

Report of Director of Children's Services

Report to Executive Board

Date: 25 June 2014

Subject: Outcomes of proposals to increase primary school and Special Education places in Leeds



Are specific electoral Wards affected?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):		
Part A: Guiseley & Rawdon		
Part B: Calverley & Farsley		
Part C: Horsforth		
Part D: Roundhay		
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:		
Appendix number:		

Summary of main issues

This report contains details of proposals brought forward to meet the local authority's duty to ensure sufficiency of school places. Following recent legislative changes some changes have been made to the consultation process and these are highlighted in the report.

Part A Guiseley

A range of proposals have been considered under old legislation for changes to school organisation that would increase capacity in this area. This legislation prescribed how and when consultation should be conducted. Due to the level of difficulty each of the proposals had met it a stakeholder engagement event using Outcomes Based Accountability methodology was held in October 2013, which identified a new route forward. At this time changes were being introduced to the legislation governing school organisation changes, and the proposal was paused while the new regulations were clarified. The new regulations retained the requirement for consultation, but removed the prescription about how and when, and in February Executive Board approved a new approach to consultation that would use the stakeholder engagement events to generate ideas, and subsequent public consultation through a combination of on line forums, written consultation documents and feedback forms, and drop in sessions for

the public to ask questions, all of which would inform the final recommendation for a route forward. This would be followed by a statutory notice where applicable under the new regulations. This approach ensured engagement with the wider learning community over the issues and potential solutions, and following the endorsement of this approach the details of the October event were shared and consulted and the preferred option emerged as follows:

- retain Guiseley Infant School as a 3 forms of entry Infant school, that has an admission number of 90 into reception each year;
- develop a through school with junior capacity on the site of Guiseley High School, with an admission limit of 90 into year 3; and
- convert St Oswald's Junior School to a 2 forms of entry primary school, with an admission number of 60 into reception class each year.

Consultation on this preferred option ran between 17 March and 11 April. Part A of this report summarises the comments made during this consultation and makes recommendations on the next steps.

Part B Expansion proposals for Farsley Westroyd Infant School and Farsley Springbank Junior School

Following consultation completed under the old regulations, at its meeting in February the Executive Board gave permission to publish a statutory notice on a proposal to increase primary school places in Farsley by converting Farsley Westroyd Infant School and Farsley Springbank Junior School into two primary schools.

The proposals were developed to meet demand from children already living in the Farsley area. By creating a new admission point at Springbank they would also increase the number of Farsley households who gained priority for a Farley School. More demographic data was supplied in the consultation documents. The extra places would be created by increasing the capacity at Farsley Westroyd Infant School from 180 pupils to 210 pupils and raising the upper age limit from 7 to 11, and increasing the capacity at Farsley Springbank Junior School from 240 to 420 and lowering the age limit from 7 to 4, all with effect from September 2015.

The notice in relation to both schools was published on Wednesday 26 March and expired on Wednesday 7 May. A final decision must be made within 2 months of the expiry of the notice, therefore by 7 July 2014. SOAB met on 9 June to consider the representations, and minutes of their meeting are in appendix 1.

Part B of this report details the representations received in response to this notice and seeks a final decision from Executive Board on the proposals.

Part C Expansion proposal for Broadgate Primary School, Horsforth

In March 2014 the Executive Board gave permission to publish a statutory notice to expand Broadgate 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 2015. This followed consultation under the old regulations. The proposal was designed to meet rising demand from children already living in the area, and also from new housing in the area. More demographic data is in the consultation document.

The notice was published on Wednesday 9 April and expired on Wednesday 7 May. A final decision must be made within 2 months of the expiry of the notice, therefore by 7 July 2014. SOAB met on 9 June to consider the representations, and minutes of their meeting are in appendix 1.

Part C of this report details the representations received in response to this notice and seeks a final decision from Executive Board on the proposals.

Part D Specialist provision at Moor Allerton Hall Primary School

In December 2013 the Executive Board gave permission to publish a statutory notice to open a specialist provision at Moor Allerton Hall Primary School for pupils who are deaf and hearing impaired from September 2014. This followed consultation under the old regulations.

The notice was published on Wednesday 26 March and expired on Wednesday 7 May. A final decision must be made within 2 months of the expiry of the notice, therefore by 7 July 2014. There were no responses to the notice, and therefore SOAB did not consider this proposal.

Part D of this report seeks a final decision from Executive Board on the proposal.

Recommendations

Part A Guiseley

Executive Board is asked to:

- acknowledge the outcome of the consultation that took place in Guiseley between 17 March and 11 April ;
- acknowledge that the governing bodies of St Oswald Church of England Junior School and Guiseley Infant School are to pursue the publication of statutory notices to convert both schools to 2 forms of entry primary schools, each with an admission number of 60 into reception class each year, with effect from September 2015
- Note that further capital spend on the feasibility works for this project will be committed to develop an outline scheme.

Part B Expansion proposals for Farsley Westroyd Infant School and Farsley Springbank Junior School

Executive Board is asked to:

- Approve changes to Farsley Westroyd Infant School, increasing its capacity from 180 pupils to 210 pupils and raising the upper age limit from 7 to 11, therefore creating a primary school, with effect from September 2015.

- Approve changes to Farsley Springbank Junior School, increasing its capacity from 240 to 420 and lowering the age limit from 7 to 4, therefore creating a primary school, with effect from September 2015.

Part C Expansion proposal for Broadgate Primary School, Horsforth

Executive Board is asked to:

Approve the expansion of Broadgate 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 2015.

Part D Specialist provision at Moor Allerton Hall Primary School

Executive Board is asked to:

Approve the proposal to open a specialist provision at Moor Allerton Hall Primary School for pupils who are deaf and hearing impaired from September 2014.

Note the responsible officer for implementation is the Capacity Planning and Sufficiency Lead.

