




Haringey Council

Report for:	Cabinet 19 July 2012	Item Number:	
--------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------	--

Title:	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
---------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Report Authorised by:	 Libby Blake Jan Doust Director Deputy Director
----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Lead Officer:	Eveleen Riordan – Deputy Head of Admissions (Place Planning) Ext 5019 eveleen.riordan@haringey.gov.uk
----------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Ward(s) affected: primarily the ward within which Belmont Infant School and Belmont Junior School are located –West Green ward and also wards surrounding West Green.	Report for Key Decision
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------

1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1 There is a rising birth rate and a rising demand for reception places across Haringey generally, but with unmet demand identified in some planning areas, which means that additional school places are needed in specific planning areas in order to meet our statutory duty to offer every child a school place. West Green, Tottenham Green and Northumberland Park wards have been specifically identified as wards where it is projected that demand is or will shortly outstrip supply. Both Belmont Infant and Junior schools are located on one site adjacent to each other, with The Vale Special School also co-located on the same site. The Vale caters for children with physical disabilities and associated special educational needs. There is timetabling of children at the Vale school to spend time in the classes at Belmont Infant and Junior schools. To allow for this, the Planned Admission number of both Belmont Infant and Junior Schools is 56 rather than 60. This provides 4 places per year group to children at the Vale. It is not proposed that the capacity at The Vale School be changed.
- 1.2 To determine where these additional places should be proposed, the Pupil Place Steering group comprising of officers from school admissions, school place planning, property, school standards and finance applied the Haringey Council's school place planning principles to all primary, infant and junior school sites in Haringey.
- 1.3 The principles are as follows;

We should:

- Seek to meet demand for places within local communities, having regard for the role of schools at the heart of sustainable communities;
- Seek to make all our schools popular and successful. Where expansion is needed to meet demand for places, we should favour the expansion of schools where there is proven demand and well-established and successful leadership and management;
- have regard to the impact of any changes on the viability and standards at existing and new schools;
- bring forward proposals that make best use of scarce capital resources;
- work towards more schools having at least two forms of entry when building new schools and through active support for federation of schools to help give each school the capacity to meet our aspirations

- 1.4 As a result of applying the place planning principles and having regard to the requirements set out in the Department for Education (DfE) Expanding a Maintained Mainstream School by Enlargement or Adding a Sixth Form regulations, the Children and Young People's Service set out a report to Cabinet recommending that the Council consult on the proposal to expand Belmont Infant and Junior Schools.
- 1.5 In July 2011 the Council's Cabinet agreed a first round of consultation on the possible expansion of Belmont Infant school and Belmont Junior School from their current two forms of entry to three forms of entry. The proposed expansions were planned to take place effect with the first additional reception class starting at Belmont Infants School in September 2013. It was proposed that the expansion of each school would grow incrementally so that each year one additional form of entry would be added. By September 2015 Belmont Infant School would have three forms of entry in every year group. The expansion would then continue through the Junior School so that by September 2019 the Junior School would have 3 forms of entry in every year group.
- 1.6 Consultations on the proposed expansions were carried out between 12 September and 2 November 2011 in line with the Department for Education (DfE) Expanding a Maintained Mainstream School by Enlargement or Adding a Sixth Form regulations see paragraph 18 of the Guidance. The Cabinet report dated 20 December 2011 detailed in full the feedback received as a result of the consultations, together with further analysis on why additional reception school places continue to be required in the borough. The December Cabinet report recommended that the consultations on the expansion of the two schools proceed to the next stage – known as the publication of statutory notices.
- 1.7 Statutory notices were published on Monday 9 January 2012 in respect of the proposal to expand Belmont Infant School and Belmont Junior School. These notices were published in accordance with the Department for Education (DfE) guidance Expanding a Maintained Mainstream School by Enlargement or Adding a Sixth Form see paragraph 2.3 –2.4 of the Guidance. These notices were valid and sent to the DfE.
- 1.8 At the Cabinet meeting of 20 March 2012, members agreed to the withdrawal of the notices to allow a further period of consultation to take place with indicative drawings to show how any expansions of the schools might take place. Following the Cabinet meeting the statutory notices issued in respect of Belmont Infant School and Belmont Junior School were formally withdrawn in accordance with paragraph 4.80 of the above guidance (Expanding a Mainstreamed School by Enlargement or Adding a Sixth Form).
- 1.9 A further period of consultation, as part of the issuing of new statutory notices, was carried out regarding the expansion of Belmont Infant School and Belmont Junior School for the statutory four week period running from 4 May to the 1 June during which comments and objections could be made. There was strong opposition to the proposed expansions from the school communities at Belmont Infant School and Belmont Junior School. There was also concern from The Vale Special School (a special school catering for children with physical disabilities

and associated special educational needs which is collocated at the schools) at how the impact of any expansions might impact on Vale pupils.

