
- 3.48 **Response:** there are many road side schools in Leeds, in fact most schools are road side schools due to their access to the public highway. Schools in Leeds have not been closed in the past due to their proximity to the road but to pupil numbers where due to a decline in numbers, schools were no longer sustainable.
- 3.49 **Concern:** that St Oswald's, being a faith school and able to control its own admissions, would prioritise faith over siblings and nearest children and therefore places would not be available for local children and that children without a faith will be discriminated against. .
- 3.50 **Response:** the governors of St Oswald's, a VA school, are their own admissions authority. If they wished to make any changes to their admissions policy they would need to consult to do so. The governors have indicated that they would wish the school to be a school that serves the Guiseley population and would wish to ensure siblings received a high priority.
- 3.51 **Concern:** that if St Oswald's moves to an admission limit of 60 in Year 3 in 2015, not all children at the former infant school will be able to transfer and siblings and friendship groups may be split causing emotional upheaval.
- 3.52 **Response:** If the admission limit of St Oswald's becomes 60 in Year 3 upon transition, it is true that not all 90 children would transfer and friendship groups may be split. The governors of St Oswald's have indicated that siblings would receive priority as they do now.
- 3.53 **Concern:** that the impact on children has not been fully considered and would be detrimental upon children at Guiseley Infants, the first cohort attending the primary school would complete their primary education without having learnt how to play with older children before they transition from primary to secondary school
- 3.54 **Response:** for those children who stay at Guiseley Infants in Year 3 in 2015 there would not be older children in school. This is the same for other changes of this type, the primary cohorts in the new 'through' schools and in newly opened primary schools. Parents would be able to remain at the school or seek to transfer to St Oswald's.

- 3.55 **Concern:** the plans could have a negative impact on two excellent schools who work very well together and that the infant and junior specialisms would be lost
- 3.56 **Response:** there is no indication that the positive working relationship would not continue. The schools would continue to enjoy their infant and junior expertise, be able to share good practice with each other and grow and develop by gaining new expertise.
- 3.57 **Concern:** A four form entry infant and junior school would be a better option as children enjoy attending two different schools and the transition is a preparation for high school.
- 3.58 **Response:** A four form entry infant school could be created on the infant site, which has greater capacity for expansion. A four form entry junior school would be more difficult to establish on the junior site. In addition the governors of St Oswald's expressed concern in relation to a four form entry junior school and expressed a preference to become a primary school.
- 3.59 There is no suggestion that the existing system does not work well however, there are many benefits for a child of attending a through primary school. These include transition. Transition between Key Stages 1 and 2 is much more easily organised in terms of understanding each child's learning needs, their strengths and areas for development, the resources they use, their confidence and their preferred learning styles.
- 3.60 Systems which support learning such as Assessment, Marking and the organisation of the curriculum can be focussed on supporting each child on their whole journey through primary school rather than just through Key Stage 1 or Key Stage 2.
- 3.61 In a through primary school, staff can be organised to share expertise across both key stages with some skilled teachers moving between key stages to ensure that there is effective continuity and progression for children's learning. Staff get to know families and their children when children start Nursery or reception and can maintain that relationship until children make the move to high school.
- 3.62 Children can be vulnerable in all sorts of ways. Some find changing schools at the end of Year 2 quite worrying. Other children may have additional learning needs, emotional needs or difficulties with behaviour. A through primary will be able to maintain the support and intervention systems from Early Years right through to the end of Year 6. There are also many social benefits which stem from older and younger children learning and working together
- 3.63 **Concern:** the proposal does not include sufficient nursery and provision of wrap around care or would have a detrimental effect on existing wrap around care.
- 3.64 **Response:** Nursery provision is not proposed at St Oswald's. The role of the Local Authority is to ensure sufficiency of nursery provision, At this point there is sufficient capacity locally and therefore we are not proposing to create additional nursery provision. There are a number of settings in the Guiseley area, including school nurseries, private nurseries, and also some childminders who are

approved to deliver Free Early Education places. At this point the data shows us that the settings are meeting the demand for places, with some places available at settings. The need for further wrap around will continue to be monitored.