1 **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 the consultation in Guiseley and advises Executive Board of the intention of the governing bodies of Guiseley Infant School and St Oswald's C of E Junior School to publish statutory notices for changes to their schools to each become two form entry primary schools. A final decision on these proposals will be sought in September. Part B describes the outcome of a statutory notice in relation to the expansion of primary provision in Farsley for September 2015, and seeks a final decision on these proposals. Part C describes the outcome of a statutory notice in relation to the expansion of Broadgate Primary School for September 2015, and seeks a final decision on this proposal. Part D describes the outcome of a statutory notice in relation to the expansion of specialist primary provision at Moor Allerton Hall for September 2015, and seeks a final decision on this proposal.

2 **Background information**

2.2 **Part A Guiseley – Outcome of proposals to expand primary school places across the Guiseley area**

2.2.1 Rising demographics and housing across Guiseley and surrounding areas has resulted in pressure for primary school places at all the schools in the area for several years. Proposals in 2012 and 2013 across this area have not progressed following public consultations and the demand for school places has increased. A stakeholder consultation event was convened to evaluate the various pieces of feedback involving all the local schools, parent groups, elected members, early years providers and officers. This event identified a new option of a through school. It also raised concerns that proposals should add structural change now to meet potential demand from new housing planned for the area. It also suggested the previous proposals be reconsidered. Following the endorsement of the new approach to consultation a new combination of proposals was brought forward which met the preferences of individual schools, retained an infant school option, and allowed 60 places to be added to meet long term potential demand. These proposals were:

- To retain the infant school with no changes
- To convert the Junior school to a primary school by changing its lower age limit from 7 to 4 and expanding it from 360 to 420 places
- To convert the High School to a through school offering junior provision, by changing the lower age limit of the school from 11 to 7 with an admission limit of 60 in year 3

2.2.2 The consultation was conducted from 17 March 2014 to 11 April 2014 in line with new legislation. Ward members were consulted prior to and during the formal consultation period. Several drop-in sessions were held and information was distributed through the school, Early Years providers, and playgroups. Leaflets were delivered to local residents living in the area surrounding the three schools. An online forum/blog was setup for the public to make comments about the proposal. Information was also posted on Leeds City Council's website. 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 or requested from the Capacity Planning and Sufficiency Team at educ.school.organisation@leeds.gov.uk

2.3 **Part B Expansion proposals for Farsley Westroyd Infant School and Farsley Springbank Junior School**

2.3.1 In February the Executive Board gave permission to publish a statutory notice to increase the capacity at Farsley Westroyd Infant School from 180 pupils to 210 pupils and raise the upper age limit from 7 to 11, and increase the capacity at Farsley Springbank Junior School from 240 to 420 and lower the age limit from 7 to 4. All with effect from September 2015.

2.4 **Part C Expansion proposal for Broadgate Primary School, Horsforth**

2.4.1 In March the Executive Board gave permission to publish a statutory notice to expand Broadgate Primary School, Horsforth from a capacity of 210 to 420 pupils from September 2015.

2.5 **Part D Specialist provision at Moor Allerton Hall Primary School**

2.5.2 In December 2013 the Executive Board gave permission to publish a statutory notice to open a specialist provision at Moor Allerton Hall Primary School for pupils who are deaf and hearing impaired from September 2014.

2.6 The proposals detailed in this report were brought forward as part of a range of measures to ensure the authority meets its statutory duty to ensure sufficiency of school places.

3 **Main issues**

3.1 **Part A Expansion proposals in the Guiseley area**

3.1.3 During the consultation phase, 96 written responses were received, 3 in favour and 93 against. The governing bodies of Guiseley High and St Oswalds C of E Junior Schools are in favour of the proposal. A counter proposal was received from the governing body of Guiseley Infants School, proposing to convert the Infant and Junior schools into 2 two form entry primary schools. The proposals were brought forward under The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013.

3.1.4 **Concern:** Lack of evidence that the additional places are actually needed, overprovision will be providing places for children outside of Guiseley, specifically Yeadon.

Response: Births and under 5s demographic data shows that there are more children living across the Guiseley/Yeadon/Rawdon planning area than there are available school places. In addition to this the housing currently being built and planned will only add to the shortage of places. A lot of this housing is based around the Guiseley area and the demographic data analysed at this level, shows that no action will mean children travelling out of area to obtain a school place. Demand for the schools in Guiseley is strong, and we aim to balance local provision and meeting parental preference.

3.1.5 **Concern:** Building too many additional school places will encourage more housing developments in an already over saturated area

Response: The data we use when planning school places is taken from national health records (hospital and GP's). The data suggests that 30 extra places would meet the short term needs of children living in the area now, and also to allow for any housing developments that are under construction. As well as the normal uncertainty about how cohorts will change in size between birth and school entry, the changing demography of the area as new houses are occupied does present some uncertainty, and it is difficult to be sure that this would be sufficient in the medium or longer term, and the proposals being consulted on added 60 places in response to previous feedback that we should plan in structural change now for the longer term picture. Clearly this does carry some element of risk.

3.1.6 **Concern:** Guiseley road infrastructure is unable to cope with increased congestion of providing more school places. In particular around Bradford Road where parking is already an issue as is the speed of traffic.

Response: It is accepted that access and parking along Bradford Road, adjacent to the High school site, is an important issue within this proposal, and consequently the resolution of existing issues is a priority for the design team. The technical solution to address these issues outside the school site would be developed in parallel with the design of the school building so each complements the other. Children's Services have been working closely with colleagues across Highways to ensure that all potential solutions are developed in partnership and are value for money, as well as specific to the circumstances of the site.

A number of drop-in sessions have taken place during the consultation period, where colleagues from the Built Environment and Highways Services were in attendance to answer these specific questions.

A transport statement and school travel plan would be prepared to support the planning application, which will include investigating the existing conditions and the likely impact of the proposed extensions at Guiseley High and St Oswald's Junior.