- 1.10 The statutory representation period is the final opportunity for people and organisations to express their views about the proposals and ensure that they will be taken into account by the 'decision maker'. The decision maker is the local authority (where the local authority take this decision within two months of the end of the statutory representation period (in this instance by 1 August 2012 i.e. two months from the end of the consultation period – 1 June 2012) or the Schools Adjudicator where a decision has not been taken within the prescribed two months.
- 1.11 This report sets out the feedback from the further period of consultation and the responses to the statutory notice period and addresses the responses received to the publication of statutory notices and four week (statutory) public consultation on the proposed expansion of Belmont Infant School and Belmont Junior School and it provides the most up-to-date information on school rolls across the borough. It also details the location of the one free school that has been approved by the Department for Education (DfE) to provide 60 additional reception places and 60 additional Year 1 places in the borough with effect from September 2012. It also indicates the possible free school provision for September 2013.
- 1.12 The report will recommend that the expansions of Belmont Infant School and Belmont Junior School from two forms to three forms of entry is agreed. The proposal is that the first 3-form reception entry would start in the Infant School for September 2013 and 84 reception places would be offered in subsequent years. Across both schools we would have provided a total of 612 places by 2019 should the proposal be approved and implemented. The Infant school currently provides 168 places and the Junior School currently provides places for 224, totalling 392 pupils in year groups from Reception through to Year 6. It is not proposed that there is any change to the Vale Special School capacity or current nursery capacity at Belmont Infant School.
- 1.13 The recommendations contained in this report were due to be considered by Cabinet on Tuesday 10 July 2012.
- 1.14 Following the publication of the report, further representations were received by the Council.
- 1.15 The key themes of the representations were as follows:
- Concerns about the negative impact on special educational needs provision and inclusion
 - Finance and the indicative budget
 - New schools and potential expansions of other schools
 - Current school role numbers
 - Averages of place planning assumptions
 - Revised GLA projections
- 1.16 In order for the decision makers to have the necessary information made available to them to enable them to consider the representations made, the earlier report to cabinet on 10 July was withdrawn, and the decision postponed.
- 1.17 A commitment was made to hold a special Cabinet meeting before the end of the school term, to facilitate parent's attendance at the special Cabinet meeting. A date was set for 19 July 2012.

2. Cabinet Member introduction

- 2.1** We have a statutory duty to ensure that all school aged children have a place at a school. At primary level we want to secure local places for children so that their journey to school is not far and so that our communities are sustainable.

- 2.2 We have listened to parents and staff at the school, including the considerable majority of those expressing views who have set out very clearly that they do not want the schools to expand for a wide variety of reasons. Councillors, including the Leader of the Council, have visited the schools on several occasions and have heard these views.
- 2.3 I must balance these views against families in the area who will need a place at the schools in the coming years and who, without expansion of the schools, will be without a local school place. I support the expansion of the schools and the benefits that it will bring to both existing and future pupils.

3. Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- 3.1 Consider the feedback from the consultations carried out in respect of the proposed expansion of Belmont Infant School and Belmont Junior School.
- 3.2 Consider 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 which is also before you for consideration today.
- 3.3 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, agree 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. This approval is 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.
- 3.4 Approve 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.
- 3.5 Note that 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.
- 3.6 Paragraph 4.77 of the guidance states 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'.

4. Other Options considered

- 4.1 As part of the decision to provide additional reception places through either bulge classes or permanent expansion(s), an officer Pupil Place Steering Group considered the entire primary estate and assessed each school's suitability for expansion against a series of gateways which included, among other things, physical suitability, school standards, local demand and capacity and the school's leadership.
- 4.2 Possible alternatives to expanding Belmont Infant and Junior Schools are:
- **Not providing any additional places** - this would result in a shortfall of school places required locally and across the borough meaning that we could not meet our statutory duty to provide a school place for every Haringey child of statutory school age who requires one.

- **Providing bulge classes** – bulge classes are provided to meet a temporary increase in demand. Only a maximum of two consecutive bulge classes can be provided before consultation for a permanent expansion of that school would be required. This is set out in paragraph 14 of the DfE guidance Expanding a Maintained Mainstream School by Enlargement or Adding a Sixth Form where it states that statutory proposals are not required where “the alteration is a temporary one which will be in place for no more than 2 year”. Our projections demonstrate that the current and projected increase in pupil numbers is sustained so to meet this demand by continually providing one off bulge options in local schools would not be an efficient use of public funds. Also to provide the additional capacity in schools further away from Belmont Infant and Junior Schools might result in pupils having to travel further away from their homes. There are also implications for local children when bulge classes are provided. This is because pupils offered a place in a ‘bulge’ year may have siblings who will go to the school in a subsequent year when the PAN will be lower. This creates a cohort with a disproportionately higher number of siblings, leaving fewer places to be offered under the distance criterion for families apply for the first time. If we were to provide two bulge classes at Belmont, the same amount of external space would be required as if a full expansion of both schools (Infant and Junior) is implemented. Please refer to Appendix 1 for further information on this. The three indicative designs show that the additional external building work required across the school sites is equivalent to two classrooms.
- **Expanding an alternative school** – The information provided in appendices 2-6 and in paragraph 3.25 demonstrate that Belmont Infant and Junior School meet the principles for school expansion in a way that no other local school is able to at the present time.
- **New schools** – Please refer to paragraphs 4.3 and 5.34 to 5.38 below.

