Councillors Kober (Chair), Bevan, Canver, Goldberg, Strickland, Vanier, Waters and

Watson

Apologies None

MINUTE		ACTON
NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	BY

CAB222	APOLOGIES
	There were no apologies for absence received.
CAB223	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
	There were no declarations of interest put forward.
CAB224	DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS
	The Cabinet agreed to consider two deputations in relation to Item 4, the expansion of Belmont Infant and Junior school's from two to three form entry. The first deputation was from Julie Mukherjee representing parents, governors and staff from Belmont Junior School and the second would be from Tom Anderson representing the parents, governors and staff at Belmont Infant School.
	The Chair invited Julie Mukherjee to address the Cabinet and put forward representations in relation to the proposed expansion of the Junior school.
	Ms Mukherjee addressed the committee in her capacity as a parent of children at both Belmont Infant and Junior schools but was speaking on behalf of other parents, governors and teaching staff to oppose the proposal to expand the Junior school. The arguments put forward against the expansion were:
	That there was not enough space in the school to support the expansion – reference was made to the small playground and the already limited space in the school dinning area.
	The funding envelope for the expansion of both schools was considered to be less than spent on other schools in the past and not enough to complete a suitable expansion.
	The attendance of children from the Vale Special School had not

been adequately considered in the plans for expansion as any

changes to the buildings would need to accommodate the mobility and safety of children and they could not envisage how this would be achieved in an already limited space.

- The council calculation of future places needed at the school was disputed as there was already a shortfall of places at the Junior school in years 4 and 5. Therefore it was contended that a future shortfall of places would lead to a future shortfall in funding. This would have a detrimental impact on the schools income and lead to staffing reductions. The deputation was keen to protect the established good teacher leadership in the school.
- It was felt that the petitions consisting of a combination of 700 signatures opposing the expansion had not been given appropriate consideration.

The parents were keen to protect the ethos of "good local schools for all" and asked that Cabinet vote against the proposals for expansion of both Belmont Junior and Infant schools.

As part of the deputation procedure, Cabinet Members put forward questions to the deputation party and gained the following understanding of their position.

- The increased funding envelope of £3.5m was still felt not to adequately cover the expansion of two schools.
- They did not agree with the figures arrived at in the school place planning strategy.
- The higher overheads associated with a bigger school would lead to a reduced income if places were not filled at the school.
- They questioned the council's application to the argument that more school places were needed in Tottenham and gave an example of where they perceived this need not to be applied. The Leader questioned the accuracy of this assertion and clarified that there had not been a 4000 home development project in Tottenham Hale and the area referred to covered student residential units as well as homes.

The Cabinet Member for Children responded to the issues raised in the deputation and those arising from subsequent Member questions. It was important to note that there was an experienced and requisitely skilled Pupil Place Steering group which examined the cases put forward for school expansion. It was accepted that there was not a vast amount of space at the two schools however the group had assessed that there was enough space to allow the good design of and a fit for purpose school that would cater for all students. The detailed physical design of the school would commence shortly and there was an opportunity for parents, governors and staff to influence the designs and ensure that issues such as the small play ground and school dining area were looked at and solutions found.

It was not appropriate to compare the past allocations of council funding

for school expansions as these were in different economical times. However there had been due consideration given to the previous issues highlighted by the governing body about the cost of the expansion and the funding envelope had been increased from £2.2m to £3.5m.

In response to the concerns raised about the accessibility and use of the expanded school by children from the Vale Special School, the council was committed to the integration of pupils and there was a genuine belief that the expanded school would have better access for disabled children. For example part of the plans would involve making corridors wider to assist children with mobility problems. This was a key priority for the council and the team that would be working on the expansion had experience of working with special schools.

In relation to the filling of school places, the Cabinet Member for Children was confident that there would not be under filled school places as there had been a higher number of reception places sought this year than in previous years. Therefore the concern about the future loss in income to the school would not be realised. There were lower numbers of pupils at key stage 2 age in schools across the borough which would account for the under filled places at the junior school in years 4 and 5.

The school place planning policy was clear that extra school places were needed in West Green/Tottenham area. Consideration had been given to the very good leadership of the school and the school's outstanding results when proposing the expansion. Also there was a demand for places as children living $\frac{1}{2}$ a mile away from the school still could not get into the school, after the admission criteria had been applied.

It was further clarified that there had been an application for a Free school in Tottenham but the take up of places at this school would not impact on the need for places in the West Green / Tottenham area. In relation to suggestion that Noel Park School should remain 3 form entry, this was a different school which had much smaller classrooms and could not accommodate a high number of pupils in each class.

The Chair invited Tom Anderson, the spokesperson of the second deputation representing Belmont Infant school parents, governors and staff to address the meeting.