3.1.7 **Concern:** All the ideas put forward at the stakeholder event (OBA) were not captured and the through school option can't be recollected by some OBA representatives.

Response: The OBA or stakeholder event held in the autumn term had 3 representatives from each school. These included the headteacher, chair of governors and a parent rep. In addition, ward members, MP's, colleagues from different services within the council were also in attendance. All the comments from every table during this event were captured by a facilitator and this highlighted several common themes. Following this event, the 4 common themes were put on an online forum/blog, to allow people to make comment and give a view on their preferred option. The main themes were based on several tables suggesting these options, but it is acknowledged that some of these themes may not have been put forward by every table. A summary of everything that was captured during the event can be requested by emailing educ.school.organisation@leeds.gov.uk

3.1.8 **Concern:** Follow up communication after the stakeholder event was poor as was communication around the whole consultation

Response: The stakeholder event took place in the autumn of 2013. Around this time the DfE were consulting on changes to school organisation. Because of this there was a gap between the event and next stage of consultation, whilst these changes were implemented into new legislation, which came into force on January 28th. The changes in legislation meant that the local authority changed its own practices around consultation, and these were subject to a report to Executive Board in February. The revised process of an OBA style stakeholder consultation event followed by the initial online consultation during March was part of the new way of consultation, which then led to the identification of a preferred option and the consultation which is the subject of this report. It is acknowledged that there was a communication gap between the September event and the March on line consultation, and that a narrative about why there were delays moving forward would have helped.

Communication about the consultation was done through all the schools with letters for parents. The local Early Years providers including children's centre were provided with documentation and posters were put up around the three schools. All attendees of the stakeholder event were informed and this was advertised through the online forum/blog and website. It was acknowledged at the various drop-in sessions that communication of these events could have been better, in particular with local residents. We are now looking at ways to improve communication with local residents, and have purchased some large reusable banners which can be displayed in public places to advertise the consultations.

3.1.9 **Concern:** Creating a through school at Guiseley would result in a loss of green space and community land.

Response: The area of the high school site that has been identified as having potential to build on is school land that is not currently used by school due to this being overgrown and waterlogged. It is however acknowledged that this land is currently used by the community. The plan for this area would be to build a junior block but also create a MUGA (multi use games area).

3.1.10 **Concern:** Lack of information about secondary planning. Consultation document mentions an increase but no supporting data at the meetings.

Response: Although the immediate pressure for school places is at primary phase, clearly this will go on to affect secondary in the future and it would therefore be prudent to also look at secondary provision in this area at the same time. This allows consideration of the value for money, design implications, and disruption to the school of delivering expansion of different phases of education at separate times, as well as the work to address existing building condition issues. Currently there are places available at the High school, however projections indicate that there could be a shortage of places at this school by 2017. These projections reflect a continuation of up to a third of all students coming from Bradford. Whilst the school wishes to continue to serve the Menston area, there are also significant numbers coming from the Shipley and Baildon areas. Demand from these areas is affected by changes to the schools in Bradford. The additional 2 forms of entry of primary capacity would not arrive at high school until 2020, although new housing means that demand for places may start to increase ahead

of this. There remains a high degree of uncertainty about the longer term need for additional secondary places, and this could be delivered later.

- 3.1.11 **Concern:** The local authority should look at other options in this area, for example expanding Tranmere Park Primary School or re-visit the proposal to expand the Infant and Junior schools and leave the High school alone.

Response: We have previously consulted on both the proposals mentioned and on both occasions a number of concerns were raised. This proposal was developed in response to the feedback received in those consultations, and allowed the infant and junior schools their preferred option, as well as delivering a new junior phase of education at the proposed through school. Since these proposals were originally consulted on the Infant school has considered further the implications of what was then their preferred option of enlarged infant and junior schools, and has revised its view. Since the proposals were originally made the Infant School has changed from a community school to a foundation school, as part of the Aireborough Trust. The change of legislation that took place around the same time now means that both the Infant and Junior schools are now the only bodies who can propose the changes required to convert to primary schools.

- 3.1.12 **Concern:** The walk from Guiseley Infants to the High is too long a journey for young children and the roads are very busy and not safe.

Response: The distance between the current Infant and Junior schools is considerably less than the distance between the Infant and proposed through school, which would on impact journey times. Schools could give consideration to their start and finish times to help address this. If the proposals progressed the Highways team would complete detailed road/traffic surveys to determine what measures need to be put in place to manage the journey and ensure safety.

- 3.1.13 **Concern:** It would be better to create a through school from reception class at the high school and leave the infant and junior schools as they are.

Response: This current set of proposals has been derived from previous consultation feedback, and from the stakeholder meeting held in the autumn of 2013. It is a combination of a number of options that were put forward and are shown in the booklet and on the forum pages headed 'main themes', and meets a number of the key concerns raised, but a through school from Reception would be another option.

- 3.1.14 **Concern:** Building a new school and leaving the other schools alone would be a better solution

Response: To build a new school, the Council would need to first identify a suitable site and then seek an academy sponsor to run the school. This is because the local authority is no longer able to open a new school under current legislation. This doesn't mean that a new school is never considered when planning school places, but finding a big enough site in the right area is always difficult, and if it is not in council ownership carries acquisition costs. In addition there are risks with building a new school as in the first few years as parents have no background or standards information to base their decision on, and it is sometimes better to build upon the excellent standards and management of existing schools. However in this instance

no land other than that at the high school has been identified which could accommodate a new primary school.

- 3.1.15 **Concern:** 60 additional places is too much for Guiseley, why have the Yeadon schools not been considered as part of a joint expansion.