4.3 The Pupil Place Steering Group made recommendations on how to provide additional places based on detailed and carefully considered evidence for the most appropriate and sustainable way in which these additional places could be provided – by the expansion of four schools to provide an additional 87 reception places a year. The schools outlined for expansion were reported to the Council’s Cabinet as part of the annual School Place Planning Report in July 2011. As demand for school places is spread across the borough it was not considered by the Pupil Place Steering Group that one new school in one location could effectively address the foreseeable shortfall of primary school places within Haringey.

4.4 The detailed work that the group carried out was used as an evidence base to determine the most appropriate schools to expand and this information informed the School Place Planning Report 2011 and the School Expansions Report that was presented to Cabinet in December 2011, as well as a further report presented to Cabinet in March 2012.

5. Background information

Demand for reception places

5.1 The annual School Place Planning Report 2011 (agreed by Cabinet in July 2011) outlined in detail that borough birth rates and school rolls are increasing year on year leading to a reduction in the number of surplus reception places that we have in the borough at the start of the academic year. Overall surplus capacity at reception in our borough fell from 7.58% in 2005/6 to 1.6% in 2011/12. The Greater London Authority Data Management Analysis Group’s (GLA DMAG) school roll projections, updated annually and used to help plan for sufficient school places, indicated that demand for reception places would outstrip supply in September 2011 leading to a shortfall in reception places of -3.32%. In fact, for the academic year 2011/12 we have had unprecedented demand for reception places across the borough. As of March 2011 the borough had received a total of 3498 applications for reception places for the academic year 2011/12. When broken down, this figure represents a total of 2952 on time applications and a further 546 late applications received i.e. received after the national closing date for applications for reception places of 15 January 2011. At that time this figure represented the highest demand for reception places on record in the borough.

- 5.2 We now have the latest figures available for reception applications for September 2012 entry. On time applications for entry into reception in September 2012 at offer day was 3194. This represents an increase of 244 on time applications when compared with the same period last year (an increase equivalent to approximately eight reception classes assuming 30 pupils per class). Full details of the applications to Haringey primary schools are set out in Appendix 2 to this report.
- 5.3 In addition to the 3194 on-time applications we have (as of 11 June 2012) received a further 236 late applications for September 2012 reception entry, making a total of 3430 applications for the 3170 places that are currently available. This means that we have 260 fewer places than we require for September 2012. How this shortfall will be addressed is set out in a report also before you for consideration tonight – the annual School Place Planning Report 2012.
- 5.4 As set out in the School Place Planning Report 2011, the provision of additional reception places for September 2011 were delivered through the use of ‘bulge’ (one-off) classes at Lancasterian Primary School and reinstating Alexandra Primary School’s PAN of 60 (previously 30) to create a total of 60 additional places in time for September 2011 entry. However, despite the additional 60 places created through the bulge classes outlined above, and the provision of an additional 30 places at Rhodes Avenue Primary School in September 2011 (as the result of a permanent expansion) and the provision of 30 places at Eden Primary (as the result of the opening of the borough’s first free school), two further bulge classes were provided (which opened in January 2012) at Welbourne Primary School and at South Haringay Infant School to ensure that every reception aged child had a school place.
- 5.5 Following the close monitoring of reception demand and supply, a further bulge class has now been provided at Seven Sisters Primary School and opened in February 2012 and a further bulge at The Triangle Children’s Centre.
- 5.6 We are now giving consideration to the provision of additional reception places for 2012. Based on the above figures we know that we will have to provide bulge classes to meet the demand for reception places. This demand has already exceeded the demand that we saw in 2011/12.

