Appendix A

COUNCIL MEETING

25th SEPTEMBER 2017

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR ORAL REPLY

1. From Sam Russell to the Leader of the Council

At the next meeting of the Executive, a decision is due to be taken regarding the future of Community Vision and Blenheim Nurseries. As the decision could involve the cessation of a directly council operated service, would the Leader consider referring the decision to a meeting of the Full Council?

Reply:
I would respectfully suggest that we should both wait and listen to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families' answers which follow on related matters, prior to making potentially premature *what if* suppositions.

Supplementary Question:
Blenheim and Community Vision stand out as fantastic beacons of good practice in this borough with fantastic employees as well. Would the Leader, if we are not going to come to full Council for this decision, be able to ensure that the Executive are able to consider, as an option, the retention of existing services, in their existing state, at the Executive meeting when the decision is due to be taken on 18th October.

Reply
I can really add nothing – all will become much clearer when you hear what is actually happening from the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families.

2. From Rhian Kanat to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families

Recent LGA figures indicate a shortfall of 2,631 secondary school places in Bromley by 2022. How long has the Council been aware of a shortage of secondary school places in the Borough, and what actions have the Council taken and what are the Council's plans to address this shortage?

Reply:
The Council uses the GLA School Roll Projections as the primary means of planning for the future provision of school places. The most recent data provided by the GLA in 2017 projects that the borough's secondary school population will grow by 2,741 between 2016 and 2022. The need for Year 7 places over the same period is projected to increase from 3,563 to 4,169. The baseline number of Year 7 places available in 2016 was 3,567 indicating a need for at least for 20 additional forms of entry by 2022. Bromley's own model based on pupils progressing through Bromley primary schools and consideration of historic net migration suggests that an additional 22 forms of entry in secondary schools will be needed by 2021.

The local authority has been planning for the growth in secondary school places since late 2013 when a paper "Planning for Growth: Review of Secondary Education" was considered by the Council's School Places Working Group and Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee. This formed the basis of the Council's

Secondary School Development Plan which is reviewed and updated on an annual basis.

This strategy initially focussed on increasing capacity through both the expansion of the existing secondary estate and supporting the opening of new schools. As the Government's Free School programme developed and more education providers were successful in having Free schools approved in Bromley, the strategy has shifted further towards the provision of new Free Schools, recognising in part that the approval and opening of Free Schools has a direct impact on the level of Basic Need Capital Grant provided by the Department for Education to enable the Council to expand existing Bromley secondary schools.

As you know, the Council does not build schools – we are simply the planning authority, and I am aware that there are colleagues in the Chamber who have differing views on what we can do and where we should open these schools. The challenge is going to be ensuring that we all work together recognising that where there is a need it is met and it is met in the correct place.

Supplementary Question:
Do you consider that the number of sites in the Local Plan is adequate?

Reply
The sites that are identified in the Local Plan do set out where we believe that there could be local education provision. It is up to the individual trusts, free schools and academies to put forward their plans for the schools.

3. From Stephen Evans to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

The post-redevelopment pavements on Beckenham High Street have been taken by restaurants for tables, chairs, plants, boxes and A-boards in an unregulated manner and are now, in such instances, narrower than pre-redevelopment. They present obstructions for the sight-impaired, disabled, those with walking-aids or prams. Who polices the restaurants' behaviour?

Reply:
All tables and chairs placed on any public highway are subject to licence under Street Trading legislation, those licences are enforced by the Street Trading Licencing Officer. Other obstructions such as plants, boxes, A-Boards and so on fall under Highways Obstruction and will be looked at by the Highways Enforcement Team.

Supplementary Question:
On the way here, I had to move a table and a chair off the pavement. For whom are the pavements provided?

Reply
The pavements are provided for pedestrians and that will always be the case. Clearly, if the pavements are wide enough, sometimes they can be enhanced by having the life of a restaurant table that is fine. But if they are causing an obstruction, preventing people from walking that is not acceptable. I will be asking the enforcement officers to go down and have a really close look.

4. From Julie Ireland to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families

The Council's auditors have presented their audit report for 2016/17 with a qualified conclusion. One reason was the failure of the Council's Children's Services Department to make the improvements requested by Ofsted following the Inadequate rating the department received. Would the Portfolio Holder please list the areas in which those improvements had not been made within the time frame of the auditors' report and state whether those improvements are now in place?