Response: The 60 places proposed are based upon past trends of demand for school places across the area, plus demographic data taken from the national health database, which shows the 0-5 year olds currently living within the area. In addition to this, it recognises the potential demand from housing developments. For a few years now, a number of schools in Guiseley have had to take extra children in reception class due to the shortage and this is happening again in September 2014. Although we there are more children living in Yeadon than there are school places, having recently expanded Rufford Park the schools there would all be extremely difficult to expand any further, and it is the Guiseley area where it is consistently difficult to provide school places for all the children who need one.

- 3.1.16 **Concern:** St Oswalds C of E could set a faith only based admissions policy if they become a primary school

Response: The governing body of St Oswalds C of E have stated throughout this and the previous consultation that they would ensure that the admissions policy aligned very closely with the local authority admissions policy. The governors acknowledge the need for additional school places in the Guiseley area and any proposal involving the expansion of their school would be to help cope with this.

3.2 **Part B Expansion proposals for Farsley Westroyd Infant School and Farsley Springbank Junior School**

- 3.2.1 There were 12 responses to the statutory notice objecting to the expansion of Farsley Westroyd Infant School and Farsley Springbank Junior School. Two in support and ten against. In addition a petition with 155 signatures was received. The objections received were all issues that had been raised during the consultation phase and were addressed in the report to the February meeting of the Executive Board and are also detailed below.
- 3.2.2 The Executive Board is the decision maker for these proposals. When representations are received SOAB is convened to consider the proposals, and they met on 9 June to consider the representations. They recommended that the proposals be approved and minutes of their meeting are in appendix 1.
- 3.2.3 The proposals were brought forward under The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007, and the local authority has until 7 July 2014 to make their final decision on the proposal to expand Farsley Westroyd Infant School and Farsley Springbank Junior school.
- 3.2.4 Both Governing Bodies are in favour of the proposals and have stated this in response to the statutory notice.
- 3.2.5 **Concern:** There are already issues with traffic, parking and congestion, these expansions will only make it worse. There are already many families that travel

from outside of Farsley to get a place in these popular schools which adds to the traffic problems.

Response: The new provision would require new buildings, which in turn require planning permission. Highways and road safety issues would need to be addressed as part of this process, and would need to consider the full impact of the complete project from the outset. Children's Services have commenced engagement with officers within the relevant parts of the Highways department with the aim of ensuring that the impact on the surrounding road and footpath infrastructure is minimised in so far as this is possible. Options being considered at this stage are altered opening times; staggered pick up and drop off times; walking buses, and options for parents to park further away from the school and walk. Child safety is a key priority and the local authority would try to ensure that staff vehicles are parked off the road. It is our policy to encourage children to walk to school. If current play space is required for parking, then it would be re-provided elsewhere.

These proposals, i.e. the establishment of two primary schools rather than linked infant and junior schools, would mean that, in the long term, families would not need to travel to both schools to drop children off at school or to collect children at the end of the school day, therefore reducing the amount of traffic between the two schools. It is acknowledged however that during the transition phase, journeys between the two schools would still be required.

These changes would create 30 extra local school places for local children and establish two admission points (one at each school instead of just at the infant site). Local provision maximises the opportunity to walk to school therefore reducing the need for people using their cars to travel to drop their children off at school from outside of the area.

3.2.6 **Concern:** There would not be enough space at Westroyd for all the children; for outside space, PE, hall space, grassed areas. Older children will not have sufficient space to play and the reception children should not have to cross New Street for lunch.

Response: Westroyd Infant school has two sites, the main infant site and the nursery site across New Street. To convert Westroyd Infant School into a 1FE primary school only one additional classroom is required. The initial design ideas look at this being provided as an extension to the existing nursery building to create a Foundation unit as this presents a clear educational benefit. This would also allow the external space on the nursery site to be developed further. The management team at the school would arrange for the Reception children's school meals to be delivered to the Foundation unit, so they would not have to leave site for their lunch.

It is acknowledged that the main site is not large and there would not be external green space on the school site for on-site PE, as is the case now. However, following some remodelling of the main site there would be indoor and outdoor hard play areas suitable for all primary aged children. Access is already arranged for off-site provision for sports and this has proven very successful. Risk assessments would be carried out in all cases when taking children off site to access external provision.

The management team at Westroyd are fully supportive of this plan and are confident that they would continue to be able to manage the provision of indoor and outdoor activities well with the space available.

3.2.7 Concern: These proposals will make Westroyd an unpopular choice for parents due to lack of space and facilities, therefore making it vulnerable.

Response: The school and its Governing Body are fully supportive of this proposal and are confident that Westroyd would remain a popular option for parents, and the smaller size would be an attraction for some families.

It is recognised that the site is relatively small, however it is of a similar size to other successful 1FE primary schools in Leeds and the overall site and buildings are within the range recommended within national guidance. The school is a key member of the design team and are supportive of a proposed solution that requires only minor extension to the school, with no loss of play space or car parking.

3.2.8 Concern: The consultation process was poorly managed and publicised. Incorrect information was presented, the online response form did not work.

Response: There was widespread publicity regarding these proposals; a leaflet drop was carried out in the streets surrounding the schools, posters and leaflets were placed in various shops, on lampposts and in the library, on Town Street/Old Road. An advertisement was placed in The Squeaker's August publication, a publication delivered to all households in the Farsley/Calverley area. Information was posted on the Leeds City Council website. Leaflets and booklets were passed to all Early Years settings in the local area and posters were placed in Jackaboos play gym at Sunnybank Mills. All Farsley schools were sent e-mails, booklets and posters to pass to the pupils to pass on to their parents/carers.

There was an issue with the online response form in the previous consultation phase, and this was described in the report to Executive Board on the outcome of that consultation. The IT department advised that this was due to a problem involving some versions of Adobe Acrobat resulting in responses not submitting correctly. This technical issue was drawn to the attention of officers at the end of the consultation period, when a respondent raised the issue. All relevant parties were contacted to inform them of this issue and allowed the resubmission of responses for a further week following the original deadline. Steps have been taken to ensure that this issue will not occur again by using the Talking Point facility through the Leeds City Council website. Other methods of response including paper forms and email were not affected.