- 3.65 **Concern:** that the creation of two primary schools will create unhealthy competition as religious schools enjoy more prestige and funding and St Oswald's will be seen as the better school by some.
- 3.66 **Response:** the creation of two primary schools offers choice to parents and the schools have both indicated that they would continue to work together, alongside the other local schools.
- 3.67 **Concern:** that when parents applied for places in Guiseley Infants, they expected their children to transfer to St Oswald's and this change is a 'breach of contract'.
- 3.68 **Response:** it is possible at any time to make changes to schools, in accordance with the statutory process. Whilst parents will have anticipated that their children would transfer to St Oswald's when they left the infant school, this proposal will still offer the potential to transfer to St Oswald's alongside an alternative option to remain in Guiseley Infant as it becomes a primary school.
- 3.69 **Next steps:** It is clear from the interest in both the consultation on expansion at Tranmere Park and this more recent consultation on Guiseley Infant and St Oswalds Junior schools that there is no strongly favoured proposal for more places that can be achieved in the time required. There have been calls for a new school to be built but no land currently available on which to do that. It is therefore proposed that an Outcomes Based Accountability session be held early in the autumn term to include local partners from the schools, elected members and representatives from the community to consider all of the issues. The delay in progressing with a permanent solution will necessitate a temporary solution being identified to ensure that there are sufficient school places in September 2014 and 2015 until a permanent solution can be agreed and put in place.

Part C: Permission to consult on Expansion of Broomfield South SILC and West Oaks SEN Specialist School and College

- 3.70 Leeds has experienced a significant rise in demand for places in specialist educational provision in recent years. The number of children and young people accessing special educational provision places purchased by the Local Authority rose from 1030 at 2009, to 1224 in January 2013.
- 3.71 The vast majority of these children and young people access places purchased from Leeds' 5 area-based Special Inclusive Learning Centres (SILCs,) which offer 'generic' provision to meet a range of special educational needs to children and young people in the locality. SILCs also work closely with partners in mainstream education provision to form 'Partnership' and 'Resource' schools which provide access mainstream school buildings resourced with specialist teaching and support provided by the SILC). This supports Leeds approach of providing all children and young people with special educational needs appropriate support to meet their individual needs, in their local area and where possible with their peers.

- 3.72 The significant rise in demand for places in Leeds SILCs results in part from the rapidly rising birth rate in Leeds: the live birth rate rose by approximately 37% between 2000/01 and 2011/12. The most significant increases in population are observed in specific areas of the city: the South and the centre of the city have a notably greater concentration of children under the age of five, than other areas.
- 3.73 It results also from increasing early identification of SEN; increasing survival rates amongst babies born prematurely and with health and development issues as a result; and increasing numbers of children transferring from mainstream education into specialist provision. There have also been notable rises in numbers of children and young people identified with specific conditions, for example autism spectrum conditions.
- 3.74 This has placed significant pressure on existing capacity in Leeds SILCs and it has become increasingly necessary to purchase places in other Local Authorities due to lack of capacity in Leeds provisions. Number of places bought in other Authorities has risen from 42 in 2009, to 79 in 2013. This has significant cost implications for the Local Authority and requires travel arrangements which are both costly and not in the best interests of families.
- 3.75 The birth rate is projected to continue rising in Leeds and accordingly so is demand for school places of all kinds; the factors described above suggest that this will be particularly the case for special educational provision. Projections submitted by the Local Authority as required by National government ('SCAP projections') in 2013 indicate that need for places in SILCs for children and young people with SEN in Leeds will rise from 1147 in 2012, to 1629 in 2016.
- 3.76 In April 2013, a bid was submitted for funding under the Department of Education's Targeted Basic Need programme to support two proposed expansions to established Special Inclusive Learning Centres in Leeds. On 1 August we received notification that the bid had been successful and confirmation of the funding contribution.
- 3.77 **Expansion of the South SILC from 200 to 250 places** using a site adjacent to the school, Broom Court. This expansion is proposed to address the projected shortfall of places in this area of the City, where the population of young children is significantly higher than other areas. In 2012, The South SILC was rated as "good" by Ofsted, who noted in their report that 'the leadership of the Principal is inspirational'. Ofsted also noted the SILC 'admits pupils with a wide range of needs, including severe learning difficulties and Autistic Spectrum Conditions'. Therefore this SILC is in a strong position to provide for both the range of needs and the specialist knowledge Leeds requires in the South of the City. The South SILC is already full for September 2013; a recent audit of all SILCs has found none with potential establishments nearby with the capacity to increase their roll. The proposed expansion has full support from the school's Governing Body.
- 3.78 **Expansion of West Oaks SEN Specialist School and College from 200 to 350 places using land at the former Blenheim Centre for children aged 2 to 16.** This site is ideally located to meet the demand projected to increase in the centre of the city. This will also provide a central location which can be relatively easily accessed from any area of the city, and can thus provide places for children and

young people from across Leeds. Ofsted inspections since 2000 have found the SILC to be at least 'good' and in 2012 it was deemed 'outstanding' in all 4 categories. The SILC also has established considerable expertise in meeting the rising demand for places for children with autism spectrum conditions. The governing body fully supports the proposed expansion.

