

EDUCATION POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 19 March 2013

Present:

Councillor Nicholas Bennett J.P. (Chairman)
Councillor Lydia Buttinger (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Peter Fookes, Brian Humphrys,
David McBride, Alexa Michael and Neil Reddin FCCA

Dolores Bray-Ash JP, Father Owen Higgs, Darren Jenkins,
Joan McConnell, Janet Latinwo and Alison Register

Also Present:

Councillor Stephen Wells, Portfolio Holder for Education
Councillor Pauline Tunncliffe, Executive Support Assistant to the
Portfolio Holder for Education
Councillors Ruth Bennett, Robert Evans and Michael Tickner

66 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Kathy Bance MBE and Councillor Peter Fookes attended as her substitute. Apologies for absence were also received from Councillor Nicky Dykes. Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Pauline Tunncliffe, Executive Support Assistant to the Portfolio Holder for Education.

The Chairman noted that Mike Barnes, Sue Mordecai, Janet Heathcote and Helen Fiorini would shortly be leaving the Local Authority and thanked them on behalf of the Members of the Education PDS Committee for the excellent contribution they had made to the London Borough of Bromley over many years.

67 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman reminded the Committee that the Declarations of Interest made at the meeting on 12th June 2012 were taken as read

68 MINUTES OF THE EDUCATION PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 23RD JANUARY 2013 AND MATTERS OUTSTANDING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The minutes were agreed subject to the penultimate paragraph of Item 59a: Refresh of the Education Portfolio Plan being amended to read:

“With regard to the aim to ensure pupils with special educational needs have *outstanding* outcomes, it was noted that the Pathfinder project to provide an integrated pathway for children and young people and their families ensuring a smooth transition to the SEND framework had been extended for a further year.”

A Co-opted Member also confirmed that in relation to Item 59e: Categorisation, Intervention and Support for High Priority Schools in Bromley, Bromley’s early years provision had recently been ranked as the joint third highest performing in the country and not fifth highest as recorded in the minutes.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 23rd January 2013 be agreed.

69 QUESTIONS TO THE PDS CHAIRMAN FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING

No questions had been received.

70 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING

Three written questions were received from members of the public and are attached at **Appendix A**. A total of 21 oral questions were also received from Members of the public and these are attached at **Appendix B**.

The Chairman commented on the high number of questions received and proposed that the Portfolio Holder give a statement in answer to the main themes highlighted by the majority of the questions. He noted that the time allocated to questions was 15 minutes but, following a vote by the Members of the Committee, this was extended to 30 minutes. The statement by the Portfolio Holder for Education is attached at **Appendix C**.

71 PORTFOLIO HOLDER UPDATE AND CHILDREN'S CHAMPION UPDATE

The Portfolio Holder for Education gave an update to Members on work being undertaken across the Education Portfolio.

Applications had been submitted for three free schools in the Borough which might impact the proposed temporary and permanent expansion of places at certain schools. The Portfolio Holder also confirmed that Harris was seeking to establish an Aspire Unit in the Borough which would provide Behaviour Services provision for secondary-age pupils from both Bromley schools and those outside of the Borough.

Discussions continued with the RC Archdiocese of Southwark around the potential to establish a four form of entry Roman Catholic secondary school in

the Borough, and work to identify a suitable site was ongoing. The Portfolio Holder was keen to encourage the Archdiocese to seek to establish a six form of entry Roman Catholic secondary school to ensure that sufficient places were available to all parents and carers who wanted their children to attend a Roman Catholic secondary school in the Borough.

A consultant had now been recruited to drive forward the academy programme across the Borough and ensure schools had the support they needed to convert to academy status. The Portfolio Holder noted that a number of primary and secondary schools were actively engaged in developing academy umbrella trusts and cluster groups. A Member highlighted the need to ensure that schools were supported to join appropriate cluster groups where appropriate.

The Children's Champion outlined her cross-Portfolio role to Members of the Committee and noted the broad scope of work undertaken during 2012-13 to ensure vulnerable children across the Borough had the support they needed to thrive. A Member highlighted the benefits of early intervention to realise the best outcomes for children and young people, and noted that the cost of early intervention services was often lower than the more intensive services needed after issues had escalated. Another Member underlined the need to ensure the support needs of vulnerable children and young people continued to be monitored if they moved out of Borough. A Co-opted Member requested that early years be included as a priority area for the Children's Champion in the new municipal year.

In response to a request from the Children's Champion, the Assistant Director Education outlined changes to the SEN Statement Policy and advised Members that funding for children with high incidence, low level statements would be included within school budgets from 1st April 2013, allowing schools to take a more flexible approach to funding support for these children. Education, Health and Care Plans would take a more holistic approach to identifying the support needs of children and young people with more complex needs and these would be piloted from April 2013.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder update and Children's Champion update be noted.