Social media was used by local residents to share information regarding the proposals and this was not mirrored by a similar social media presence by the Council although officers did post comments on the site created in response to queries raised. Communication methods and lack of social media presence have been considered and measures have been put in place to have a presence for future consultations.

There were opportunities for stakeholders to respond to the consultation. Two public meetings were held during the consultation period, one at each of the schools, along with drop in sessions to allow parents/residents to ask questions of

officers in a more informal setting. Additional meetings were also held during the latter stages of the consultation to present the emerging design options.

All of these comments refer to the earlier consultation phase. During the statutory notice phase all requirements were met.

3.2.9 **Concern:** Alternative options presented by parents at consultation events were not listened to.

Response: All the alternatives out forward were addressed in the previous report to Executive Board outlining the outcomes of the consultation. Several of these, such as considering a new school, were also addressed in the initial consultation materials. No new suggestions were made during the statutory notice period.

The counter proposal of leaving Westroyd as a 2FE infant school and changing Springbank in to a 1FE primary school yet retaining the admission point at Year 3 so that children could still transition at Year 3 from Westroyd addressed many of the issues raised about other options, and some merit. The matter was fully appraised in the previous report, but on balance it was not supported. In summary, from an educational perspective it makes the issues of transition from KS1 to KS2 more complex. The schools would lose the benefits of becoming primary schools, including the opportunity to attract and retain staff and offer greater breadth and depth of professional experience. The concerns about increased traffic would be further exacerbated by the continuing need for parents who have children in both of the schools to make journeys to both each day as well as the additional cohort. Neither school felt this was not an option they could support.

3.2.10 **Concern:** There is a housing development planned at Kirklees Knoll where a new primary school will be built. This will make Westroyd vulnerable.

Response: The proposal is brought forward on the basis of the children who are already living in the area. Should the Kirklees Knoll project go forward this would produce further demand, estimated at half a form of entry across every year group. A S106 agreement has been drawn up with the developer that could allow a new school to be provided on the site, if the development went ahead.

At this point it is not certain that the development will go ahead as planning permission has not yet been granted. There is a need to establish additional educational provision to meet the needs of children already living in the area. Meeting those needs in a timely manner forms an essential part of our drive to become a child friendly city, and meet our obsessions. At this stage, securing the land for a new school is an essential precaution, but this would be subject to full evaluation and consultation. There remains a significant funding gap, not least to acquire the land for the school, and all options will be evaluated if the building proposals are approved. The impact on neighbouring schools and their ability to expand would also be taken into consideration before opening further provision in the area.

3.2.11 **Concern:** Is there actually need for 30 places? The data appears to suggest that only 9 additional places are required. How would school places be managed if the birth rate reduces?

Response: The birth and cohort data suggests that a further form of entry (30 places) is required in the area. See appendix 2 for a data table showing the number of births in the Farsley Planning area from 2012 to 2016. It shows that the birth rate is rising and there will be no spare capacity in the area from 2015. The demographic pressure is in the Farsley area and additional places would provide a place in a Farsley school for Farsley children. Many children for whom Valley View is their nearest school do actually live in Farsley.

There has been a sustained rise in the birth rate across Leeds and this is mirrored in Farsley. The Local Authority has a statutory duty to provide school places for all children living in Leeds and must ensure therefore that sufficient places are available for those who have been born. If the birth rate declines in the future then officers could work with local schools to determine how a reduction in size of the schools could best be managed, and this would also be subject to consultation.

- 3.2.12 **Concern:** Transition arrangements have been badly thought through and will have a negative impact on the children's education. There is not sufficient space at Westroyd to accommodate all the children should all families opt for their children to stay at Westroyd for the whole of their primary education. Going from a 1FE primary school to a 6FE secondary school will have a negative impact on the children.

Response: The transition arrangements would allow for 60 year 3 places at Springbank for three years to enable those who wished to transfer to Springbank as they had intended on entering Westroyd to do so. All children on roll at Westroyd would automatically be entitled to stay on and complete their primary education there. This would allow for maximum parental choice. It is acknowledged that there would not be sufficient accommodation on site and therefore alternative accommodation would have to be found should this be the case. Experience with the conversion of infant to primary school in Horsforth in 2012 was that more families chose for their children to transition to what had been the junior school as they originally intended, rather than stay at the infant school.

As a part of the statutory notice transition arrangements that would apply for the schools were described, and this overwrites the admissions policy for its duration. The proposed transition arrangements allow sibling priorities to be applied to both older and younger siblings. No admissions arrangements can ever provide an absolute guarantee of places, but these would ensure in practical terms that the children attending Westroyd would have priority for the Springbank places, should they wish to transition to Springbank. Full details of the commitments are outlined in appendix 3.

Transition from a 1FE primary school to a 6 FE high school is common. Transition to high school is a key priority for all primary and secondary schools and the schools would work together to ensure transition was well managed. The Learning Improvement Team at Leeds City Council would also provide support, guidance and assistance during this time.

- 3.2.13 **Concern:** The majority of respondents who are parents objected to the proposal but it still got to the statutory notice stage. Also, the numbers do not add up with regard to the respondents.

Response: All concerns, comments and views received during the consultation were collated and included in a report to the Executive Board in February 2014. The Board considered the paper and approved the recommendations that expanding and Farsley Westroyd Infant School from a capacity of 180 pupils to 210 pupils and raising the upper age limit from 7 to 11 and expanding Farsley Springbank Junior School from a capacity of 240 pupils to 420 pupils and changing the lower age limit from 7 to 4 are still considered to provide the most appropriate solutions for the area and on that basis gave permission to publish a statutory notice.

