

DECISION-MAKER:	CABINET
SUBJECT:	PRIMARY SCHOOL REVIEW: PHASE 2 STATUTORY CONSULTATION
DATE OF DECISION:	22 NOVEMBER 2010
REPORT OF:	HEAD OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND CAPITAL SERVICES
AUTHOR:	Name: Kevin Verdon Tel: 023 8091 7593 Email: kevin.verdon@southampton.gov.uk
STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY	
None.	

SUMMARY

This report sets out proposals for statutory consultation on expanding a number of primary schools in the city. It follows on from Phase 1 of the Primary Review, carried out last year, which expanded and restructured a number of primary schools in the city centre.

These proposals are informed by widespread pre-statutory consultation with parents, schools and the wider community and in response to continuing forecast rise in the primary school population, driven mainly by a rise in the number of births.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1 To note the outcome of the pre-statutory consultation as set out in Appendix 1 of this report.
- 2 To make the following statutory proposals for changes to primary education in the city by enlarging the following schools in September 2011.
 - (i) The enlargement by 15 places (0.5FE – forms of entry) per year group of Bassett Green Primary School, with implementation from 1 September 2011, beginning with Year R and continuing incrementally until all 7 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 1.5FE (45 places) to 2FE (60 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 315 to 420 by September 2017.
 - (ii) The enlargement by 30 places (1FE – form of entry) per year group of Glenfield Infant School, with implementation from 1 September 2011, beginning with Year R and continuing incrementally until all 3 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 2FE (60 places) to 3FE (90 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 179 to 270 by September 2013.

- (iii) The enlargement by 10 places (0.33FE – forms of entry) per year group of Highfield CE Primary School, with implementation from 1 September 2011, beginning with Year R and continuing incrementally until all 7 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 1.16FE (35 places) to 1.5FE (45 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 233 to 315 by September 2017. This enlargement would be carried out in conjunction with the CE diocese of Winchester.
- (iv) The enlargement by 15 places (0.5FE – forms of entry) per year group of Kanes Hill Primary School, with implementation from 1 September 2011, beginning with Year R and continuing incrementally until all 7 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 1.5FE (45 places) to 2FE (60 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 315 to 420 by September 2017.
- (v) The enlargement by 30 places (1FE – forms of entry) per year group of Moorlands Primary School, with implementation from 1 September 2011, beginning with Year R and continuing incrementally until all 7 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 1FE (30 places) to 2FE (60 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 210 to 420 by September 2017.
- (vi) The enlargement by 30 places (1FE – forms of entry) per year group of Shirley Warren Primary School, with implementation from 1 September 2011, beginning with Year R and continuing incrementally until all 7 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 1FE (30 places) to 2FE (60 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 210 to 420 by September 2017.

3 To make the following statutory proposals for changes to primary education in the city by enlarging the following schools in September 2012

- (i) The enlargement by 15 places (0.5FE – forms of entry) per year group of Banister Primary School, with implementation from 1 September 2012, beginning with Year R and continuing incrementally until all 7 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 1.5FE (45 places) to 2FE (60 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 162 to 420 by September 2018.
- (ii) The enlargement by 30 places (1FE – form of entry) per year group of Fairisle Infant School, with implementation from 1 September 2012, beginning with Year R and continuing incrementally until all 3 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 3FE (90 places) to 4FE (120 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 270 to 360 by September 2014.