72 PORTFOLIO HOLDER PROPOSED DECISIONS

A) MEMBERSHIP OF SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES

Report ED13042

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report outlining a LA Governor appointment to a school in the Borough.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve the following LA Governor appointment, subject to CRB checks:

St Olave's and St Saviour's Grammar School

Councillor Julian Grainger
(Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom)

**B) CONSULTATION OUTCOMES: PROPOSALS TO
RESTRUCTURE BROMLEY ROAD AND WORSLEY BRIDGE
SCHOOLS**

Report ED130028

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report summarising the outcomes from consultations undertaken on the proposal to restructure Bromley Road Infant School from a three forms of entry Infant School to a one form of entry primary school from September 2014, and a proposal to restructure Worsley Bridge Junior School from a three forms of entry junior school to a two forms of entry primary school from September 2014. Bromley Road Infant School and Worsley Bridge Junior School were currently 'linked' schools with automatic pupil transfer.

The consultations for the proposed changes to school organisation had run from 11th January to 15th February 2013, and produced 46 Bromley Road responses and 23 Worsley Bridge responses which were largely supportive of the proposals. The Governing Bodies and School Councils for both schools also supported the proposed changes to school organisation.

Councillor Michael Tickner, Ward Councillor for Copers Cope noted that there were a number of benefits to the proposed changes to school organisation including strengthened leadership and management across key stages, continuity of curriculum organisation and pupil assessment and consistent governance across both schools. He was however concerned at the cost of adapting the schools to support the proposed changes to school organisation, and also noted that Bromley Road would be vulnerable to staffing changes as a one form of entry primary school.

In response, the Portfolio Holder for Education underlined the present disruption to pupils in transferring between two schools sited three-quarters of a mile apart when moving into Key Stage 2, and confirmed that funding to adapt the schools would come from the suitability budget. The Vice-Chairman noted that the response to the consultation had been largely supportive of the proposals and highlighted the educational benefits to children through the more diverse curriculum offer of a primary school.

A Member was concerned at the sustainability of one form of entry primary schools, particularly under the new schools funding formula. He also noted the difficulties in recruiting headteachers to lead smaller primary schools. The Assistant Director: Education advised the Committee that the Schools' Finance Team had undertaken a great deal of work on the financial position of Bromley Road Infant School as a one form of entry primary school over the next five years, and had confirmed that it would be viable.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- 1) Note Members' comments regarding the outcome of the consultations;**
- 2) Agree the proposed change of age range at Bromley Road Infant School and Worsley Bridge Junior School so that both schools become all-through Primary Schools with effect from 1st September 2014; and,**
- 3) Authorise Officers to undertake the formal statutory processes for the restructuring of a school.**

**C) CONSULTATION OUTCOMES: PROPOSAL TO EXPAND
KESTON CE PRIMARY SCHOOL**

Report ED13029

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report summarising the outcomes from the consultation undertaken on the proposal to permanently expand Keston CE Primary School from 30 to 60 pupils at Year Reception (the year children start school) from September 2014.

The consultation for the proposed permanent expansion of the school had run from 11th January to 15th February 2013, and produced 136 responses of which 28 were in support. The responses received and the comments made to a Consultation meeting held on 17th January 2013 showed significant opposition to the proposal, primarily on the grounds of access and parking. The Governing Body arrived at a 'majority decision to support the proposal' on educational and financial grounds whilst acknowledging that there were access and parking issues to be addressed in conjunction with the Local Authority.

In considering the proposed expansion of Keston CE Primary School, the following Motion to amend the recommendations of the report was proposed by Councillor Alexa Michael and seconded by Councillor David McBride:

"That this Committee recommends the Portfolio Holder to agree expansion for an additional 'bulge' year of one form of entry for the academic year 2013/14 and that the Portfolio Holder be requested to give serious consideration to alternate school sites for permanent expansion."

On being put to the vote the Motion was CARRIED.

Members considered the proposed expansion of Keston CE Primary School for an additional 'bulge' year of one form of entry for the academic year 2013/14.

In considering the proposal, the Portfolio Holder for Education highlighted the significant demand for school places at Keston CE Primary School and noted

that 178 applications had already been received for the 30 existing available places in Reception for 2013/14.

Councillor Alexa Michael, Ward Councillor for Bromley Common and Keston agreed that there was a need for more school places across the Borough but noted that many parents and carers were attracted to the 'small school' ethos of Keston CE Primary School as a one form of entry primary school. There were also a number of key local issues that would have to be addressed prior to any permanent expansion of the school, such as the accessibility of the school and traffic management. Councillor Alexa Michael underlined that the Unitary Development Plan of the Local Authority stated that new development would normally be resisted for those developments that would substantially increase traffic on roads that were not part paved, as was the case in the area around Keston CE Primary School.

Another Member was concerned that the scope of the Portfolio Holder for Education's decision was required to be based purely on educational grounds, and noted the need to involve other members of the Executive in the decision making process to ensure that the full implications of any expansion on both the school and the local community were considered before the final decision was made.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- 1) Note Members' comments regarding the outcome of the consultation;**
- 2) Agree expansion for an additional 'bulge' year of one form of entry for the academic year 2013/14 and that the Portfolio Holder be requested to give serious consideration to alternate school sites for permanent expansion; and,**
- 3) Authorise Officers to undertake the formal statutory processes for the temporary expansion of a school for a 'bulge' year for the academic year 2013/14.**

D) CONSULTATION OUTCOMES: PROPOSAL TO EXPAND GLEBE SCHOOL

Report ED13030

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report summarising the outcomes from the consultation undertaken on the proposal to expand The Glebe School to admit 16 additional children with Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD) at Year 7 each year from September 2014.