During the consultation period 75 responses were received, 65% of the respondents agreed with the proposals and 35% of the respondents disagreed. Out of the 38 parents, carers and residents that responded 14 agreed with the proposals and 24 objected.

Whilst strength of feeling is taken into account, decisions are not made solely on the basis of a vote or numbers of representations; they are made on the basis of the concerns raised and whether they can be addressed. One comment which raises a serious barrier will be as important as any number of comments on another equally valid concern.

3.2.14 **Concern:** Will play equipment be removed from Westroyd reception playground.

Response: The outdoor play space would be remodelled to accommodate the number of children and be suitable for their age group. This may mean moving play equipment from one area to another.

3.2.15 **Concern:** You stated that as primary schools, staff would have better job opportunities than if they stayed as infant and junior school. If the staff do not have good job opportunities now, then that is a failing of the local authority and the schools themselves.

Response: The response provided was in the context that teaching/working in a primary school offers the opportunity to teach across the age ranges whether foundation, Key Stage 1 or Key Stage 2. It provides the opportunity to work across a broader curriculum with children across the age ranges. The numbers of infant and junior schools are relatively low, and so opportunities within those settings are restricted. When staff are applying for promotion posts a wider range of opportunities exist by including primary schools, but experience of teaching across the primary age range may be beneficial or even essential.

3.2.16 **Concern:** If the proposals are approved, there will be disruption during the building work.

Response: Wherever possible work would be carried out in school holidays but some work may have to be carried out during term time. The local authority have extensive experience of managing building projects on school sites in a safe manner and risk assessments would be carried out as standard practice.

3.2.17 **Concern:** A member of the Capacity Planning Team was a Governor at Westroyd during this consultation. Is this not a conflict of interest?

Response: Many council officers are school governors. The member of staff concerned is a parent governor at Westroyd Infant School and he has acted professionally throughout this process. Along with other officers in the team he supported the preparation of consultation materials but he did not attend any of the public meetings or drop in sessions as would normally be expected of officers nor did he attend the Westroyd governing body meeting during the consultation stage. There was no conflict of interest.

- 3.2.18 **Concern:** An e-petition was received by the Local Authority asking for the consultation to be revisited as it had not been conducted fairly, alternative options had not been considered and the proposals were unrealistic

Response: Whilst the petition asks that consultation is revisited, the statutory notice period during which it was received was a period which specifically sought the views of parents, residents and other stakeholders on the proposal. The views expressed during this phase have been addressed in the preceding paragraphs of this report, and include all of these issues.

3.3 **Part C Outcome of statutory notice on a proposal to expand Broadgate Primary School**

- 3.3.1 The notice in relation to the expansion of Broadgate Primary School was published on Wednesday 9 April 2014. The notice expired on Wednesday 7 May 2014 and a final decision must be made within 2 months of the expiry of the notices, i.e. by 7 July 2014.
- 3.3.2 There were 3 official responses to the statutory notice objecting to the expansion of Broadgate Primary School. The Executive Board is the decision maker for this proposal. When representations are received SOAB is convened to consider the proposals, they met on 9 June and recommended that the proposals be approved. The minutes of that meeting are in appendix 1.
- 3.3.3 The school governing body remain in favour of the proposal, but have some concerns around access and parking issues along Broadgate Lane. This concern had been raised by residents, parents and local ward members throughout the process. Since that time, Leeds City Council Highways services team have conducted traffic and parking surveys and are working to identify options to address these concerns
- 3.3.4 **Concern:** Illegal and dangerous parking by parents on Broadgate Lane and surrounding streets will only increase with an expansion.

Response: Following work carried out by Leeds City Council Highways services team, which has included parking and traffic surveys on Broadgate Lane and surrounding area, there are a several proposed measures to mitigate these issues which include:

- Raising existing zebra crossings which would remove parking around these areas, create better and safer crossing points and reduce traffic speeds.
- Implement speed cushions at the top and bottom of Broadgate Lane
- Create 'no waiting at any time' points around Broadgate Lane and King Edward Avenue, to alleviate the issue of parents parking across junctions and residents driveways
- Discussion with the schools to consider staggering start and finish times.

3.3.5 **Concern:** Lack of parental drop off or parking areas, would only get worse if the school doubles in size

Response: This is a key issue that Children's Services and Highways Services have been working to address and would continue to. So far a number of options have been considered and are still being worked on, these have included:

- Establishing a drop off area/turning circle for parents within the current school boundary. This would be very difficult and not cost effective and would require parents to drive out of this exit very close to the zebra crossing. A number of mature trees would also need to be felled, which would likely cause objections from planning.
- Utilise land near to St Mary's church to create additional parking. An initial survey of this land has been conducted and there is potential for up to 28 car parking spaces. The development of this land including the creation of an entrance needs to be fully costed, however there are concerns that this would not necessarily solve the problem of parking for Broadgate parents and may not be cost effective.
- Utilise the Brownlee Arms car park near to the top of Broadgate Lane as a park and stride option. The school themselves including the children have campaigned to use this area at least for morning drop off. The manager of the pub has indicated that morning may be difficult due to deliveries, but the Highways and Transport team are continuing to investigate this with the owners of the pub.
- Utilise Morrisons supermarket car park as a park and stride option. This has been agreed by all parties and a pilot park and stride is currently being developed and would be reviewed over a number of weeks to determine take-up and success.

3.4 **Part D SEN / Moor Allerton**

3.4.1 The public consultation in relation to opening a specialist provision at Moor Allerton Hall Primary School for pupils who are deaf and hearing impaired ran from 16 September to 25 October 2013.

3.4.2 There were 16 responses to the consultation. All responses supported the proposal to open the provision at Moor Allerton Hall very clearly. A report to the Executive Board in December 2013 considered the responses received and approved the publication of the statutory notice.

3.4.3 The statutory notice expired on Friday 7 May 2014. There have been no representations received in response to the statutory notice. The governing body have reiterated their support for the proposal.