Part D: Outcome of the Targeted Basic Need bid

- 3.79 The government announced a two year capital allocation for Basic Need on 1 March 2013 and at the same time launched the Targeted Basic Need bid. Local Authorities that had been experiencing increasing birth rates, and had a requirement to provide additional school places were encouraged to bid. The deadline for submission of bids was 30 April and the requirements for inclusion in the bid were that additional places would be delivered no later than September 2015, and must either be a new academy or the expansion of a good or outstanding school.
- 3.80 A total of 11 proposals were submitted by Leeds which included six primary school expansions, which were already subject to public consultation, two expansions of secondary academies, one proposed new secondary academy and two expansions of Specialist Inclusive Learning Centres. On 18 July we received confirmation that seven of the bids had been successful, which included five of the primary expansions and both of the SILC expansions. On 1 August we were further notified of the actual capital funding that was to be made available.
- 3.81 The five primary expansions were Asquith Primary, Rufford Park Primary, East Ardsley Primary, Little London Primary and Allerton Bywater Primary. All of these schemes were already subject to public consultation at the time of submitting the bid and as such capital funding had already been identified for the schemes. Although estimated scheme costs were submitted as part of the bid the allocation made to Local Authorities was on a flat rate per place. For the five primary schemes this totalled £8.344m of capital funding.
- 3.82 The two SILC expansions are the subject of part C of this paper requesting permission to consult. The proposal is to create an additional 200 places in SILC provision. The allocation of capital funding has been calculated on a per place basis resulting in a total allocation of £5.5m to cover the cost of both schemes. Initial estimates of scheme costs indicate a shortfall in the region of £10m which would have to be met from existing resources. During the consultation on the expansion further work will be undertaken on the schemes to achieve value for money which will be reported back with the outcome of consultation.

4 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

- 4.1.1 The consultations in relation to Part A and B have been managed in accordance with all relevant legislation and local practice. The proposals were advertised widely. The statutory notices described in Part A of the report were published in

the newspaper, notices placed on the school gates as well as being advertised in the community. Information was also placed on the Leeds City Council website. Ward members in all wards city wide were formally consulted at the public consultation stage, both individually, and through area committees where appropriate to ensure awareness of all proposals city wide and improved understanding of the impact of proposals in neighbouring areas.

- 4.1.2 Further consultation and engagement will take place with stakeholders about a solution in the Guiseley area before progressing any proposal.
- 4.1.3 Consultation in relation to Part C would be carried out in line with good practice and in accordance with good practice. Local communities at the proposed sites for expansion are also key stakeholders to engage in consultation. Consultation activity recently undertaken by the Complex Needs Service indicates a strong feeling amongst education practitioners, parents, and voluntary organisations that additional capacity in Leeds schools is vital to meet the needs of children and young people with SEN
- 4.1.4 Consultation on the five successful primary school bids has already taken place and the two SILC expansions are subject to public consultation as referenced in Part C.

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

- 4.2.5 Screening forms for the five proposals for expansion and the proposal to lower an age range in 2014 (part A of the report) have previously been completed and published as part of a report to the Executive Board in February 2013, therefore, they are not attached to this report.
- 4.2.1 The screening form for the Pudsey Primrose Hill proposal and Guiseley Infant and Nursery School and St Oswald's C of E Junior School have been completed and was submitted as part of the report to May 2013 Executive Board. They are therefore not attached to this report.
- 4.2.2 The screening form in relation to the expansions of Broomfield South SILC and West Oaks SEN Specialist School and College is attached as an Appendix.

4.3 Council policies and City Priorities

- 4.3.1 The proposals are being brought forward to meet the Council's statutory duty to ensure there are sufficient school places. Providing places close to where children live allows improved accessibility to local and desirable school places, and thus reduces the risk of non-attendance

4.4 Resources and value for money

Part A

- 4.4.2 The high level estimated cost of delivery of the proposals is £5.7m which will be funded through the education capital programme. Section 106 funding has also been secured in respect of housing developments in the vicinity of several of the proposed schools. This will contribute to the overall funding of these projects.

- 4.4.1 The proposal in respect of Hollybush Primary School has no capital resource implications, provision is delivered from existing accommodation on the school site within the Children's Centre.

Part B

- 4.4.2 The estimated cost of delivery of the proposals to expand Pudsey Primrose Hill Primary School is £1.6 m.

Part C

- 4.4.3 The proposed expansions will receive funding of £5.5m through the successful Targeted Basic Need Bid. High level estimates indicate the schemes may require additional capital funding of £10m.

Part D

- 4.4.4 The Targeted Basic Need Bid has secured an additional £13.844m of capital funding for the provision of additional school places. The five primary schemes already had funding allocated and £8.344m will offset these. The two SILC proposals will received £5.5m towards expansions that had not previously been brought forward.

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

- 4.5.5 The changes described constitute prescribed changes under the Education and Inspections Act 2006. The consultations have been, and will be, managed in accordance with that legislation and with local practice.