Birth rates in the borough and local to Belmont Infant and Junior Schools

- 5.7 Birth rates in the borough are rising. This is a pattern repeated across the majority of London boroughs. The report to Cabinet in December 2011 showed that birth rates are on an upward trajectory which is expected to continue until 2017/18 (paragraph 5.9 of the December Cabinet report). Since that report was presented to Cabinet in December 2011, we have received a further set of birth data from the Office for National Statistics (ONS). This data provides us with the actual births for the period September 2009 to August 2010 (where previously we have had only projections for this period). This data corresponds to the September 2014 reception cohort intake. When compared with births for the corresponding period in 2008/9 the data shows an increase of 221 births (up from 4191 in 2008/9 to 4412 in 2009/10). The Greater London Authority (GLA) predicted that the total number of borough births for 2009/10 would be 4281. The figure of 4412 births shows that actual live births are 131 higher than the GLA projections and illustrate that we can expect a greater demand for school places than had previously been projected. A summary of this birth data is included at Appendix 3.
- 5.8 We know that between birth and school some families will choose to move out of the borough. Approximately 24% of children born in the borough will not seek a school place in the borough when they reach statutory school age. Even using this crude proxy, demand for school places in our borough will increase as a result of the increase in the number of children being born.
- 5.9 On a ward by ward basis, the births for West Green ward, where Belmont Infant and Junior schools are situated, are up by 30 births in the one year between 2008/9 and 2009/10 (rising

from 199 to 229) (see Appendix 3). These children will enter Reception in the year 2013/14 and 2014/15 respectively

- 5.10 The January 2012 PLASC¹ data for Belmont Infant and Junior schools shows the following pupils currently on their rolls:

Rec	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
58	59	55	56	49	52	48

- 5.11 This data shows that Foundation and KS1 cohorts in Belmont Infant School are almost full, whilst known borough-wide lower cohorts in KS2 are currently working their way out of Belmont Junior school.
- 5.12 We have also looked at mobility in the Junior school and see that over the last four years the school has gained as well as lost pupils. In some years pupil mobility (the term used to describe a pupil entering or leaving the school at a point other than the first day of reception or the last day of Year 6) has been offset when the number of in-year pupils lost has been the same as the number of in-year pupils gained. Both Belmont Infant and Belmont Junior schools have lower levels of pupil mobility than comparable schools close to them, and this is despite the fact that the schools are located in a planning area generally characterised by with higher levels of temporary accommodation units and where you might expect that pupil mobility would be higher. See Appendix 8 for Junior School mobility analysis.
- 5.13 We also know that both Belmont Infant and Junior School's are well led and well managed and that the senior leadership teams (SLT) are capable of carrying the expansions forward. Both schools at the last Ofsted inspections were determined as outstanding.

School Roll Projections

- 5.14 The latest available school roll projections from the GLA for 2012/13 show that we expected around 3210 reception pupils for September 2012. By 15 January 2012 we had received 3194 confirmed on time reception applications for September. When including late applications (as of 11 June 2012) for September 2012 entry, this figure rises to 3430. Whilst we acknowledge that some of these applicants may have expressed preferences for out of borough schools, our neighbouring boroughs have reported similar pressures for reception places. We anticipate that we will have to accommodate the majority of these late applications within our schools and this figure already exceeds the GLA projection for 2012/13 by 220 children.
- 5.15 The GLA projections for 2013/14 show a moderate decline in reception aged pupils from their projection for 2012/13. A decline in the number of actual births from 4337 in 2007/08 to 4191 in 2008/09 (corresponding intake year 2012/13 and 2013/14 respectively) is a contributory factor. We have examined the projections by planning area and have concluded that these must be viewed with some caution in light of recent experience of actual applications received.
- 5.16 The GLA roll projections for 4 year olds are calculated using the catchment method. This is calculated by using the known number of 4 year olds (reception cohort) on roll from the January PLASC data set and comparing that to the estimated population of children aged 4, producing a population to school roll ratio. This ratio is applied to the projected population of children aged 4 to project the rolls forward. In planning areas, where there is little or no projected change in children aged 4, typically those with little new development and stable birth rates, the end result tends to be a flat trend. However, the projections do not fully account for demand from residents of other planning areas and with large developments planned in planning areas 8 (Tottenham Green), 9 (Tottenham Hale) and 13 (Noel Park), there is a very strong likelihood that some of these families may seek school places in surrounding wards. Also there is an issue where planning area projections are artificially "capped" by the

¹ PLASC – Pupil Level Annual School Census

school capacity within that planning area, and therefore do not show any growth. For example, Planning Area 12 can only accommodate a total of 236 reception aged pupils, with the schools full there is no ability for the schools to take further children resulting in the projections being suppressed even if there is additional demand .