Reply:
Following Ofsted's inspection of the service in April 2016, the service was judged to be inadequate in all areas. Local Authorities judged as 'inadequate' by Ofsted are subject to further monitoring and inspection activity. Ofsted require local authorities to produce an action plan within 70 days of receipt of the inspection report.

From April 2016 to September 2016 work was carried out by the service in consultation with partners to draft an improvement plan that covered Ofsted's 23 recommendations. The Children's Services Improvement Plan was submitted to Ofsted in September 2016. The plan has identified 10 priority areas with 306 actions. The 10 priorities are:

Priority 1	Leadership and Governance
Priority 2	Management Oversight and Quality Assurance
Priority 3	Bromley Safeguarding Children Board
Priority 4	Safeguarding
Priority 5	Children Looked After
Priority 6	Care Leavers
Priority 7	Adoption Services
Priority 8	Tackling child sexual exploitation, children missing and gangs
Priority 9	Strategic Commissioning
Priority 10	Legal Services

Ofsted carry out quarterly follow up visits to review progress being made against the plan. So far, Ofsted have carried out two monitoring visits in the 2016/2017 financial year. The 1st visit was carried out on 8 and 9 November 2016 and the 2nd visit on 22 and 23 February 2017. In their feedback from the first monitoring visit, inspectors said that services were making limited progress in improving services.

There was considerable structural change at the beginning of 2017 with both myself bringing in Childrens' Services to my Education Portfolio and the recruitment of the Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Education, Care and Health Services. This recruitment has made a significant impact on the direction of travel. We were quick to introduce a number of key changes including; a restructure of the service to increase management capacity, launching service wide practice standards and a caseload promise. There has also been a significant drive to recruit quality, skilled and experienced practitioners, which has included a new permanent senior management team. Ofsted have recognised the impact of these changes in feedback to the service for the second and all subsequent monitoring visits. Feedback letters from all visits can be found on Ofsted's website https://reports.ofsted.gov.uk/local-authorities/bromley.

(The Mayor asked the Portfolio Holder to be brief; the questioner asked the Portfolio Holder to respond in particular to the last phrase in her question – whether the improvements were now in place?)

Yes, we are making improvements to the service that can be followed through in the Ofsted reports and we are following the Plan. If you look at the recent Ofsted review we were praised for some of our services, saying that we were "good" in many areas. If you look at the fundamentally good news of the DfE Commissioner Frankie Solke saying that Bromley can retain its Children's Services which is nearly unprecedented across the local authority landscape I think it is a really strong recommendation of the fact that Bromley has grasped the problem and is really committed to making our journey to excellence complete.

Supplementary Question:
Given that you are confident that all these improvements are in place, can you explain why the Department for Education said only two weeks ago that Bromley was still failing its vulnerable children?

Reply
If you read the review in full it talks about the changes that Bromley has put in place, how Bromley has driven them through with pace and at the fact that we are the first authority to retain our Children's Services. Unprecedented when it comes to local authorities. Our Ofsted review that we received last year will remain in place until we have a thorough Ofsted review. If you read the report in full, some of this is as a result of some appalling press coverage. It is a shame to see in the local media that the comments section is bubbling up into the actual article. I am reminded of Orwell talking about it being like the rattling of a stick in a swill bucket. The truth of the matter is that Frankie Solke, the DfE Commissioner, gave the services back to Bromley. The most recent Ofsted review talks about good practice and I am very proud of what we and the staff have achieved in this borough.

5. From Dr Brian Philp to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

With Bromley's sad history of heritage destruction, as at The Rookery, High Elms Mansion, the attempt to destroy the Priory/Outbuildings and the closure of its only museum in 2016, does our Council agree that the totally unnecessary demolition of the listed Vestry, an integral part of the Battle of Britain Chapel, will be another nail in the coffin of Bromley's heritage?