The consultation for the proposed permanent expansion of the school had run from 11th January to 15th February 2013, and produced 36 responses which were largely supportive of the proposals. The Governing Body also supported the proposed changes to school organisation, as did the School Council,

which accepted the reasons for expansion and the subsequent increased student numbers but expressed a number of concerns that would be addressed by the school on an ongoing basis.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- 1) Note Members' comments regarding the outcome of the consultation;**
- 2) Agree the permanent expansion proposed to take effect from 1st September 2014; and,**
- 3) Authorise Officers to undertake the formal statutory processes for the permanent expansion of a school.**

E) FUTURE ROLE OF THE LA IN EDUCATION SERVICES

Report ED13032

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report outlining the future role of the Local Authority in Education Services. On 21st January 2013, Full Council had agreed a new set of parameters for its work with schools in the form of the Education Covenant, and this was reflected in the new business plan agreed by the Portfolio Holder for Education following the Education PDS Committee meeting on 23rd January 2013. The new approach sought to encourage schools to be independent of the Local Authority, with the Local Authority adopting the role of community champion on behalf of parents and their children, holding schools to account and ensuring an adequate supply of high quality school places.

The Chairman thanked the Executive Director of Education and Care Services for an excellent report.

In response to a question from a Member, the Executive Director of Education and Care Services confirmed that the Local Authority did not have a statutory role to address issues identified in maintained or academy schools, with Ofsted and the Department for Education as the respective authorities for each. The Local Authority had entered into a local agreement with maintained schools across the Borough, and the Executive Director noted that the Local Authority also had a statutory responsibility for the five outcomes of 'Every Child Matters' and could theoretically intervene in any school where these were not being met.

A Member noted the importance of ensuring that academy schools with specialist units were encouraged to maintain them and that the transfer agreements ensured that places in these units continued to be made available to Bromley pupils. Another Member queried the responsibilities academy schools had with regards to audit. The Portfolio Holder confirmed that all schools had a requirement to be audited but that academies were responsible

for purchasing their own audit services. He noted that a number of academy schools currently purchased audit services from the Local Authority.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- 1) Endorse the new role of the Council as champions of the community and continue to expect only the highest standards from all our schools;**
- 2) Use the Education Covenant to establish this new relationship with schools and ask all governing bodies to sign it following an appropriate period of consultation;**
- 3) Agree the proposal to undertake a final review of services to schools with a view to the Local Authority only offering services of the highest quality and which represent good value for money for the Council Tax payer, with a further report to Members in Autumn 2013; and,**
- 4) Request the Executive provide ratification of these recommendations at its meeting on 3rd April 2013, and that the recommendations also be provided to the Full Council for ratification at its meeting on 1st July 2013.**

F) UPDATE FROM SCHOOL GOVERNANCE WORKING PARTY

Report RES13071

The Chairman introduced a report providing an update from the School Governance Working Group which had been established by the Education PDS Committee at its meeting on 23rd January 2013 to ensure that the Local Authority had a pool of well trained governors able to play an effective role in ensuring that schools were well governed. The School Governance Working Group had met on 12th March 2013 to discuss a range of issues impacting on the recruitment, role and responsibilities of Local Authority Governors and had made a number of recommendations around how this could be better developed.

In considering the report, Members of the Committee suggested that local libraries and the back of parking stickers might also be used to advertise the role of Local Authority Governors to members of the public.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- 1) Note Members' comments on the recommendations of the School Governance Working Group; and,**
- 2) Support the recommendations of the School Governance Working Group.**

G) BASIC NEED PROGRAMME UPDATE REPORT 5

Report ED130034

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report providing an update on progress in delivering the 2012/13 Basic Need Programme, which was funded by the Basic Need Capital Grant to support the provision of sufficient school places in publicly funded schools, and to request agreement for additional works in 2013/14 and 2014/15 required to meet increased demand for pupil places at Reception age.

On 13th September 2012, the Portfolio Holder for Education had agreed a list of priority schemes for addressing the estimated increase in the number of reception age pupils from September 2013. To meet this demand, 'bulge years' were planned at existing local schools to provide the required pupil places, which would be delivered through a combination of modular build and internal refurbishment.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- 1) Approve the updated list of schools within the Basic Need Capital Programme 2012/13;**
- 2) Agree the procurement of schemes within the Basic Need Programme through traditional procurement, the Lewisham Modular Buildings Framework or through devolution of Basic Need Capital Grant to schools; and,**
- 3) Authorise the Executive Director of Education and Care Services to submit planning applications at the appropriate time in respect of the list of schemes.**

H) EDUCATION PORTFOLIO BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2012/13

Report ED130049

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report outlining the budget monitoring position for the Education Portfolio based on expenditure to the end of January 2013. The Schools' Budget, funded from the Dedicated Schools' Grant and specific grants, was forecast to spend in line with budget. The Non-Schools' Budget, funded from Council Tax, Revenue Support and specific grants was forecast to be in an underspend position of £2,114,000.