Free Schools

- 5.17 Back in March 2012 we reported that we were aware that one free school, provided by E-Act, had been given approval to open a two form entry reception and two form entry Year 1 primary in the Tottenham area of the borough for September 2012. At the time of the writing of the March Cabinet report, E-Act had still not secured a site for their free school. E-Act has now confirmed that they are to locate in a site at the former Cannon Rubber Factory on Tottenham High Road N17. This site is located on the border with the London Borough of Enfield. As the 60 additional places are being provided in Northumberland Park ward we know that these places will meet the local need, rather than the demand for school places that has been identified in and around West Green ward. Further, the close proximity of E-Act's free school to Enfield means that some of the children who enter the school under its admissions criteria will be Enfield children. The reality, therefore, is that while the provision of free school places is likely to have some positive impact on the overall demand for places in our borough, it will not address identified unmet demand to a level where no further additional places are required.
- 5.18 The deadline for groups to submit applications to the Department for Education (DfE) to open free schools in September 2013 was in February 2012. To date, whilst no free school provider has formally approached the Council to confirm that they have submitted an application, representatives of the Harris Federation have referred to their intentions to do this through the current academy consultation processes. We are aware that the Harris Federation, in partnership with the Academy of Entrepreneurship and Sporting Excellence (AESE), has set out their plans to open a through school (ages 4 – 19) in our borough from September 2013. They would provide a 2fe primary school, a 6fe secondary school and a 2fe sixth form. This would provide additional places to meet demand in and around the Northumberland Park ward and does not have any significant implications for the proposal now before you as places at the new school are likely to be taken by local children. Further information can be found on the Harris Federation website at <http://www.harrisfederation.org.uk/150/proposed-free-school-in-tottenham> . Further details on AESE's aims and objectives can be found on their website at <http://www.aese.org.uk>
- 5.19 **Why expand Belmont Infant and Junior Schools?**
The DfE guidance Expanding a Maintained Mainstream School by Enlargement or Adding a Sixth Form sets out that we must consider the following factors when expanding schools. The guidance says that these factors should not be taken to be exhaustive. Their importance will vary, depending on the type and circumstances of the proposals
- **Whether there is a need for expansion** - Members should take into account not only the existence of spare capacity in neighbouring schools, but also the quality and popularity with parents of the schools in which spare capacity exists and evidence of parents' aspirations for places in the school proposed for expansion. The existence of surplus capacity in neighbouring less popular or successful schools should not in itself prevent the addition of new places.
 - **Parental preference** - Parental preference for Belmont Infant and Junior Schools is given in appendix 4. This is shown in comparison to other schools in the same planning area.
 - **Popular Schools** – additional places should be created where there is proven parental demand and it should be easier for successful and popular schools to expand. Appendix 5 demonstrates how popular Belmont Infant and Junior Schools are.
 - **Standards and Successful Schools** - Both the Infant and the Junior Schools are judged as Outstanding by Ofsted and the respective key stage 1 and 2 results are given in Appendix 6. This is shown in comparison to other schools' performance in the

local area. The quality of education and opportunities afforded to pupils attending Belmont Infant and Junior Schools support our consideration of how the proposals will help achieve the Every Child Matters principles. Members should be satisfied that the proposals will contribute to raising local standards of provision, and will lead to an overall improved attainment for children and young people. They should pay particular attention to the effects on groups that tend to under-perform including children from certain ethnic groups, children from deprived backgrounds and children in care, with the aim of narrowing attainment gaps.

- **Diversity and Equal Opportunities** – The Equality Impact Assessment carried out as a part of the consultation is included at Appendix 7 sets out how providing additional places at Belmont Infant and Junior Schools will allow access to an outstanding education to more pupils. It also explains how the challenges associated with an expansion which may affect different groups, including those pupils who attend the Vale School who have special educational needs, and outlines what steps can be taken to mitigate against their effect.
- **Capital** – Capital costs have been outlined based on the expansion of the two schools from 2fe to 3fe. In determining those costs the current and future provision of places at the Vale school has been taken into account. The Chief Financial officer confirms that capital funding is available to meet the indicative costs and that a scheme which is compliant with the requirements of BB99 can be achieved within the sum indicated.
- **Other interested parties** – There has been considerable objection amongst stakeholders to the proposals. We have always set out that the views of all stakeholders as to whether or not the expansions go ahead are an important consideration in the decision making process. However, this must be qualified with the fact that the views expressed are not the sole material consideration and we must balance these views against the fact that we do not have enough school places in the borough to meet the numbers of reception aged children that we know are coming through. We have sought to answer all objections received in the most informative and transparent way possible. We have sought to balance all views and opinions expressed against other material considerations in proposing the expansion of the Belmont schools.

Indicative design proposals

5.20 Three indicative plans have been drawn up in accordance with RIBA stage B. This is an outline feasibility stage of construction which provides the high level information to inform the Council that there is enough space to expand on a site within the relevant building regulations. If the decision is made to expand Belmont Infant and Junior Schools then the project will progress to stages C and D which are the detailed part of the design process. To actualise stages C and D requires in the region of £167,000.00 so therefore to progress to stages C and D before the decision to expand in principle represents an inefficient use of public funds. If Cabinet agree that Belmont Infant and Junior Schools should be expanded then Cabinet will have agree the final detailed designs when they agree the award of contract.