Reply:
The question is a little devious in that it tends to suggest that we are personally responsible for the destruction of The Rookery and High Elms Mansion. In fact, the Rookery was burnt down in 1948 before the London Borough of Bromley existed. High Elms was destroyed by fire in 1967, and in fact a project was undertaken by the authority in 2010 to record the site's heritage. The Priory outbuildings are still standing and used by local business. The Museum was moved to Bromley Central Library and £395,000 was invested in its improvement, including three new exhibition spaces, and its merger with Local Studies.

As you are aware the Council makes many other contributions to the protection of the borough's heritage, including providing annual funding to Crofton Roman Villa which you manage.

The removal of the 1990 annex to the Chapel, which is not a public space and is used primarily for storage, has been informed by heritage conservation experts. Its removal will return the historic Chapel to its original design.

Supplementary Question:
Does our Council understand that but for my direct personal intervention, the Crofton Roman Villa, Bromley's major archaeological education asset, very busy this week, would have been totally destroyed for the Civic Hall car park. Similarly, the unnecessary destruction of the Battle of Britain vestry, used as a vestry, can easily be avoided, given mutual good will.

Reply
I do understand.

(Note: It was subsequently clarified that The Rookery referred to by Dr Philp was the building in St Mary Cray, not the building in Bromley Common of the same name.)

(At this point the time allowed for questions expired, but the Mayor allowed Question Time to continue so that the key issues raised in questions 6 and 7 could be dealt with.)

6. From Ms Anna Brett to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families

Regarding the proposed closure of Community Vision Nursery in Penge, please can you explain how the combined loss of £348,000.00 has been arrived at for the two nurseries facing closure? This figure was stated in a letter to parents dated 28/06/17. Our FOI applications for this information are overdue.

Reply:
The implication in the question is that closure is an inevitability - that is not the case. I have addressed this point with the MPs for Lewisham West and Penge and Croydon North. Closure was stated in the letter as one of three options that were under consideration for the nurseries. The point is that this was consideration. We went out to a consultation to get a better idea of what the landscape was – this was expressed to Labour colleagues. The consultation was designed for us to achieve a better understanding of how the nurseries operate, if they were reaching and serving the right people and to ensure that those in the community who are most in need of the support were receiving it. I did become aware that there was a narrative starting up around the pre-determined idea that there was a closure of a nursery. That digital manipulation of the facts is something that we need to be wary of in the future. We undertook the consultation, we listened to feedback, we analysed the data and we have concluded that the best option on the table was to continue with that nursery provision. There will be some implementation of necessary changes that will make the service viable, which was one of the three possible options identified at the start of the process, but the nurseries will remain open and we will be in discussions about the best way to move that forward.

Supplementary Question:
That is fantastic news. To make our nursery more financially viable, since 2013 our nursery has made the borough nearly three quarters of a million pounds, so how can we reconcile that against the claim the nursery is making a loss?

Reply
I assume that you are talking about Community Vision. I am happy to go into further detail, perhaps outside or in writing. There is a long-term issue of Children's Services buying places at the nurseries that we did not necessarily require, which meant that there was a surplus of cash going in, which meant that the funding was balancing off places for people that did not necessarily need them. The point of the consultation was to get in and find all this so we are determined to make sure that we get the best services for people but that the money that is set aside for helping those people that need extra assistance gets to them.

Additional Supplementary question:
Councillor Angela Wilkins asked the Portfolio Holder to confirm that the good news that he had announced applied to both nurseries.

Reply:
Absolutely, yes. We found some real differences in use between Blenheim and Community Vision – showing how vital it was to get out there and get a proper idea of what the services is. I am happy to share all of this in more detail.

7. From Ian Catchpole to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families

Before the recent publicity, was the Council aware of St. Olave's Grammar School's policy on withdrawing places to children entering year 13, if so when did they become aware, did they agree with the school's policy, and what contact has the Council had following the recent publicity in the media?"

Reply:
I am informed that the Local Authority was made aware of this by a group of teachers on 18 July 2017 following their letter to the Chair of Governors asking the school to re-consider its position on the policy. In addition, the local authority received four letters from concerned parents on the 25th and 26th of July in respect of this. A formal letter was sent by the Education Director on 26 July to the Head Teacher asking him to explain his position and also putting across the views of concerned parents and staff.

The Local Authority is clear that the policy of the school was wrong and validated its views by seeking Counsel's opinion on the matter. The local authority discussed its position with the Department for Education, Ofsted and Diocese and was instrumental in the U turn decision made by the school. We did not have these conversations out in the media, we had them as partners.