In response to a query from a Co-opted Member, the Early Years Manager confirmed that the recent restructure of the Early Years Service would not impact the level of service provided for early years and that there was no reduction in the number of officer posts.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- 1) Note Members' comments on the budget monitoring position for the Education Portfolio;**
- 2) Approve the latest 2012/13 budget projection for the Education Portfolio; and,**
- 3) Approve carry forward requests for £297k for urgent property work for children's centres, and for specific Dedicated Schools' Grant projects totalling £204k (as detailed in paragraphs 3.5 and 3.6 of Report ED13049).**

I) 2013/14 DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT

Report ED13050

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report detailing the allocation for the 2013/14 Dedicated Schools' Grant, which had been notified to the Local Authority as a total sum of £228,331,776. This would be allocated in three blocks comprising the Schools Block (£167,903,853), the Early Years Block (£14,560,243) and High Needs Block (£45,867,680).

A Member noted the reduction in pupil rolls of up to 7% in some secondary schools across the Borough for 2013/14. The Head of Education and Care Services Finance confirmed that there had been a downward trend in the number of pupils seeking places in the Borough which was at its lowest in 2013/14, but that that demand for pupil places at secondary level would consistently increase each year from 2014/15.

A Co-opted Member was concerned that there had been a 'top slice' of Dedicated Schools Grant funding across all three blocks, including Early Years, to provide hospital-based education provision which did not benefit Early Years pupils. The Head of Education and Care Services Finance confirmed that this top-slice was applied nationally by the Department for Education to support hospital-based education provision in leading regional centres of children's medicine, such as Great Ormond Street Hospital, without the need for host boroughs to recharge other Council's for education provision.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve the Dedicated Schools' Grant allocation for 2013/14.

73 EDUCATION PORTFOLIO HOLDER INFORMATION ITEMS

The Portfolio Holder Briefing comprised seven reports:

- Minutes of the Education Budget Sub-Committee held on 13th February 2013
- Update from the SEN Executive Working Party

- Achieving Two Year Olds – Capital
- ECS Contract Activity Report
- Development of Free Schools Update
- Academy Programme in Bromley: Update
- Education Policy and Legislative Changes: Update

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder Briefing be noted.

74 STANDARDS OF ATTAINMENT IN BROMLEY SCHOOLS 2012

Report ED13033

The Committee considered a report outlining standards of attainment and progress in Bromley maintained schools during the 2011/12 academic year.

In response to a query from a Member, the Head of Learning confirmed that Pupil Premium funding of £900 per pupil was provided for all pupils who had been in receipt of free school meals at any point during their time in Key Stages 1 and 2. Schools were required to publish details of how this funding had been spent and to outline the impact of this funding on the progress of pupils in receipt of the Pupil Premium on their school website. A Member noted that the new Ofsted framework targeted the progress of pupils in receipt of the Pupil Premium. A Co-opted Member highlighted the importance of schools encouraging parents and carers to apply for free school meals where eligible.

The Chairman noted the need to ensure that the gap in attainment between pupils who received free school meals and those who did not remained a priority for Bromley schools at all key stages, and requested that an item on 'Impact of the Pupil Premium' be considered at the meeting of Education PDS Committee on 30th January 2014. A Co-opted Member also requested that information on the standards of attainment for children with special educational needs be circulated to the Members of the Education PDS Committee.

RESOLVED that Members' comments on the annual report on the standards of attainment and progress in Bromley maintained schools be noted.

75 RAISING THE PARTICIPATION AGE

Report ED13031

The Committee considered a report providing background information on 'Raising the Participation Age' which was written into the Education and Skills Act 2008 and placed a duty on all young people to participate in education or training until their 18th birthday. Members were advised that from September 2013, young people would be required to continue in education or training until the end of the academic year in which they turn 17 years. From 2015,

young people will be required to continue until their 18th birthday. Young people would be able to choose from full-time education in school, college or home education, work-based learning with training, such as an apprenticeship and part-time education or training if they were employed, self-employed or volunteering for more than 20 hours a week.

In response to a query from the Chairman, the Head of Youth Support Services confirmed that of those young people categorised as non participation (in either full time or part time education, training or employment), there were 314 young people who were classified as 'not in education, employment or training (NEET). This was a significant reduction on the previous year, and the Head of Youth Support Services confirmed that work continued to be undertaken with schools and academies to improve reporting on the destinations of young people. A stretch target of zero young people being categorised as non participation had been set within the Education Portfolio Plan for 2013/14.

The Head of Youth Support Services advised Members that Bromley was also participating in a Department for Education working group to identify best practice in supporting young people to engage with education, training and employment. It was important to ensure that appropriate provision was in place for young people for whom traditional mainstream and work-based programmes would be inappropriate.

RESOLVED that Members note the inclusion of the action plan for the delivery of Raising the Participation Age in the 2013 Education Portfolio Plan as one of seven educational and learning action plans for business planning and implementation.

**76 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EDUCATION PDS COMMITTEE
2012/13**

The Committee considered the annual report of the Education PDS Committee for 2012/13. It was noted that the annual report would be provided to the Executive and Resources PDS committee on 27th March 2013 before submission to Council on 22nd April 2013

RESOLVED that the annual report of the Education PDS Committee be approved.