5.21 Implementation of the proposals may require the grant of planning permission so that Cabinet is being asked to approve proposals conditional on the grant of any necessary planning permission.

5.22 **Potential Option 1: Minimum Expansion** –

This potential option was developed as part of an ongoing feasibility study with a view to remain within the original cash limited budget of £2.215m, whilst expanding the school to 3FE. It allows for additional teaching spaces but due to budget constraints was unable to address any additional requirements as part of the schools' expansions. This potential option was developed during feasibility as a test of the cash limited budget

Positive

- Consequential Improvements under Building Regulations Part L.
- Increase and improvement to teaching space.
- Potential for additional play areas to be created.
- The existing planted garden is maintained.

Negative

- Overall play area per pupil is reduced (but still within current design guidance)
- Disruption to the school during construction
- Additional traffic
- More students

5.23 Potential Option 2: Full 3FE Provision -

This potential option was developed as part of an ongoing feasibility study; it removed the budgetary constraints noted in Potential Option 1, and was developed to determine what could be achieved with the site constraints and what would be an acceptable proposal in terms of current government design guidance and any other material considerations.

Positive

- Consequential Improvements under Building Regulations Part L.
- Increase and improvement to teaching space.
- Increase and improvement to support space including
 - Staff room improvements
 - Group rooms
 - Treatment room
 - Additional toilet provision
- Potential for additional play areas to be created.
- A much more efficient use of space with 'dead' areas being utilised.
- A new 'planted garden' is created.

Negative

- Overall play area per pupil is reduced (but still within current design guidance)
- Disruption to the school during construction
- Additional traffic
- More students
- The existing planted garden is moved.

5.24 Potential Option 3: Full 3FE Provision – Shared Provision –

As with Potential Option 2, this potential option was developed as part of an ongoing feasibility study; it removed the budgetary constraints noted in Potential Option 1, and was developed to determine what could be achieved with the site constraints and what would be an acceptable proposal in terms of current government design guidance and any other material considerations. It also tested the suitability of using shared resources between both the Infants and Junior school, such as library, ICT, and office space, with a view to allowing more efficient use of space on the site and the potential for more efficient management practices at the school.

Positive

- Consequential Improvements under Building Regulations Part L.
- Increase and improvement to teaching space.
- Increase and improvement to support space including
 - Staff room improvements
 - Group rooms
 - Treatment room
 - Additional toilet provision
- Potential for additional play areas to be created.

- A much more efficient use of space with 'dead' areas being utilised.
- The use of shared resources such as the library, ICT suite, and office space allows more efficient use of space on the site and potential for more efficient management of both schools.
- A new 'planted garden' is created.

Negative

- Overall play area per pupil is reduced (but still within current design guidance)
- Disruption to the school during construction.
- Additional traffic.
- More students.

An overview of consultation responses

- 5.25 A period of non statutory consultation took place between 12 September 2011 and 2 November 2011. This was undertaken to ensure that we had the opportunity to hear the views of interested parties and take these into consideration when we made the decision on whether or not to publish Statutory Notices on the expansion of the schools. Please refer to Appendices 9 and 10 which provide the analysis of this consultation.
- 5.26 Statutory Notices proposing the expansions of Belmont Infant and Belmont Junior Schools were published on 9 January 2012 beginning a four week period of statutory consultation. Appendices 11 and 12 provide the analysis of this round of statutory consultation. We listened very carefully to the views of the interested parties and the Council's cabinet decision to withdraw the Statutory Notices on 20 March 2012 was informed by the clear message from the school communities that any expansions consultation had to set out indicative designs to show how the expansion of both schools might be delivered.
- 5.27 Statutory notices were published and a four week period of consultation took place on the proposed expansion of Belmont Infant and Belmont Junior Schools from two to three forms of entry between 4 May and 2012 and 1 June 2012. In the week preceding the start of the consultation a statutory notice was published in the Journal series of newspapers across the borough. A copy of the statutory notices are attached at Appendix 13. In addition to the publication of the statutory notices, the following methods were used to publicise that the consultation as taking place:
- Written notification (via email) to the London Diocesan Board (Anglican) and Diocese of Westminster (Catholic), the governing bodies of Belmont Infant and Belmont Junior Schools, MPs (Lynne Featherstone and David Lammy), all adjoining boroughs to Haringey (Barnet, Enfield, Islington, Waltham Forest, Hackney and Camden), all head teachers and chairs of governors in Haringey, the Chair of the Haringey Federation of Residents Associations (HEFRA) for dissemination to all residents groups within the borough, all relevant trade unions, all directors in Haringey, the DfE's School Organisation Unit
 - The consultation document (see Appendix 14) was sent Belmont Infant School, Belmont Junior School and The Vale Special School allowing enough copies for all families and staff members. The consultation document was also sent out to local residents and businesses in the area around the school.
 - A copy of the statutory notices were pinned to all entrances to the schools for the duration of the consultation period. A copy of the notices were also displayed in the Marcus Garvey Library.
- 5.28 Two public meetings were held at the schools – one on the evening of Thursday 17 May 2012, and one on the afternoon of Friday 18 May 2012. The public meetings included a question and answer session hosted by Cllr Claire Kober, leader of the Council and by Cllr Lorna Reith, Lead member for Children and Young People's Service (at the time of the meeting). The meetings were also attended by officers from Admissions and School Organisation (Place