We have been very concerned about this issue. We have worked behind the scenes with partners to resolve this matter.

The question also gives me an opportunity to answer a few more points.

The local authority asserts that the initial decision was flawed, and it was wrong for the school to throw out some sixth formers. This was also the view of the Counsel who looked into this on behalf of the local authority. The oversight of maintained

schools is laid out in legislation. The law is much clearer in respect of failing schools, and less so in terms of high performing schools and St Olave's is a high performing school. Oversight is maintained by the local authority, reviewing attainment results of children attending school, reviewing fixed term and permanent exclusions and addressing any safeguarding issues. Safeguarding was an area that we looked at but with two recent reports there were no safeguarding issues raised by either of those two scrutiny bodies.

The local authority also plays an active role in supporting and challenging schools judged as not performing well by Ofsted, but as I said the school is performing well.

Regarding the appointment of a governor, as a local authority we have the right to nominate a governor, rather than appoint, and we have done that. We do not have the legal mandate to compel the school to accept the nomination. We have formally nominated an individual, and recent information tells me that this individual has been rejected. We are seeking further information as to why that individual was rejected, as I can see no professional reason for that being the case. We have formally asked the new chairman of the governing body to consider this (and you will know that there is a new chairman and deputy chairman.) I have been in contact with the new chairman today, there has been an expression of eagerness to work very closely with the local authority, and it is paramount for the local authority to await the response from the chairman a decision is reached on this matter. At the beginning of this meeting the Director of Education, Children and Families provided more confirmation from Counsel that the opinion is that we have no scope for the local authority to interfere or to issue a warning notice.

There are a couple of questions about the Headmaster's pay. That is an issue for the governing body as the employer, not the local authority. We have been asked if we had any information about the companies that the school has set up. The Council gave St Olave's no permission to set these companies up and we are presently establishing whether the companies would require the consent of the local authority.

Over a couple of very busy weeks we have worked very hard to make sure that we are fulfilling all of our duties, and especially with our primary care about safeguarding. The two independent scrutiny bodies have found no safeguarding issues and there really are no doors for us to go through.

I have also been made aware that there are considerable elements of support for the school, and the school is rather worried about its reputation. It is a good school – if it was not a good school then people would not want to send their children there. I am fully convinced that when it gets to the application process for this year it will once again be oversubscribed. The local authority is committed to working with the good school, pulling the levers we can, using the influence that we have, albeit soft, to make sure that we get to the position where parents, the school and pupils are best served by a school in this borough.

Supplementary Question:
Given the disregard for several regulations and lack of proper governance, will the Portfolio Holder undertake to review the Education Inspections Act 2006 section 61e which states that a maintained school is eligible for intervention if there has been a serious breakdown in the way that the school has been managed or governed.

Reply

As live and fresh as just before this meeting, we have further Counsel opinion to say that we have no method or vehicle of intervention and no lever to pull. We will use what soft influence that we have to make sure that we get the school to the position which it should rightly have as one of the jewels of education landscape in this borough.

Additional supplementary question:
Councillor Simon Fawthrop asked what actions were available to the Council if St Olave's continued to reject the Council's nominations for governor.

Reply:
One would hope that in the spirit of co-working they would accept the nomination of a local authority governor, especially as we would go to all good care and attention to ensure that the person we send over is appropriate. They are not forced to accept our nomination, however, I think it would get to a point where unreasonable rejection could give us concern to escalate up to another level.

Additional supplementary question:
Councillor Kim Botting asked the Portfolio Holder why a school like St Olave's is described as causing concern or having weak governors or management given the outstanding Ofsted and SIAMS reports and the unrivalled public exam results this year. Public confidence was demonstrated by the record 1300 pupils sitting the entrance test last Friday and a record 241 students joining year 12. Parents choose the school because of the way it is and has always been and the Mayor of the London and the Woollard Group have awarded grants to St Olave's as a hub to lead other schools. As a local councillor for Orpington I attended their prize-giving ceremony.

Why is it causing so much concern? We should be supporting the school and celebrating its successes.