77 EDUCATION PROGRAMME 2013-14

Report ED13036

The Committee considered the forward rolling work programme for the year ahead based on items scheduled for decision by the Education Portfolio Holder and items for consideration by the Education PDS Committee.

In considering the work programme for 2012/13, the Chairman requested that a number of additional reports be considered at the next meeting of the Education PDS Committee to be held on 2nd July 2013:

- Objectives for the Education PDS Committee for 2013/14
- Future Shape of Adult Education in Bromley
- Update on the SEN Pathfinder

Members also requested that a report on 'Truancy in Bromley' be reported to the Education PDS Committee at its meeting on 17th September 2013, and that reports providing an update on 'Raising the Participation Age' and 'The Impact of the Pupil Premium' be reported to the meeting of Education PDS Committee on 30th January 2014

The Portfolio Holder thanked Members and Co-opted Members of the Education PDS Committee for attending a number of school and unit visits across the Borough during the municipal year. The Chairman noted that the Council Members' Visits Schedule for Autumn 2013 was now being developed and asked Members to provide any suggestions for visits to the Clerk to the Committee for inclusion in the Council Members' Visits Schedule.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) **The Education Programme 2012/13 be noted; and,**
- 2) **Members and Co-opted Members provide their suggestions for the Council Members' Visits Schedule for Autumn 2013 to the Clerk to Education PDS Committee.**

78 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 AS AMENDED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) (VARIATION) ORDER 2006, AND THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000

RESOLVED that the press and public be excluded during consideration of the items of business listed below as it was likely in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information.

79 EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE EDUCATION PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 23RD JANUARY 2013

RESOLVED that the exempt minutes of the Education PDS Committee meeting held on 23rd January 2013 be agreed.

80 PORTFOLIO HOLDER PROPOSED PART 2 (EXEMPT) DECISIONS

**A) OPTIONS APPRAISAL ON THE FUTURE ARRANGEMENTS OF
COMMUNITY VISION AND BLENHEIM NURSERIES**

The Committee considered the report and supported the recommendations.

**B) CONTRACT AWARD - CAPITA ONE DATABASE -
MAINTENANCE CONTRACT**

The Committee considered the report and supported the recommendations.

81 REPORT FROM AUDIT SUB-COMMITTEE

The Committee considered the report and supported the recommendations.

The Meeting ended at 10.30 pm

Chairman

EDUCATION PDS COMMITTEE
19th March 2013

QUESTIONS TO THE EDUCATION PORTFOLIO HOLDER

Written Questions for the Education Portfolio Holder received from Michelle Blythe

Q1 Parents are stressed out and fighting to park every day. It would be unethical for new parents not to be fully briefed on these serious issues that will affect the safety of their children. Will you pre-warn prospective parents of these very serious issues that will impact them daily?

Reply:

It is the role of the school to make parents aware of any issues related to their child's attendance at the school and in particular any health and safety issues. I am aware that Keston Primary takes this issue very seriously and in relation to that make parents very aware of the issues around delivering their children to and collecting their children from the school. I have no doubt any new parents will be made aware by the school of the issues you raise as indeed to many other schools with particular issues related around the start and close of the school day. Specifically I am advised that the school already discusses with existing and prospective parents the congestion at the start and end of the school day and the school actively promote the 'unofficial' one-way system in Lakes Road and Keston Avenue.

Q2 Currently I cannot exit my drive before 9am most mornings. Currently I cannot enter my drive at 3.20pm most afternoons. How are you going to protect residents and enable them to leave their properties to go about their lives?

Reply:

This is an issue which is outwith my remit; however this is not an uncommon problem for any resident who lives in proximity to a school. Various solutions, some very innovative have been found by other schools, no doubt these and others will be looked at by the school and responsible Officers in the near future and will be taking this into account when reaching my decision on the future of the Keston school. I acknowledge that congestion is a known issue for local residents

Q3 Parking restrictions will definitely be required to allow residents free movement. How will these parking restrictions be enforced, I assume you will need to bus in parking wardens or install cameras?

Reply:

The operation of a Controlled Parking Scheme with residents only parking is an option which will be evaluated regarding Keston Primary Schools access routes, however that is not an option in my direct gift. How such a scheme is

enforced is also not in my control however I would point out that at present the police will act regarding any vehicle which is causing an obstruction. Currently there is no proposal to implement parking restrictions in the vicinity of the school.

Minute Annex

APPENDIX B

EDUCATION PDS COMMITTEE 19th March 2013

QUESTIONS TO THE EDUCATION PORTFOLIO HOLDER

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from David Clapham, Chairman, Keston Village Residents' Association

- Q1 The Councils current UDP Policy C7 permits new or extensions to existing educational establishments provided that they are located so as to maximise access by means of transport other than the car. Given that the Public Transport Accessibility Level is 1a, (very poor) how can expansion be justified?

Reply:

This is a planning issue that should be directed to the Planning Sub-Committee.

Supplementary question:

The consultation process indicated that all aspects of the consultation responses would be reported to Education PDS Committee. Why wasn't it made clear in the consultation process that some issues would not be considered?