Planning), Property Services and Finance. See appendices 12,16,22 which demonstrate how the decision makers listened and responded to questions and comments from interested parties

- 5.29 This round of consultation provided an opportunity for interested parties to view early proposed indicative designs for delivery of the expansions. These designs were displayed at the schools for the duration of the consultation period and were on display at the public meetings. Interested parties were able to address detailed questions about the indicative schemes to the architect and to officers from Property Services, as well as questions on the principle of expansion to officers from Admissions and School Organisation. In addition to the opportunity to complete a formal consultation response form, an opportunity was also given to leave questions and comments on a consultation board. These responses are given in appendix 16 to this report.
- 5.30 In response to the consultation, 41 individual objections were received as well as a petition objecting to the proposals and containing 449 signatures. A detailed summary of the consultation responses is included at Appendix 17 to this report.
- 5.31 The main points respondents have made across all three rounds of consultations (but not limited to) are:
- the impact of the expansion on the performance, school ethos and well being of the children (please refer to appendix 7)
 - the impact on children with SEN, (please refer to appendix 7)
 - the impact of expansion on the children at the Vale School (please refer to appendix 7)
 - the impact on neighbouring schools, the impact of the building work and enlarged school on neighbouring properties and streets (please refer to appendix 7)
 - internal and external space provision for a 3fe school (This is addressed in paragraph 5.20)
 - an insufficient budget to expand the school to a high standard and a budget that does not correspond with budgets for other similar expansions in the borough, (this has been addressed by increasing the budget to meet the cost of the preferred indicative design option.
 - the belief there is surplus capacity at other local schools that should be used (this is addressed in paragraph 5.19)
 - the fact objectors do not believe there are a shortage of places in this planning area (this is addressed in paragraphs 5.51-5.53)
 - the financial viability concern if the school does not fill at 3fe (please refer to paragraph 5.43)
 - the school and the local community do not support the proposals
 - use the Professional Development Centre for school provision (please refer to paragraph 5.39 in the report).
- 5.32 In every case these views have been listened to and the relevant appendices explain how these views have been addressed or mitigated against. Copies of the issues raised and the responses given are also included within appendices 9-17.
- 5.33 However, in addition to the questions already raised, further questions have been raised in respect of 1) the use of part of Belmont Recreation Ground as open space for the school to ease pressure on playtime and sports activities, 2) why a new school is not being built, 3) use of the PDC as a school 4) why Broadwater Farm Primary School (now The Willow) reduced from three to two forms of entry, 5) The future financial viability of the Schools including as a result of the impact of pupil mobility, 6) Concerns that school place projections do not show a future deficit of school places for the area. The responses to these additional questions are set out below.