Reply:
I can certainly empathise with why people have concern, especially if the transition from year one to year two of A levels is broken. When the local authority, Department for Education and others went to look at the legal construct for that it was found that it was illegal practice. Hence, the school has u-turned, and we took an important part in that.

You raise an important point, which is around the Ofsted review, the SIAMS review about safeguarding and the results. If you think back to my argument previously to the three issues that we as a local authority we could go in and do something about, all of those three issues have been positively reported on by independent bodies, so there is no route for us to go in using one of those issues as an area of concern. I can empathise with parents and pupils who have their education broken like that, but I do recognise that it is a very popular school, it will probably be oversubscribed again and I can understand why people would want to continue their education at St Olave's.

Additional supplementary question:
Councillor Robert Evans remarked that there had been numerous valid questions, but some were unsubstantiated and too personal. He asked the Portfolio Holder if he welcomed the note from the current Chairman of Governors, and if he would applaud the stellar achievements of this outstanding school.

Reply:
As I mentioned earlier, I had some correspondence with Dr Paul Wright, the newly appointed Chairman of Governors, and he did set out a long briefing paper which I have not read yet. The main point I take from that correspondence is that he is very keen to establish good working relations with the local authority and I am very keen to do that as well.

Regarding the second point applauding the achievements of an outstanding school, it is without question that many children have done incredibly well at St Olave's.

(At this point the time allowed for questions ran out and written answers were sent for the following questions.)

8. From Dr Josh King to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families

What is the Council's position on the initial decision taken by St Olave's School to throw out some 6th formers half way through their A level studies?

Reply:
The Local Authority asserts that the initial decision was flawed and it was wrong for the school to throw out some 6th formers. This was also the view of the Counsel who looked into this on behalf of the Local Authority.

9. From Louise Selvadurai to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families

Please could Council members explain what oversight the Council has of Saint Olave's grammar school in Orpington?

Reply:
The oversight of maintained schools is laid out in legislation. The law is much clearer in respect of failing schools and less so for a high performing school. Oversight is maintained by the Local Authority reviewing attainments results of children attending the school, reviewing of fixed term and permanent exclusion and addressing any safeguarding issues. The Local Authority also plays an active role in supporting and challenging schools judged as not performing well by Ofsted.

10. From Rita Radford to the Leader of the Council
Can the newly appointed Leader of the Council assure the residents of the London Borough of Bromley that he/she will ensure that their concerns about local matters are given due weight?

Reply:
Yes I can.

11. From David Evans to the Leader of the Council

In the light of the public's overwhelming condemnation of the Biggin Hill Memorial Museum design is the new Leader of the Council prepared to admit that this is, to

quote Cambridge Professor of Architecture Gavin Stamp, 'a bad divisive scheme and it would be a scandal if it goes ahead?

Reply:
No I certainly wouldn't and would remind Mr Evans that the Heritage Lottery Fund described the scheme as being "exemplary" and the design was developed with advice from Historic England [previously known as English Heritage].

That said, I do readily accept that aesthetics are a matter of subjective personal opinion.

12. From Tia Fisher

I would like to know why, despite the fact that St Olave's is an LEA-controlled school, Bromley Council does not respond to the complaints from parents and staff over a number of years, and has regarded the Year 12 exclusions for a grade C or below as 'legal' when the DfE rules that they are not?

Reply:
As indicated earlier, the Local Authority does not consider the policy as legal. The Local Authority has responded to complaints from teaching staff and from parents as indicated above. Please do let me know if any complaints remain outstanding.

13. From Michael Thatcher to the Leader of the Council

Is it morally defensible for one of the richest boroughs in the country to use Lottery funds to build the Biggin Hill museum, replacing their own legally allocated funds, held in escrow for many years, thus denying other deserving charities of assistance?

Reply:
Yes it is, very much so, given the significant monies contributed to the Lottery over many years by Bromley residents set against the outrageously unfair and totally inadequate revenue funding which Bromley residents receive from Central Government per capita compared to other, less efficient and over bloated mainly Inner London Boroughs.

The chart (Appendix 1) which is placed before you this evening and which will be appended to this evening's minutes illustrates this graphically.

Additionally it is should be noted that the Heritage Lottery Fund has previously actively encouraged Bromley to submit applications and historically we have been a priority borough for funding.