Mr Anderson began his presentation by insisting that the fundamental issues relating to the expansion of the two schools had not been addressed. He explained that parents had approached the initial proposal of the expansion with an open mind but had been failed to be convinced of its overall benefit to the school when considering the funding envelope, the current space at the school and initial planning documents. Reference was made to neighbouring schools Noel Park and Downhill's which had recently been converted to sponsored academy status and it was felt that the uncertainty around these two schools had been part of the reason to focus the expansion and provision of extra school places on Belmont schools.

Mr Anderson contended that the outstanding Ofsted rating of the school would be put at risk by the expansion and gave further reasons about the cost and impact on staff leadership of the school.

He contended that the issues raised in the consultation meetings by parents had not been listened to and claimed that should the Cabinet agree to expand the two schools, there would be an appeal to the Schools Adjudicator and the process for the schools to become Academies commence.

Following no further Cabinet Member questions, the Cabinet Member for Children accepted that there had been a lot of arguments put forward from different viewpoints opposing the two school's expansions. However there was an undeniable need for more school places as illustrated in the school place planning report. This need was further demonstrated by the number of bulge classes in other schools. To provide a quality education it was necessary to expand schools rather than continue with bulge classes. When considering the areas of most need for school places, they were in the vicinity of Belmont Infant and Junior School.

The funding for the expansion should be considered in the current economic climate and within the context of £84m cuts made by the council. However the Council had a responsibility to provide children in the borough with a school place and provide a reception class in 2013 at Belmont Infant School to meet demands. The deputation was assured that the council would endeavour to provide a school expansion according to purpose and landscape together with ensuring the school was better suited to disabled children attending from the Vale School.

The planning arrangements for the expansion were not mismanaged and were focused on providing a space for the expansion.

The Cabinet Member for Children and the Leader opposed the view that parents had not been listened to and pointed to the additional public meetings held as well as meetings at councillor surgeries and additional meetings with the school governing body. However there was an equal need to give consideration to the families that wanted their children to attend Belmont Infant and Junior school.

CAB225

PROPOSALS TO EXPAND BELMONT INFANT SCHOOL AND BELMONT JUNIOR SCHOOL FROM TWO TO THREE FORMS OF ENTRY TO TAKE EFFECT FROM SEPTEMBER 2013 AT BELMONT INFANT SCHOOL AND SEPTEMBER 2016 AT BELMONT JUNIOR SCHOOL

Prior to considering this report the Leader referred to the Local Government Act 1972 Section 100b which advised that Cabinet can consider late reports under special urgency. The report was late to allow necessary information to be included responding to the issues raised in

respect of the earlier report to Cabinet on 10 July which was withdrawn. The Leader advised that a special Cabinet meeting was promptly organised on the following day, 11 July, to consider this report and the date notified to both deputation parties. The report was published on 13th July, following the completion of responses to the representations made regarding the earlier report.

The proposals being considered were the expansion of Belmont Infant School and Belmont Junior school from two to three form entry, to take effect from September 2013 at Belmont Infant School and September 2016 at Belmont Junior school.

The Cabinet Member for Children introduced the report and explained that the council had a statutory duty to provide local places for children at schools; the council had a duty to serve the community and ensure school places were available. The Cabinet Member for Children had considered the options and believed that expansion of Belmont Infant and Junior school was the best option and planning permission would be sought in January 2013 for the expansion to allow an additional reception class to be available by September 2013. Although parents of both schools had set out their objections to the expansion, consideration was given to the positive impact of the expansion as well as the mitigating actions that could be taken to counter against any access issues of Vale Special School students to Belmont whilst the changes took place. With expansion there will follow more money, a larger SLT and an opportunity for greater specialisms and diversity in the management of and delivery of the curriculum and to address the very special and individual needs of The Vale pupils, as well as of all the pupils generally. The indicative designs allowed for greater access between sites and should the expansion be agreed, the Vale pupils would be a key consideration when the final plans are drawn up.

An application from Harris to open a Free School in Tottenham has progressed to the next stage. Two reception classes were planned and a site had not yet been identified. Even with the potential opening of this school there was still a need to provide places in West Green/Tottenham area. Therefore these factors were considered together with the objections of parents and it was felt that there was a need to meet the needs of all families living in the area and build and expand the school.

Following Cabinet Member questions, the following clarifications were made:

- That the £3.5m would enable expansion,
- There was a waiting list for the infant school but not the junior school the proposed expansion would not lead the school to lose money.
- Following application on the admissions criteria there would be more places available to children that live in the vicinity of Belmont Infant and Junior schools.

Assurance was further given that the particular needs of the disabled

children attending Belmont Infant and Junior schools from the Vale Special School had been taken into consideration when compiling the proposals for the expansion. The EQIA reflected the work undertaken and in particular there had been engagement with the families of the children about plans. The Cabinet Member for Children reiterated that there would be a careful plan compiled which would set out what would happen each day for disabled children attending the school when the expansion commenced. The design would accommodate the needs of disabled children moving around the school and the team working on the expansion had previous experience of designing similar schools.