Reply:

All aspects of the consultation responses have been considered and have contributed to a proposed amendment to the recommendation of the Education PDS Committee for the Portfolio Holder for Education to agree expansion for an additional 'bulge' year of one form of entry for the academic year 2013/14 in place of the proposed permanent expansion.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from Soraya Williams

- Q1 How can you increase the school size as proposed if in doing so it will be causing parents to have to put their younger children in danger? Parents are having to park in car parks in Commonside, West Common Rd, Baston Rd. There are no pavements, they walk along the road.

Reply:

Health and safety of pupils is a key concern. I am aware that some roads leading to Keston CE Primary School have no pavements but am pleased to note that in the last nine years there have been no accidents involving any children attending Keston CE Primary School. Both parents and the school

have a sensible attitude to underpinning safety issues which help keep children safe.

Supplementary question:

Just because there have been no accidents to this date, it does not mean that there will be no accidents in the future, particularly if there is a vast increase in the number of pupils and road users.

Reply:

An increase in the number of pupils and road users does not mean that the level of safe behaviour of parents, pupils and residents will reduce. There is a high quality of teaching in Keston CE Primary School which raises awareness of pupils and their parents around safety issues.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from Hilary Ryder

Q1 The LBB Constitution states the following:-

13.02 Principles of decision making: All decisions of the Council will be made in accordance with the following principles:

(a) Proportionality (i.e. the action resulting from the decision will be proportionate to the desired outcome);

Can the portfolio holder explain how he will address the issue of proportionality in reaching his decision in respect of agenda item 7c?

Reply:

In considering the consultation, I am minded to amend the proposed recommendation by agreeing an additional 'bulge' year of one form of entry for the academic year 2013/14 in place of the proposed permanent expansion. I am also minded to revisit these issues at a later date to look more closely at the impact of any permanent expansion of Princes Plain Primary School on the demand for pupil places in the Strategic Planning Area.

Supplementary question:

How will you consult with the neighbourhood if the decision is made for permanent expansion of Keston CE Primary School?

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder for Education will come to his/her conclusion by assessing if there is still a need for additional pupil places in the area and then a new consultation process will be undertaken with all interested parties.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from Toby Blythe

- Q1 Despite repeated requests during the consultation, no meaningful proposals to deal with the acknowledged and serious traffic issues associated with Keston have been put forward from LBB - Why is this?

Reply:

The serious traffic issues in the area have been looked at and are included in the consultation responses. These issues will be reflected in decision I am minded to make and will be looked at again if any decision is made to move for permanent expansion.

Supplementary question:

Nothing has been put forward regarding serious traffic issues. What measures are being considered?

Reply:

A number of issues are being looked at with a view to mitigating the serious traffic issues identified and the movement of traffic in the area. This could include walking buses, school buses or dedicated pick up points. More radical solutions may also be considered.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from Charlie May

- Q1 In the face of such overwhelming, obvious and compelling evidence that the location of Keston School makes it inappropriate for expansion how can the Education department still recommend approval of this proposal?

Reply:

A statement in response to the questions received was reported by the Portfolio Holder for Education.

Supplementary question:

A supplementary question was not asked as Charlie May was not present.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from John Algar

- Q1 With the proposal to double the school intake, who will be taking full responsibility for the safety of the children and residents during peak times in the narrow entrance, Lakes Road and private unadopted Keston Avenue, used as the exit

Reply:

A statement in response to the questions received was reported by the Portfolio Holder for Education.

Supplementary question:

The Education and Care Services Department has proposed Keston CE Primary School be expanded as it is a good school. No concern has been given to the impact on Keston Village and the local residents. If the same consultation is undertaken again with a view to permanent expansion of the school, how will you support the area?

Reply:

Many schools in the Borough could be considered as being located in the wrong place by local residents. The planning aspects of any proposed expansion will be looked at very closely, but the concern of the Portfolio Holder for Education is to look at the local need for pupil places and the capacity of the school to expand.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from Michael Ormond

- Q1 Given the Local Authority accepts “there are no measures that could fully resolve” the significant issues concerning traffic congestion and safety (point 3.8 Consultation Outcomes), how can it be possible to expand the school on educational reasons alone?

Reply:

A statement in response to the questions received was reported by the Portfolio Holder for Education.

Supplementary question:

Can I request the decision for permanent expansion be made after the meeting of Plans Sub Committee No. 3 on Thursday 21st March 2013 to avoid predetermination of the planning decision?

Reply:

The decision does not need to be made immediately and can be made after the meeting of Plans Sub Committee No. 3 as appropriate.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from Paul Haskey

- Q1 Hyder Consulting’s traffic survey has only considered the impact of expanding the school to accommodate two bulge classes. How can the LBB report justify extrapolating the conclusions of that report to apply in the case of the much

larger proposed expansion? Is no further consideration of traffic issues intended?

Reply:

I am minded to agree expansion for an additional 'bulge' year of one form of entry for the academic year 2013/14 in place of the proposed permanent expansion. The Planning Sub-Committee will consider traffic issues arising from the expansion in more detail.

Supplementary question:

So will more discussion take place at Plans Sub Committee No. 3 on Thursday 21st March 2013?

Reply:

On the basis of the traffic survey commissioned by the Residents' Association there is no reason not to expand the school.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from Vivien Haskey

Q1 In view of the earlier comments about the viability of single entry primary schools, why is the LBB planning to close Bromley Road Infants School in Beckenham (where there is a 3 form entry infant school) and change it into a single form entry primary school?