3.4.4 A final decision must be made within 2 months of the expiry of the notices, i.e. by 7 July 2014, and this report seeks a final decision on the proposals.

4 **Corporate Considerations**

4.5 **Consultation and Engagement**

4.5.1 The consultations in relation to all the proposals detailed above have been managed in accordance with all relevant legislation and local practice. The

proposals were advertised widely. Concerns raised during these consultations regarding lack of publicity have been considered, and we have made changes to our processes to address this for future proposals, including using banners in public spaces advertising the consultations.

4.5.2 The statutory notices described were published in the newspaper (YEP), notices placed on the school gates as well as being advertised in the community. Information was also placed on the Leeds City Council website and Facebook for Farsley and Horsforth.

4.5.3 Ward members in all wards city wide were formally consulted during 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.

4.6 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

4.6.1 The screening forms for the proposals to increase places in Guiseley were previously published when the authority brought forward those proposals. Given the change in circumstances in the area the forms have been revisited, and it was concluded that there are no further implications.

4.6.2 The screening forms for the proposal to increase primary school places in Farsley have previously been published as part of a report to Executive Board in July 2013. They are therefore not attached to this report.

4.6.3 Screening forms for the Broadgate proposal have previously been completed and published as part of a report to the Executive Board in November 2013. Therefore, they are not attached to this report.

4.6.4 The EDCI impact assessment screening tool for the Moor Allerton Hall proposal has been completed and was attached as an Appendix to the original Executive Board report of 4th September 2013. It is therefore not attached to this report.

4.7 Council policies and City Priorities

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

4.7.2 A key objective within the Best Council Plan 2013-2017 is to build a child friendly city. The delivery of pupil places through Basic Need is one of the most baseline entitlements of a Child Friendly City. A good quality school place contributes to the achievement of targets within the Children and Young People's Plan such as our obsession to 'improve behaviour, attendance and achievement'. It is therefore important that when bringing any proposal forward, there is a degree of certainty that any change would not have a negative impact on the teaching and learning. All the schools contained in sections A to D of this report have been rated 'Good' by Ofsted at their most recent inspection.

In addition, "Narrowing the Gap" and "Going up a League" agenda and is fundamental to the Leeds Education Challenge. A key area of monitoring in

primary schools is the key stage 1 to 2 value added scores. The scores relevant to the schools contained in this report are below:

- Broadgate Primary, value added score: 99.8 (middle 20% nationally)
- Farsley Springbank Junior, value added score: 101.0 (top 25% nationally)
- St Oswald's C of E Junior, value added score: 99.9 (middle 20% nationally)

4.7.3 A further objective of the Best Council Plan 2013-2017 is to ensure high quality public services. We want to promote choice and diversity for parents and families and deliver additional school places in the areas where families need them. Meeting this expectation while demonstrating the five values underpinning all we do is key to the basic need programme.

4.8 **Resources and value for money**

4.8.1 The estimated cost of these proposals is £6.26m. Although the proposals for changes to Guiseley Infants to convert to a primary school have previously been consulted on they had not progressed and so design work is still in its infancy. The design work for St Oswald's conversion to a primary school is further progressed as this change continued to be a feature of the revised package of proposals. Following the decision by the governing bodies of St Oswald's C of E and Guiseley Infants Schools, both schemes will need further development. Early design works of £16.9k will be required to ensure sufficient confidence in the deliverability of both schemes during the statutory notice period so that a final decision can be made. The current total budget estimate for both projects at £4.1m, and this will be revised as plans progress. Although the schools would now be the statutory proposer, the projects are intended to meet the local authority's sufficiency duty and the build costs would therefore continue to be met by the authority. Should the proposals be approved planning applications and requests for authority to spend would follow. It is not unusual for all planning details to be unresolved at this stage and the remainder will be dealt with through the planning application.

4.8.2 The current total estimated cost of both projects (Farsley Westroyd and Farsley Springbank) is £3.2m. Each project has progressed through early design stages and detailed design will commence if Executive Board approve the proposals. Planning applications and requests for the Authority to spend would follow for each project at the appropriate time.

4.8.3 The current total estimated cost of the project to expand Broadgate Primary School is approximately £3.7m. This includes a substantial contingency to allow for off-site highway works in response to concerns raised by local residents and elected councillors. We would also seek to apply s106 developer contributions collected from housing development in the area proportionate to the scheme.

4.8.1 The current capital cost of the new specialist provision at Moor Allerton Primary School is £389k. The design work is at an early stage and will be progressed if a final decision is made. There are no costs involved in the closure of the provision at Cottingley.

4.8.2 There would be no additional revenue costs resulting from this proposal. Staffing of the provision is provided by the Sensory Service from its budget regardless of the location, and staffing levels within the service would be unaffected by the proposal.

4.9 **Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In**

4.9.1 The processes that have been and will be followed are in accordance with the Education and Inspections Act 2006 as set out in the School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007, and amended by School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013 .

4.9.2 This report is subject to call in.

4.10 **Risk Management**

4.10.3 There is a statutory time limit for a final decision on each of the proposals detailed above of 7 July 2014. The proposals to increase primary provision in Guiseley, Farsley and Horsforth have been brought forward in time to allow places to be delivered for 2015. 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.

4.10.4 If the proposals for the changes to Moor Allerton hall are not approved the City would risk having no viable primary resourced provision for deaf and hearing impaired children for a prolonged length of time as there would be a significant delay in relocating the provision while new proposals were developed. This would likely have a negative impact on outcomes for some deaf and hearing impaired children who would not receive suitable provision. It would also likely result in more expensive placements being made at greater cost to the local authority.

4.10.5 Parents have statutory rights regarding the placement of children with statements of SEN (to be replaced in September 2014 by Education, Health and Care Plans) and without a successful resourced provision the City Council may find itself compelled to place children in expensive, out of borough provision or supporting individuals in a multiplicity of mainstream placements at great cost and reduced efficacy.