- (iii) The enlargement by 30 places (1FE – form of entry) per year group of Fairisle Junior School, with implementation from 1 September 2015, beginning with Year 3 and continuing incrementally until all 4 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 3FE (90 places) to 4FE (120 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 360 to 480 by September 2018.
This proposal is to be treated as linked to 3(ii) above.
- (iv) The enlargement by 15 places (0.5FE – forms of entry) per year group of Harefield Primary School, with implementation from 1 September 2012, beginning with Year R and continuing incrementally until all 7 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 1.5FE (45 places) to 2FE (60 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 315 to 420 by September 2017.
- (v) The enlargement by 30 places (1FE – form of entry) per year group of Tanners Brook Infant School, with implementation from 1 September 2012, beginning with Year R and continuing incrementally until all 3 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 3FE (90 places) to 4FE (120 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 270 to 360 by September 2014.
- (vi) The enlargement by 30 places (1FE – form of entry) per year group of Tanners Brook Junior School, with implementation from 1 September 2015, beginning with Year 3 and continuing incrementally until all 4 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 3FE (90 places) to 4FE (120 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 360 to 480 by September 2018.
This proposal is to be treated as linked to 3(v) above
- (vii) The enlargement by 30 places (1FE – form of entry) per year group of Valentine Infant School, with implementation from 1 September 2012, beginning with Year R and continuing incrementally until all 3 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 3FE (90 places) to 4FE (120 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 270 to 360 by September 2014.
- (viii) Linked to this is the enlargement by 30 places (1FE – form of entry) per year group of Heathfield Junior School, with implementation from 1 September 2015, beginning with Year 3 and continuing incrementally until all 4 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 3FE (90 places) to 4FE (120 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 359 to 480 by September 2018.
This proposal is to be treated as linked to 3(vii) above.
- (ix) The enlargement by 30 places (1FE – form of entry) per year group of Sholing Infant School, with implementation from 1 September 2012, beginning with Year R and continuing incrementally until all 3 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 2FE (60 places) to 3FE (90 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 174 to 270 by September 2014.

- (x) Linked to this is the enlargement by 30 places (1FE – form of entry) per year group of Sholing Junior School, with implementation from 1 September 2015, beginning with Year 3 and continuing incrementally until all 4 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 2FE (60 places) to 3FE (120 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 239 to 360 by September 2018.

This proposal is to be treated as linked to 3(ix) above

- (xi) The enlargement by 15 places (0.5FE – forms of entry) per year group of St Patrick's Catholic Primary School, with implementation from 1 September 2012, beginning with Year R and continuing incrementally until all 7 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 1.5FE (45 places) to 2FE (60 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 315 to 420 by September 2017.

This enlargement would be carried out in conjunction with the RC diocese of Portsmouth.

- (xii) The enlargement by 30 places (1FE – forms of entry) per year group of St Mark's CE Primary School, with implementation from 1 September 2012, beginning with Year R and continuing incrementally until all 7 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 2FE (60 places) to 3FE (90 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 459 to 630 by September 2017.

This enlargement would be carried out in conjunction with the CE diocese of Winchester.

- 4 To note enlargements to the following schools which do not need statutory proposals, but will be actioned through the annual admissions process in due course.

- (i) The enlargement by 30 places (1FE – form of entry) per year group of Beechwood Junior School, with implementation from 1 September 2014, beginning with Year 3 and continuing incrementally until all 4 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 2FE (60 places) to 3FE (90 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 311 to 360 by September 2017.

This proposal is to be treated as linked to 2(ii) above.

- (ii) The enlargement by 30 places (1FE – forms of entry) per year group of Mansel Park Primary School, with implementation from 1 September 2011, beginning with Year R and continuing incrementally until all 7 years have been expanded. This would have the effect of enlarging the school from 1FE (30 places) to 2FE (60 places) per year group, and increasing the net capacity from 358 to 420 by September 2017.

- 5 To delegate authority to the executive Director of Children's Services & Learning, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children's Services & Learning to do anything necessary to give effect to the recommendations in this report.

- 6 To delegate authority to the executive Director for Children's Services & Learning in consultation with the Solicitor to the Council to take any action necessary to comply with the requirements of the Schools Standards & Frameworks Act 1998 and associated legislation, including but not limited to the publication of Statutory Notices and compliance with statutory representation procedures, to give effect to the recommendations in this report.

REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The rapid rise in the number of pupils requiring a school place over the last four or five years, has meant that severe pressure has been brought to bear on the school estate. Forecasts indicate that this pressure is not likely to recede in the foreseeable future.
2. Extra places are already being put in schools in the City Centre and Freemantle areas of the city as a result of the Primary Review Phase 1.
3. The need for extra school places is not restricted to these two areas and is spread over a wide area of the city. Consequently there is a need to expand a number of schools throughout the city by up to 30 places in each year group. This enables demand for school places to be met locally, and reduces the likelihood of young people needing to travel long distances to go to school.
4. If we are to maintain and improve the school experience we offer to our children we must ensure that their learning environment is conducive to a quality education.
5. As a local authority we have a statutory obligation to provide every child who wants one with quality school place. Failure to do so would mean we would be failing in one of our basic duties.

DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)

6. At the beginning of the year, officers attended all Headteacher Cluster Meetings and explained the need for expanding schools. Some options were discussed at the meetings and feedback received.
7. Feedback, together with updated forecast data and discussions with officers in other Divisions, enabled us to formulate proposals which were refined and were consulted on.
8. Pre-statutory consultation was held between September 14th and October 26th. Officers provided 'drop-in' sessions at all the Primary and Infant schools affected, 16 in total, with an invitation extended to parents, staff, and governors of all schools.
9. A rolling PowerPoint presentation was displayed at the 'drop-in' sessions and documentation, leaflets and response forms were provided. Officers were on hand to answer any questions that arose, and to encourage attendees to express their views in the response forms.
10. All the documentation together with a response form was replicated on the City Council's web site and the address was advertised in City View and other publications.

11. Appendix 1 gives a detailed breakdown of the responses. In general, respondees saw the need for the expansion program and were on board with the proposals. Many, however, expressed reservations at the increased traffic that would be generated and the loss of play space that might occur
12. Although the drop-in sessions were not well attended, anecdotal feedback we received suggested that if parents were unhappy with the proposals then there would have been a significant increase in the number of parents attending.
13. Our pupil forecasts suggest that we will need nearly 3,000 Reception places in September 2012. If all our proposals were to be implemented, then we will have 3030 places. It is very tight, but we would be able to accommodate all our expected intake. It would not allow for a high degree of parental preference, nor would it allow much leeway for an underestimation in our forecasts.
14. Numbers of pupils requiring a Reception school place in September 2013 and 2014 will be down marginally, but the latest information we have from the Primary Care Trust states that the number of births for the last quarter (July-Sept 2010) is rising again. These pupils will be requiring a Reception school place in 2015
15. As the increase in numbers is building up from Reception Year, then it is logical that the increase in places follows suit. We may not need to put in all the extra places in a school in one go. It may be possible to stagger some of the work and do it in two or three stages. Schools with a PAN, (Published Admission Number) of 45, generally have two Reception classes and two Reception teachers. Therefore in the first year of expansion, not a great deal will be needed to be done at these schools as the classes will have only 22/23 pupils in them and this will increase to 30 in each class.
16. The following years, however, space will need to be created to accommodate the extra pupils and this has significant resource implications.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Capital

17. It is difficult to accurately predict either the cost or affordability profile of the Primary Review programme at this stage for a number of reasons:
 - pupil numbers are unlikely to remain static and are under constant review;
 - detailed feasibility work and options appraisals are not yet complete;
 - project development and delivery will be on a phased basis and the optimum phasing of works is still being determined.
18. Similarly we do not yet know the amount of government grant available to support the Council in addressing this issue.