Reply:

An exercise has recently been conducted Beckenham around the future need for primary places in the area as several major housing developments are currently underway and are expected to increase demand for school places. Following completion of the exercise it has been concluded that it would be viable for Warren Road Junior School to become a three form of entry primary school with the potential to further expand as needed, and for Bromley Road Infant School to become a one form of entry primary school.

Supplementary question:

Mrs Haskey noted that some one form entry primary schools appeared to be considered viable and queried whether Keston CE Primary School was viable as a one form of entry school.

Reply:

One form of entry primary schools tend to be more vulnerable to staffing changes and can find it difficult to manage financially. The proposal for Bromley Road Infant School to become a one form of entry primary school will be considered in light of these issues and the particular circumstances of the

area that indicate that there will be an increased demand for primary school provision in Beckenham.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from David Clapham, Chairman, Keston Village Residents' Association

Q2. The UDP Policy for Transport T13 says "The Council will normally resist developments that would substantially increase traffic on roads which are not hard paved". 100 cars and parents and children use Keston Avenue now and the Schools expansion will increase this substantially, how can this development be justified?

Reply:

A statement in response to the questions received was reported by the Portfolio Holder for Education.

Supplementary question:

Can a scatter diagram be provided of where the pupils of Keston CE Primary School live?

Reply:

This can be arranged; however the existing 'bulge' year is atypical in that expansion came at a late stage in the school year. A number of pupils with special educational needs also joined the school at this time to access the specialist support provided.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from Hilary Ryder

Q2 Paragraph 3.7 of the report agenda item 7c States that:- "The responses received and the comments made at the Consultation meeting show a significant level of opposition to the Proposal" - does the Portfolio Holder believe that the significant concerns raised by the local community have been adequately addressed by officers to enable him to make an informed decision?

Reply:

The issues raised by local residents in the consultation have been taken into account but many do not relate to the Education aspects of the proposed expansion of school and are based on traffic and parking concerns.

Supplementary question:

You suggest there could be a radical rethink of access to the school. What is it?

Reply:

Aspects could include reconsideration of the road network in the area so that an 'unofficial' one way system is not needed.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from Toby Blythe

Q2 Knowing that planning consent will be required for expansion and there are serious highways and traffic related issues already, why is it that LA Education Department does not consult with the planning department early to consider planning potential of expansion, saving a lot of time and public cost?

Reply:

The aspects of the legislation and regulations that operate for planning consent and the way the Education and Care Services Department carries out consultations regarding the proposed expansions of schools means that the two areas are kept separate.

Supplementary question:

The two issues are inexplicably linked. Do you not think that to not link the two Departments results in a flawed process?

Reply:

The decision does not need to be made immediately and can be made after the meeting of Plans Sub Committee No. 3 as appropriate.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from Charlie May

Q2 Why does the Education Department not consider the planning aspect of any expansion plans during the consultation process especially when there are such obvious planning issues to consider?

Reply:

A statement in response to the questions received was reported by the Portfolio Holder for Education.

Supplementary question:

A supplementary question was not asked as Charlie May was not present.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from John Algar

Q2 How will LBB Highways justify the absence of sight lines exiting the dangerous junction of Keston Avenue into the 30mph plus Heathfield road, visibility splays fail policy.

Reply:

This is a planning issue that should be directed to the Planning Sub-Committee.

Supplementary question:

You have quoted the traffic survey. Are you recommending the permanent expansion of Keston CE Primary School for an education reason?

Reply:

I have looked at all aspects of the two reports which make it clear that expansion of Keston CE Primary School is feasible. There is no case made in either report to preclude expansion of the school.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from Michael Ormond

Q2 The Bailey Partnership commissioned traffic survey from Hyder Consulting UK Ltd has been widely criticised by local residents as factually incorrect and misleading, will the Local Authority investigate this miscarriage before going further with their decision process?

Reply:

The Bailey Partnership traffic survey is a standard survey carried out when any school is seeking expansion. On the basis of the traffic survey carried out on behalf of the Keston Village Residents Association there was no reason identified to preclude the expansion of the school.

Supplementary question:

All the residents are talking about traffic issues but we have been told that only education issues related to the proposed expansion will be considered. Why are the traffic issues reported in the consultation not being addressed?

Reply:

My decision around the proposed expansion of the school must be based on education considerations and cannot be made based on planning and traffic issues.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from Paul Haskey

Q2 The response of the ambulance service is ambiguous and I see no response from the fire service. Is no other consultation intended on this important issue? We would like assurance that all consultations have been conducted on the basis of full expansion of the school (not just two classes).

Reply:

A recent Fire Service survey described access to Keston CE Primary School as 'adequate.'

Supplementary question:

Were the Fire Service made aware of the proposed expansion of the school?

Reply:

The survey was carried out at the request of the Keston Park Residents' Association and the results were looked at in light of the potential expansion of Keston CE Primary School.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from David Clapham, Chairman, Keston Village Residents' Association

Q3 Keston Avenue has no pavements and the exit onto Heathfield Road has poor, almost non-existent sight lines for drivers. This is dangerous and is diametrically opposed to the sentiments contained within UDP Policy T18. How can the further development of Keston CE School be justified?