14. From Sarah McAleer to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families

In view of the unlawful exclusion of St Olave's students between Years 12 and 13 (limiting students' options and manipulating school results),

a) why has the local authority not nominated its own governor to provide the skills, support and challenge necessary to an effective governing body?
b) will the local authority investigate the current governance of the school, particularly with a focus on its accountability and transparency?

Reply:

a) The Local Authority has in fact nominated its own governor. However, the Local Authority does not have the legal mandate to compel the school to accept its nomination as indicated earlier.
b) As indicated earlier, the Local Authority has formally asked the new Chairman of the Governing Body to consider this. It is paramount for the Local Authority to await the response from the Chairman before a decision is reached on this matter.

15. From Julian Grainger to the Chairman of the Education, Children & Families Select Committee

Noting that:
i) The unlawful grade-exclusion policy at St Olave's has operated since 2011 despite annual challenge, seriously disrupting the lives of around 60 young people and their families.
ii) The practice of barring students from sitting A-levels to manipulate league tables limits future options for students.
iii) Staff and students have reported behaviour that some might consider "threatening."
iv) The unprecedented number of forum and email comments from parents and students, recent and current, attesting to a culture described as "toxic" and "uncaring."
iv) St Olave's has a history of ignoring regulations.
vi) A school with excellent students and teachers deserves a leadership that does not undermine its academic reputation by a combination of league table manipulation and supine governance.

Would the Chairman agree: a) that an immediate investigation into the above and related matters is more than justified, b) that if governance of the school is found wanting, an Interim Executive Board could be appointed?

Reply:

a) As indicated earlier, the Local Authority has formally asked the new Chairman of the Governing Body to consider this. It is paramount for the Local Authority to await the response from the Chairman before a decision is reached on this matter. The Education Select Committee does not have the mandate to intervene in this.

b) The Local Authority asserts that the grounds for an Interim Executive Board are not met as this is mainly used in respect of schools that are failing.

16. From Tony Wright-Jones to the Chairman of the Education, Children and Families Select Committee

St Olave's has a growing list of deficiencies in leadership and governance such as:

a) Staff, Parent and Student complaints and concerns being ignored.
b) Rigging by the Head Master in the democratic election of a Chairman.

c) A history of Numerous regulations and statutory guidelines ignored.

Would the Chairman agree the leadership appears autocratic and appropriate governance significantly lacking, and that;

a) a proper investigation undertaken immediately;
b) to include a School and Governance Review; and
c) an Interim Executive Board is an option

- to protect students and teachers from harm.

Reply:
(a) As indicated earlier, the Local Authority has formally asked the new Chairman of the Governing Body to consider this. It is paramount for the Local Authority to await the response from the Chairman before a decision is reached on this matter.

(b) The Education Select Committee does not have the mandate to intervene in this by conducting a school and governance review

(c) The Local Authority asserts that the grounds for an Interim Executive Board are not met as this is mainly used in respect of schools that are failing. The Counsel`s opinion supports this.

17. From Sam Russell to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families

A decision about the future of Community Vision and Blenheim Nurseries is due to be taken at the Executive Meeting on 18thOctober. Could the Portfolio Holder summarise the opportunities for scrutiny related to this decision that will have taken place prior to this meeting?

Reply:
As the service will continue at both nurseries a report will no longer be going before the Executive Committee in October.

18. From Rhian Kanat to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families

Please could the Council provide a breakdown of the shortfall of secondary school places by gender in different parts of the Borough?

Reply:
The local authority does not hold data in this format.

The primary source of projection data is the GLA School Roll Projections which for the secondary sector is provided at a borough wide level. This includes details of the projected school population broken down by gender. However, projecting the shortage of place for either boys or girls is not possible as approximately 49% of places across the borough are in schools where gender is not an admissions criterion.

However, the local authority monitors the secondary school gender balance at a borough-wide level. Based on Year 7 PANs currently 29% of school places are in girl's school and 22% in boy's schools. It is noted that there has been a reduction in

places in boy's schools due to Harris Beckenham becoming co-educational and Kemnal reducing its published admission number (PAN).

19. From Stephen & Diana Evans to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

What provision has been made in the redevelopment of Beckenham High Street for the parking and/or secure parking of bicycles?