The Director for Children's service gave assurance to the Cabinet that the building would be designed within budget and in a suitable space. The service was confident in its school place planning predictions and places at the school were expected to be filled making the schools more financially viable as they expanded.

The factors supporting the expansion of Belmont Infant and Primary schools were: that it was an outstanding school, there was room for expansion and it was in an area where places were needed. Parents were again invited to participate in discussions about the design.

Having carefully read the report including all the appendices and having carefully taken into account representations received throughout the consultation process, including the evening's deputation, and, having due regard to council's public sector equality duty, the Leader asked Cabinet to approve the proposals set out in the report subject to the grant of planning of permission. The permission, if granted, be obtained by 15 January 2013.

The Leader further reminded the Cabinet that the reasons for this decision were set out in the report in that there was a need for expansion to accommodate the demand for additional school places. This school fitted the criteria for expansion despite the objections and concerns raised as it was a popular school with proven and increasing demand. The school is outstanding and successful and able to meet all the requirements for expansion and meets the Council's school place planning principles.

Following a Cabinet Member vote the following resolutions were made:

RESOLVED

- That the feedback from the consultations carried out in respect of the proposed expansion of Belmont Infant School and Belmont Junior School be noted.
- ii. That the analysis of other factors including the provision of and demand for reception places across Haringey and, in particular, in and around West Green ward that is set out both in this report and set out in detail in the School Place Planning Report 2012 be

noted.

Having considered the findings of the consultation and objections attached at Appendices 9, 10, 11,12,16,17 and 22, and the Equality Impact Assessment attached at Appendix 7, the recommendation without modification (in line with Para. 4.74 of the DfE guidance) that Belmont Infant and Belmont Junior Schools are expanded from 2 forms of entry (56/60 places) to 3 forms of entry (84/90 places) with effect from the reception intake in September 2013 be agreed. This approval was conditional on the granting of any planning permission required as a result of the expansion works that may or may not be required under the relevant planning legislation, any such planning permission to be obtained by 15 January 2013.

Dir Children's Services

iv. That an increase in the estimated cost of the expansion scheme from £2.2m, within the currently approved Capital Programme for 2013-2015, to £3.5m be approved.

Dir Children's Services

v. That it be noted the design of how the additional form of entry will be delivered on site has not been finalised and will be the subject of ongoing further consultation with the school community, including its Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and Governors.

Dir Children's Services

vi. That it is noted in accordance with Paragraph 4.77 of the guidance that 'all decisions must give reasons for the decision, irrespective of whether the proposals were rejected or approved, indicating the main factors/criteria for the decision', and the reasons were set out in the report and were referred to by the Leader immediately prior to putting the resolutions to a vote. (There was a need for expansion to accommodate the demand for additional school places. This school fitted the criteria for expansion despite the objections and concerns raised as it was a popular school with proven and increasing demand. The school is outstanding and successful and able to meet all the requirements for expansion and meets the Council's school place planning principles.)

CAB226 ANNUAL SCHOOL PLACE PLANNING 2012

Prior to considering this report the Leader referred to the Local Government Act 1972 Section 100b which advised that Cabinet can consider late reports under special urgency. As the previous expansion report and School Place Planning Report were linked it had also been necessary to withdraw the School Place Planning report from the Cabinet meeting on 10th July. The report was late as it was necessary to ensure the representations received by the Council had been responded to before a report was put forward for decision.

The report provided an assessment of demand for pupil places in Haringey's Primary, Secondary, Special schools and Post 16 settings

and provided an update on actions being take to ensure adequate places and robust planning were in place to meet demand for mainstream and special school and post 16 places across the borough.

The Cabinet were asked to note that there were four bulge reception classes required for September 2012 as all classes were full. Increase demand coupled with rising birth rates meant that providing additional places at primary schools through to secondary schools was imperative. The introduction of free schools and new Academies may have complicated the process of planning schools places but they do not diminish the findings that an increased number of school places was needed.

The Cabinet Member for Children responded to questions from Cabinet Members and it was noted that:

- If Belmont Infant and Junior schools were to become Academies then the Council would need to consider alternative expansion schemes and in the meantime the bulge classes would continue.
- Tottenham area place provision the decisions relating to expansion of Lancastrian school was on hold to take account of the E-Acts provision, Welbourne Primary school was due to expand as there was a need to provide places in the middle of Tottenham.
- The forecasts for place planning altered as the applications are made during the year; the availability of the census data for 2011 will further inform base data in early 2013.

Further to considering the information contained in the report the Cabinet

RESOLVED

 That the working priorities set out in paragraphs 18.1 below, including the provision of a further two bulge classes (yet to be determined) to meet projected demand for September 2012 be agreed.

Dir Children's Services

ii. That a further round of consultation on the possible expansion of Lancastrian Primary school, to take effect from September 2014 (put back from September 2013 to take account of E-Act's provision) be agreed.

Dir Children's Services

iii. That a further Annual Report be brought before Cabinet in July 2013.

Dir Children's Services

Cllr Claire Kober