4.10.6 It would be important to keep parents and other stakeholders fully engaged and supportive of the relocation of the specialist provision. Without their consent and support the new provision would not be successful. It is expected that a consultative group would be formed to assist in the development of the provision.

4.10.7 A detailed risk register would be established and would be maintained for each project if approved. 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 would increase the risk of delayed delivery of the building solution or financial risk of abortive design fees being incurred.

5 Conclusions

- 5.1 Our ambition is to be the best city in the country. As a vibrant and successful city we will attract new families to Leeds, and making sure that we have enough school places for the children is one of our top priorities. These proposals have been brought forward to meet that need, and following the appropriate consultation we now seek to move them to the next stage. They would ensure that children in Leeds would have the best possible start to their learning, and so deliver our vision of a child friendly city.
- 5.2 In Guiseley three different sets of proposals have now been brought forward. The first created 15 places at Tranmere Park, and although there remains some appetite for this from the school and parents, a solution has still not been identified to address the traffic and highways issues at that site. Although a very popular school and well placed to meet local demand, there was also a risk that this would not create sufficient places. The proposals to convert both Guiseley Infants and St Oswald's Juniors created 30 extra places, but met with concern about the loss of the infant school option for parents, and was at the time opposed by the governing body of the infant school, although St Oswald's were keen to become a primary school. There were traffic and access issues raised, but there are a range of options to explore which may address these.
- 5.3 In the light of two separate proposals being challenged, the stakeholder consultation reviewed all the issues, and suggested that we should put in structural change now to deal with all of the potential house building in the area. The latest set of proposals consulted on therefore added 60 places, allowed the Junior school their preference, allowed the Infant School to remain and Infant school, and used a new suggestion of a through school. This proposal does carry significant risk of over provision in the short to medium term, which could be damaging in years where there are fewer children, and could potentially damage the councils' ability to harness developer contributions for school provision. The Infant School have since reconsidered their position, and recognised the concerns about 4FE Infant and Junior provision which had been their preferred solution. Working together, the schools have come to a joint conclusion of supporting the previous proposal to convert both schools to primary schools.
- 5.4 During the time that these proposals have been debated, the schools in the area have formed a trust, and the legislation surrounding school organisation changes has also been amended. This means that the local authority can now only propose the expansion of Tranmere Park. Any other proposals must be put forward by the schools themselves as Trust and VA schools. The proposals to convert both the Infant and Junior Schools into 2FE primary schools would seem to offer a sensible route forward, ensuring sufficiency but allowing scope for other proposals in future should further capacity be needed. For this reason it is recommended that the school's proposals for conversion to primary schools be supported, and that the capital costs of the project are borne by the authority to discharge its sufficiency duty.
- 5.5 The proposals to expand Farsley Westroyd and Farsley Springbank Schools remain strong ones. The issues raised during the statutory notice period were very similar to the concerns raised during the public consultation phase. These

concerns were addressed in the Executive Board report for February and have been addressed in this report also.

- 5.6 The additional places are required to ensure the authority meets its legal requirement to ensure sufficiency of primary provision for September 2015. There is evidence of local need for places, and they would offer choice and diversity of provision, and it is therefore recommended that the proposals be approved.
- 5.7 Although three representations were received as part of the statutory notice phase regarding the expansion of Broadgate Primary School, the issues raised in these were consistent with issues raised during the public consultation phase which were reported to Executive Board in March. On balance, the proposal for the expansion of Broadgate Primary Schools from September 2015, remains strong and addresses sufficiency needs in the Horsforth area. An update of options and work carried out to mitigate these issues have been noted and commented upon in the report and are being addressed as part of the detailed stage through the planning process. The delivery of the project would be complex, and would be overseen by experienced project managers. The on-going need for places will continue to be carefully assessed across the city, and further proposals brought forward as necessary.
- 5.8 The School Organisation Advisory Board have met to consider each of the proposals and minutes of their meeting are in appendix 1
- 5.9 There is currently no viable primary resourced provision for deaf and hearing impaired children. It is vital for the outcomes and welfare of this group that a new provision is established. The provision should be a good or outstanding school from which significant numbers of pupils transfer to Allerton Grange High School. Moor Allerton Hall Primary school has been identified as the most suitable school to host the primary provision in the future.

6 Recommendations

Part A Guiseley

Executive Board is asked to:

- acknowledge the outcome of the consultation that took place in Guiseley between 17 March and 11 April ;
- acknowledge that the governing bodies of St Oswald Church of England Junior School and Guiseley Infant School are to pursue the publication of statutory notices to convert both schools to 2 forms of entry primary schools, each with an admission number of 60 into reception class each year, with effect from September 2015
- Note that further capital spend on the feasibility works for this project will be committed to develop an outline scheme.

Part B Expansion proposals for Farsley Westroyd Infant School and Farsley Springbank Junior School

Executive Board is asked to:

- Approve changes to Farsley Westroyd Infant School, increasing its capacity from 180 pupils to 210 pupils and raising the upper age limit from 7 to 11, therefore creating a primary school, with effect from September 2015.
- Approve changes to Farsley Springbank Junior School, increasing its capacity from 240 to 420 and lowering the lower age limit from 7 to 4, therefore creating a primary school, with effect from September 2015.

Part C Expansion proposal for Broadgate Primary School, Horsforth

Executive Board is asked to:

Approve the expansion of Broadgate 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 2015.

Part D Specialist provision at Moor Allerton Hall Primary School

Executive Board is asked to:

Approve the proposal to open a specialist provision at Moor Allerton Hall Primary School for pupils who are deaf and hearing impaired from September 2014.

Note the responsible officer for implementation is the Capacity Planning and Sufficiency Lead.

7 Background documents¹

7.1 None

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.