Reply:
One of the key scheme objectives of the Beckenham improvements works is to improve the quantity and quality of the cycling infrastructure in Beckenham town centre. The current scheme design will see an increase in the number of individual cycle stands from 6 (six) to 30 (thirty). It is proposed that the new cycle stands will be sited along the length of the High Street at appropriate locations that offer good passive security coverage and serve individual parades of shops. In addition it is proposed to install 2 "Dr Bike' cycle pumps and repair units at Beckenham Junction Station and Sainsbury forecourts. Key cycle stand locations will include outside Marks and Spencer, Kelsey House, Beckenham Green, Beckenham Junction and Sainsbury's.

20. From Julie Ireland to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

How many apprenticeships has the Council offered since 2014 and what is the current employment status of the people who took up those apprenticeships?

Reply:
Since 2014 there have been 7 apprenticeship posts within the Council and Community and Voluntary Controlled schools. Of these 7 posts 2 have continued to be employed within the Council. Additionally, the Council fully funded the Bromley Employment Scheme (The YES Programme) at circa £500k over a two year period, aimed at providing community based apprenticeship and work experience opportunities. Under the YES programme a total of -----apprentices were recruited into public, private and voluntary sector organisations mainly in the borough.

In response to the new Apprenticeship Levy which came into force on the 6th April 2017 and as part of the Government's Vision for 2020 to increase the number and quality of apprenticeship opportunities, the Council has developed a hybrid model scheme which provides for;

- a number of permanent dedicated apprenticeship roles within Departments using existing vacancies
- a pool of apprentices who will be trained in basic administration and business skills and who would then be available to be utilised across the Council for relevant posts graded at circa £18k as an alternative to using agency staff where this need was identified.

In addition to the mandatory levy which in our case is £350k (0.5% of pay bill), the Council has also provided a one off £200k totalling £550k to support the programme. The Council's target under the Apprenticeship Levy is 34. Following a successful open recruitment day for potential apprentices, parents and guardians, and school representatives 10 recruits are being processed for suitable placement of which 5

have already been placed or matched to suitable roles in the organisation. HR is working with managers to match the other 5 recruits, and further selection interviews will be taking place shortly to recruit more apprentices. Managers and services with recruitment and retention challenges including children and adult care, environment health and planning services to mention a few are working with HR to develop a 'Grow your Own Scheme' using the apprenticeship route. There is strong leadership both at the political and the Chief Executive levels for the Council's apprenticeship programme.

The proposal benefits both the Council by utilising funding made available through the digital portal and the Local Community as the Scheme is only be available to Bromley Residents and offers real opportunities for future employment and acquisition of skills.

21. From Dr Brian Philp to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

In January, 2015 the Prime Minster stated "we will protect the chapel and do all we can to protect and preserve it for future generations." £2M of Libor money was then allocated for the purpose. With the intended demolition of the listed Vestry, an integral part of the Chapel, which part of "protect and preserve" does the Council and its two advisers not understand?

Reply:
The project has been developed specifically to protect and preserve the Chapel and Biggin Hill's wartime heritage, and the Council fully understands these words. The vestry is not an integral part of the Chapel, it is a storage annex built in 1990.

22. From Anna Brett to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families

FOI application 13384 MOSELEY shows Community Vision Nursery made a profit for 3 years before 2016/2017 when it made a £16,073.00 loss. This is due to a £85,840.00 drop in CSC recharge, 68% less than forecast and 67% less than 2015/2016 actuals. Please explain why this reduction has occurred?

Reply:
The nurseries for several years have received an annual recharge from Children's Social Care to support referrals to the nurseries for children formally assessed as being in need. It has been established that the actual cost is substantially below the amount received. It is not appropriate that social care funding, intended to support eligible children in need, continues to be used to subsidise the cost of places for both fee paying and Free Early Years funded children where there is no such evidence of need . The recharge from Social Care has been reduced accordingly.

23. From Louise Selvadurai to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families

Please could Council members confirm when a representative of the LEA will be confirmed as a governor of Saint Olave's Grammar school in Orpington?

Reply:
As indicated earlier, nominations were put to the Governing Body by the Local Authority. We are awaiting the outcome of the latest nomination.