19. High level estimates, based on the range of possible projects implied in the pre-statutory consultations, suggests that the widest cost range for the works to accommodate the entire cohort over the 5 year period is between £10.1 million (based on minimal new build) to £37 million (based on maximum new build). Both figures are based on standard DfE benchmark school construction rates and do not include any assumptions at this stage about site risks or abnormals.
20. It is clear that final proposals will have to match the resources available to the Council, and it should be noted that the final costs will need to be substantially less than £37 million maximum figure quoted above. It is likely that proposals will therefore need to be reviewed on at least an annual basis to ensure that option appraisal and cost planning is in line with known resources. We anticipate having a detailed cost / affordability estimate for 2011/12 projects by January 2011.
21. In November 2009, the City Council received £1 million from the Department for Education's Emergency Basic Need Safety Valve grant. This funding was distributed to Local Authorities who were experiencing a large increase in pupils applying for a school place and £690,000 of the grant will be used to help fund Primary Review Phase 2
22. In 2010/11 the City Council received £18.1 million of capital funding, including £2 million of Schools' Devolved Formula Capital Grant. The Comprehensive Spending Review has stated that:
 - There will be a 60% reduction in real terms in capital spending over the Spending Review period
 - The independent review of education capital will ensure that the Department for Education's capital budget is targeted where there is most need
23. Although actual capital allocations for Southampton from 2011/12 onwards will not be known until later in the year, the funding received will be targeted towards the needs of the school estate in general and the Primary Review Phase 2 in particular. In addition £900,000 per year is available from the Revenue Development Fund within the Council's budget plans to ensure that funds can be borrowed if necessary.
24. It is anticipated that the combination of Government grant and borrowing over the 5 years of the project will be sufficient to fund the proposals.

Revenue

25. The revenue costs of all schools are met from the Individual Schools Budget funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant. The amount of Dedicated Schools Grant that the authority receives each year is based on the number of children in the city. If the city's overall numbers grow, this will result in an increase in the amount of grant received which can be passed onto schools via budget shares calculated using Southampton's Fair Funding Formula.

Property

26. The property implications arising from this and future reports will be the subject of further detailed consideration in the normal way including an evaluation of any property implications and, (as required by Financial regulations), the results of option appraisals.
27. It is unlikely, however, that the proposals above would have any significant bearing on property issues as the whole thrust of the program is to make more intensive use of the current assets.
28. Some schools may require that formerly 'redundant' classrooms which have been let to other agencies, e.g. Pre-school Playgroups, Archives, Intercultural centre etc., are taken back into school use. These groups will need to be re-housed into other suitable buildings.

Other

29. None

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Statutory Power to undertake the proposals in the report:

30. Local Authorities have a statutory duty to ensure that there are sufficient school places in their area, promote high educational standards, ensure fair access to educational opportunity and promote the fulfilment of every child's educational potential. Local Authorities must also ensure that there are sufficient schools in their area and promote diversity and parental preference.
31. Alterations, changes, creation or removal of primary provision across the city is subject to the statutory processes contained in the School Standards and Frameworks Act 1998. Proposals for change are required to follow the processes set out in the School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) Regulations 2007 together with Statutory Guidance for proposers and decision makers. The Local Authority will be the decision maker for all proposals set out in this report and a further report on the outcome of statutory representations will therefore be brought forward to Cabinet in due course for final determination.

Other Legal Implications:

32. In bringing forward school organisation proposals the Local Authority must have regard to the need to consult the community and users, observe the rules of natural justice and the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998, article 2 of the First Protocol (right to education) and the Equalities Act 2010.

POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

33. The Primary Strategy for Change will contribute directly to the achievement of the outcomes set out in the City of Southampton's Strategy, the Children and Young Peoples Strategic Plan and the Primary Vision, by providing improved buildings for primary pupils and communities in Southampton.
34. It will facilitate closer joint working between schools and thereby enable a range of strategic objectives to be met.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Non-confidential appendices are in the Members' Rooms and can be accessed on-line

Appendices

1.	Summary of the outcome of pre-statutory Consultation.
2.	Integrated Impact Assessment.

Documents In Members' Rooms

1.	Pre-statutory consultation full consultation document.
----	--

Integrated Impact Assessment

Do the implications/subject/recommendations in the report require an Integrated Impact Assessment to be carried out.	Yes/No
--	--------

Other Background Documents

Title of Background Paper(s) Cabinet Paper of 6 September 2010: "Primary Review Phase 2: Pre-statutory Consultation"	Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)
--	--

Integrated Impact Assessment and Other Background documents available for inspection at:

WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:	ALL
------------------------------------	-----