- 4.5.1 This report is subject to call in.

4.6 Risk Management

- 4.6.1 Detailed risk registers have already been started for the projects in relation to parts A and B of this report, and if approved these will be maintained until completion.

- 4.6.2 **Part A:** There is a statutory time limit for a final decision on these proposals of 18 September 2013. The proposal has been brought forward in time to allow places to be delivered for 2014. A decision not to proceed at this stage would mean fresh consultation on new proposals, and would mean places could not be delivered in time. The authority's ability to meet its statutory duty for sufficiency of school places in the short term may also be at risk.

- 4.6.3 **Part B:** It is necessary to progress feasibility design work at risk during the public consultation stage; however the decision to proceed to detailed design stages will be dependent on approval to progress to the latter stages of the statutory process. Therefore any delay to the statutory process will increase the risk of delayed delivery of the building solution or financial risk of abortive design fees being incurred.

5 Conclusions

Part A

- 5.1 The proposals remain strong proposals, which would meet an immediate need for places in those areas, and are widely supported. No representations were received as part of the statutory notice phase. The delivery of the projects will be complex, and will be overseen by experienced project managers. In terms of project delivery the Council is working with the Council's Joint Venture Company partner, NPS Leeds Limited. The on-going need for places will continue to be carefully assessed across the city, and further proposals brought forward as necessary.

Part B

- 5.2 The issues raised during consultation have been considered, and on balance, the proposal for the expansion of Pudsey Primrose Hill Primary School from September 2015 remains strong. It addresses the need for school places in the area.
- 5.3 The proposal has been supported during the public consultation, and although some concerns were raised, these have been addressed in the report, and it is believed that they can be overcome.
- 5.4 The proposals in relation to Guiseley Infant and Nursery School and St Oswald's C of E Junior School were not widely supported and it is proposed that further consultation and engagement be undertaken prior to progressing with any proposal.

Part C

- 5.5 The Local Authority has been successful in bidding for funding to expand two of the Special Inclusive Learning centres which meet the varied needs of children and young people with SEN in Leeds. The proposed expansions would make a significant contribution to a programme of work currently underway to address an identified major shortfall in places projected to be required by 2015/16. The proposed expansions would offer a high standard of education which has been identified as either 'Good' or 'Outstanding' by Ofsted. The expansions are well located to meet needs in areas of the city where the child population and thus projected demand for places, is significantly higher; but also in the case of the site in the centre of the city, offer a location which is reasonably accessible for families from across all of Leeds.
- 5.6 Parents and education professionals have reported concerns about lack of adequate capacity to meet children's special educational needs locally. The proposed expansions would alleviate these concerns and are likely to be welcomed by families and professionals. The proposed expansions are fully supported by the governors of the SILCs in each case.

Part D

- 5.7 The outcome of Leeds Targeted Basic Need bid to secure additional government funding to deliver school places in Leeds resulted in an allocation of £13.8m

capital funding. This is specific to 7 schemes, including the two referred to in Part C which now require public consultation

6 Recommendations

Part A

Executive Board is asked to:

- Approve the expansion of Allerton Bywater Primary School from a capacity of 210 pupils to 420 pupils with an increase in the admission number from 30 to 60 with effect from September 2014;
- Approve the expansion of Asquith Primary School from a capacity of 210 pupils to 420 pupils with an increase in the admission number from 30 to 60 with effect from September 2014;
- Approve the expansion of Morley St Francis Catholic Primary School from a capacity of 154 pupils to 210 pupils with an increase in the admission number from 22 to 30 with effect from September 2014;
- Approve the expansion of East Ardsley 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;
- Approve the expansion of Robin Hood 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;
- Approval to lower the age range of Hollybush Primary School from 5 to 11 to 3 to 11.

Part B

Executive Board is asked to:

- Approve the publication of a statutory notice to expand Pudsey Primrose Hill from a capacity of 315 pupils to 420 pupils with an increase in the admission number from 45 to 60 with effect from September 2015.
- Note the further work to be undertaken in the Guiseley area.

Part C:

Executive Board is asked to:

- Give permission to consult on the expansion of Broomfield South SILC from a capacity of 200 to 250 pupils with effect from September 2015 using a site adjacent to the school, Broom Court (Broom Place, Leeds, LS10 3JP)
- Give permission to consult on the expansion of West Oaks SEN Specialist School and College from a capacity of 130 to 280 pupils by the creation of a satellite site for

150 children and young people aged 2 to 16 on the former Blenheim Centre (Crowther Place, Leeds, West Yorkshire)with effect from September 2015;

Part D:

Executive Board is asked to:

- Note the allocation of capital funding through the Targeted Basic Need bid.

7 Background documents¹

7.1 There are no background papers to this report.

¹ 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.