24 From Rita Radford to the Leader of the Council

Will the newly appointed Leader strive to ensure the reputation of London Borough of Bromley Council is beyond reproach?

Reply:
I am very happy to confirm that I will strive to ensure the reputation of the London Borough of Bromley continues to remain beyond reproach at all times.

25. From David Evans to the Leader of the Council

Does the Leader agree with me that the St George's Royal Air Force Chapel of Remembrance is a most sensitive site with regard to its development?

Reply:
Yes I do, very much so.

26. From Tia Fisher to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families

When will there be representation from the LEA on the St Olave's Board of Governors?

Reply:
As soon as the Governing Body decide at their next Board meeting in October 2017.

27. From Sarah McAleer to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families

Can the Portfolio Holder please tell me the date(s) on which the Council gave permission for any such St Olave's company/companies to be set up?

Reply:
The Council did not give St Olave`s the permission or mandate to set up these companies. The Council is presently establishing whether the company is one for which consent would be required.

28. From Sam Russell to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families

In report CS14073, section 3.10, it is stated that additional nurseries in Penge "do not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the volumes currently accessing Community Vision Nursery." Would this, in the Portfolio Holder's opinion, be evidence that no other provider is willing to provide childcare?

Reply:
The report referred to sets out the position as it was in 2014 and the childcare landscape in the Penge area has changed since then. Recent research undertaken by officers has shown that the Penge and Cator Ward (which Community Vision is located in) has the second highest number of childcare places of all the Borough Wards. There are currently 7 day nurseries, 2 of these are awaiting their first graded inspection and the others are all graded Good. A further 7 preschools provide a mixture of sessional and extended childcare. 2 are graded Outstanding and 4 are Good. There are also 24 childminders within the ward, many of whom are now offering the Funded Childcare places.

In addition, the Early Years Quality team are currently supporting a proposed new setting in the ward and a local primary school have indicated they would like to open a nursery in September 2018. These will provide additional capacity in the area.

Although some of the settings are full with waiting lists there are vacancies across the Ward with a large number at the new provision which is a 6 minute walk from Community Vision.

Our Sufficiency assessment, carried out in August 2017 demonstrates that there is sufficient capacity to meet the childcare demand in the Ward and in the neighbouring wards of Clock House, Crystal Palace and Copers Cope. This includes the predicted demand for the newly introduced 30 hours extended entitlement.

29. From Anna Brett to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families

Has anyone body responsible for making the decision to close Community Vision actually visited the nursery? If not, are there plans for this visit to happen before the Executive Meeting on 18th October?

Reply:
As the service will now continue members of the Executive will not now be making a decision regarding the future of the nursery on 18th October.

30. From Louise Selvadurai to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families

Please could council members explain what action the council and the borough's Department for Education Services is taking after Saint Olave's Grammar school's policy of removing pupils from the school based on academic achievement at the end of Year 12 was deemed to be unlawful by the Department for Education?

Reply:
As indicated earlier, the Local Authority has formally asked the new Chairman of the Governing Body to consider this. It is paramount for the Local Authority to await the response from the Chairman before a decision is reached on this matter.

31. From David Evans to the Leader of the Council

When the London Borough of Bromley agreed to take on the RAF Chapel did they realise that they did so on behalf of the nation?

Reply:
Yes, Bromley Council did. I strongly believe that the Council was right to do so as well, despite the financially straightened times we are living through, as that single action prevented the building from being mothballed by the MOD.

Since it did so, the Council has invested significant officer resource developing the project which recently gained approval, the future success of which will safeguard the Chapel moving to the future.

32. From Tia Fisher to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families

How can teachers and parents of students at St Olave's pursue an investigation into the governing body and senior management of the school in order to expose and correct the lack of pastoral care, lack of whistle-blowing policy, and the authoritarian nature of the regime imposed by the headmaster and Senior Leadership Team, who do not listen to concerns from staff, parents and students?

Reply:
Firstly, by raising these concerns with the Governing Body who are responsible for the running of the school and if not satisfied, by raising it directly with the Diocese and the Local Authority. Complaints can also be made directly to the DfE and also to Ofsted as regulators.

Appendix 1 (Question 13)

Whole of London Funding per Head 2017/18
(including Transition Grant)