Reply:

This is a planning issue that should be directed to the Planning Sub-Committee.

Supplementary question:

Please can you explain why planning issues are being 'bounced' to the meeting of Plans Sub Committee No. 3 on Thursday 21st March 2013, as that planning application is only considering a single storey extension to provide two additional classrooms and not permanent expansion of Keston CE Primary School.

Reply:

I am minded to agree expansion for an additional 'bulge' year of one form of entry for the academic year 2013/14 in place of the proposed permanent expansion. A full consultation will be undertaken if any decision is made to move for permanent expansion at a later date.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from Hilary Ryder

Q3 Why does the report 7c not identify the number of people who signed the petition but did not send in individual objections as objectors in paragraph 3.7 table 2?

Reply:

Petitions are considered separately from the rest of the objections received.

Supplementary question:

If a second consultation is undertaken around permanent expansion in the future is it better for those objecting to the application to put their objections in writing rather than in a petition?

Reply:

Individual action by those objecting to a proposal by writing an objection letter is generally seen as a stronger message than signing a petition.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from Toby Blythe

- Q3 Response to issue 5 states that 'all schools are considered for expansion'. This is misleading because LBB immediately applies 'successful and popular' criteria thus eliminating many schools. Farnborough school however (area 5) is 1FE, more successful, more applications, has better access. Why is Keston ahead of Farnborough for expansion?

Reply:

We have looked particularly at schools with the potential to expand in Strategic Planning Area 5. Keston CE Primary School has been prioritised for expansion over Farnborough Primary School as there is higher demand for pupil places at Keston CE Primary School. This will be revisited at the next meeting of the Primary Place Planning Working Group.

Supplementary question:

That is a different answer than that given to a recent Residents' Association meeting where residents were told that there was no Headteacher support for expansion at Farnborough Primary School.

Reply:

There is strong support for expansion from staff at both schools. However staff support was perceived to be higher at Keston CE Primary School.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from Charlie May

- Q3 What happens further down the line if this proposal is approved, when the small village area is overrun daily with school traffic and the situation is genuinely unmanageable. Who will be held responsible for future problems and accidents associated with school traffic?

Reply:

A statement in response to the questions received was reported by the Portfolio Holder for Education.

Supplementary question:

A supplementary question was not asked as Charlie May was not present.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from John Algar

- Q3 What steps have been taken to avoid the impact this proposal will have on Keston Village and its residents long term.

Reply:

A statement in response to the questions received was reported by the Portfolio Holder for Education.

Supplementary question:

A supplementary question was not asked as the period of time allocated for questions had expired.

Oral Question for the Education Portfolio Holder received from Michael Ormond

- Q3 Given the Council's strategy of "Building a Better Bromley" and their desire "to achieve the status of an Excellent Council", how do they feel they can achieve this if they go against the majority of local residents desire to keep Keston School as a single form entry?

Reply:

A statement in response to the questions received was reported by the Portfolio Holder for Education.

Supplementary question:

A supplementary question was not asked as the period of time allocated for questions had expired.

This page is left intentionally blank

EDUCATION PDS COMMITTEE 19th March 2013

Statement from the Portfolio Holder for Education in response to Oral Questions received.

Within the role of the Executive Member responsible for Education my remit with regards to the proposed expansion of a school such as Keston CE Primary is very specific and limited. I must consider only those matters which are directly related to the education of children within the Borough and specifically of those children whose parents have expressed a wish to see them educated at Keston Primary.

Other matters which relate to the expansion of any school which are planning (and traffic) related must be considered by others at a Planning sub-Committee meeting. In the case of Keston Primary that meeting will take place on Thursday next.

There is clear and demonstrable evidence across the Borough of a need for an increase in the numbers of Primary School places, similarly there is evidence that a substantial number of parents living in reasonable proximity to Keston wish to have their children attend Keston Primary for their introductory years in education. It is also clear that Keston Primary has the capacity to expand given its performance, staff capabilities and financial position.

Giving due regard to all of the above I am therefore minded to approve the expansion of Keston Primary School by one form of entry (30 children) commencing September 2013. However I am aware that there are issues that will arise from this decision which I can attempt to mitigate.

In order to allow the necessary time to further investigate options in Educational Planning Areas 5 regarding school placements and to address options regarding access to Keston Primary School, many of in the case of the latter, such as the use of Parking Regulations, which are not in my gift, I intend to expand the School in September 2013 as a one form of entry 'bulge' year-group only, not at this time as a permanent expansion. As previously discussed the temporary expansion commencing in September 2013 is completely justified and necessary.

The Planning sub-Committee meeting on Thursday evening will consider building proposals designed to address the temporary expansion proposed for September 2013 only, (and to a degree the previous temporary 1 FE expansion that occurred in September 2012). Planning Permission is being sought at this time for building works to accommodate this expansion such that works can be completed in good time for the 2013 intake.

Should it prove necessary and desirable to permanently expand Keston Primary School to two forms of entry, further planning permissions would be sought for further modest buildings expansions on the site. Such proposed permission might well include measures both physical and regulatory to address the various concerns expressed by residents regarding access to the School.

This page is left intentionally blank