- 5.34 **Use of part of Belmont Recreation Ground** – Belmont Recreation Ground is designated as Significant Local Open Land (SLOL) in the Council's current land use for the borough – the Unitary Development Plan. This designation is carried over into the draft Core Strategy which is currently the subject of an Examination in Public. Once adopted by the Council the Core Strategy will replace the UDP as the spatial plan for the borough. In common with almost all London boroughs, Haringey has an overall deficiency in public open space. Open space plays an important part in the lives of our borough's residents: not only does it meet recreational needs but it also contributes to the landscape and nature conservation value of the borough. It is essential for everyone's well-being that there should be green 'lungs' in urban areas. Policies contained in the Council's UDP and the emerging Core Strategy seek to protect the open space in the borough that we have and add to it where possible to ensure adequate provision for the growing population that we have in our borough. These open space policies are underpinned by regional policy set out in the London Plan 2011 which seeks to protect open space in London. The use of part of Belmont Recreation Ground would reduce the open space available for the use of local people in an area where there is already open space deficiency. Belmont Infant and Junior Schools currently use the park, on occasion, for events such as sports days and, following any expansion they might choose to continue to access this open space on an informal and occasional basis. The need to provide school places must be balanced against the need to provide sufficient good quality open space within the borough for recreational purposes.
- 5.35 **Why can a new school not be built?** – Statutory requirements under section 14 of the Education Act 1996 mean that local authorities, in their role as commissioners, must plan and secure sufficient schools for their area. Where a local authority identifies the need to establish a new school, new section 6A of Education and Inspections Act 2006 (EIA) places the authority under a duty to seek proposals to establish an academy/Free School and to specify a date by which proposals must be submitted.
- 5.36 Once the specified date for the proposals has passed, the local authority are required to send the Secretary of State a notification setting out the steps the authority has taken to seek proposals for an academy/Free School and copies of all proposals,
- 5.37 Under section 7 a local authority can, with the Secretary of State's consent, publish a notice inviting proposals for the establishment of a new foundation, voluntary or foundation special school, or an Academy. This competition process is likely to ensue only if the local authority has failed to get suitable proposals for an academy under section 6A. Local authorities cannot participate in the section 7 competition.
- 5.38 Under section 10 a local authority, with the Secretary of State's consent, may publish proposals to establish a community or foundation schools, but consent is likely to be given only where the section 6A and 7 processes have not identified a suitable school. Section 11 says that the local authority may (without the need for consent from the Secretary of State) publish its own proposals to establish a community or foundation school where no proposals are received in response to the section 7 competition notice or no Academy arrangements result from any such proposal. The local authority's proposals under sections 10 and 11 may in certain circumstances be referred to the Schools Adjudicator
- 5.39 The Council does not currently have any buildings or land suitable for a school on its disposal list and any land purchase costs have not been provided for and are likely to be prohibitive. In addition the capital construction cost of a new school is also significantly in excess of that required for an expansion scheme with an estimated cost in the range of an estimated £7m (for a 1FE school) to £11m (for a 3 FE school) being significantly in excess of the available resources. In overall terms therefore it has been concluded that a new school would not provide Value for Money where an expansion scheme is achievable at a local school meeting other key considerations.

- 5.40 **Use of the PDC as a school** – The PDC (Professional Development Centre) on Downhills Park Road) is currently occupied by staff and is a working building. It also currently provides a base for training facilities for teaching staff and for governors in the borough. The estimated cost of converting this space to a working school, including the cost of relocating existing services elsewhere, would be in the region of £6m.
- 5.41 **Why was Broadwater Farm Primary reduced in capacity?** - The PAN at Broadwater Farm Primary School (BWF) – now called The Willow - was expanded in September 1998 to 81 in response to perceived local demand. The additional places proved difficult to fill as the demand was not geographically compatible with the school. Discussions began in September 2007 to reduce the PAN back to its previous level of 60. This was undertaken in parallel with the early stages design work for the Inclusive Learning Campus. Prior to this date the school had already been informally operating at 2FE, with capacity to meet unmet demand in the area if required. In addition to difficulty in filling the school beyond the PAN of 60 there was also the consideration of the potential impact on the school of retaining an unachievable PAN coupled with the strain that would be caused by the creation of a fully inclusive campus. For this reason the PAN was formally reverted to 60 and the design agreed to provide a 2FE primary school and 100 place SEN school on the site. Please also refer to appendix 5. The current demand at this school satisfies a current PAN of 60 and not, at the present time, a higher PAN. Therefore to increase the PAN at this stage would work against our agreed school place planning principles and, further, would not satisfy the DfE guidance for the expansion of a maintained school (referred to in para 5.19 above).
- 5.42 **Financial viability** – The governing bodies of both schools have raised concerns about the financial viability of the schools should they not fill to a full 3 forms of entry across all cohorts. Particular concerns have been expressed in light of the fact that there are currently vacancies in some cohorts within Belmont Junior School. The School Place Panning Report 2012 demonstrates that the projected figures for pupils that will join the Junior School in 2016 are significantly higher than the current cohorts of pupils in KS2. The risk of future vacancies is mitigated against significantly primarily because the school is a very popular school. Officers have met with the Junior School to discuss their specific concerns around pupil mobility in KS2. The analysis of this mobility data is given in Appendix 8.
- 5.43 The Council has always been clear with the schools that the existing funding formula supports schools at both 2FE and 3 FE without any structural inefficiencies and that there is no reason to suggest that the expansion proposals would, in themselves, disadvantage any school financially. Indeed the perceived disadvantage from the loss of the 'small schools grant' would have been more than outweighed by the increase in pupil driven funding from the greater number of pupils at an expanded school.
- 5.44 However, at the time of the public meetings at the schools, the position in respect of the proposed Education Funding changes for 2013-14 inasmuch as they would affect the proposals to expand the Belmont Schools were unclear. The outcome of the government's last consultation exercise were awaited and there were concerns that the proposals did not allow for Councils to retain resources in order to support school expansions. Resources would have had to be delegated to all schools initially and then follow a process of seeking approval for de-delegation from the Schools Forum.
- 5.45 We have now seen the final proposals and they allow for Councils to continue to retain contingency sums to support the Council's statutory duties in this respect. There is therefore increased confidence that it will be possible to replicate the current arrangements for supporting expanding schools which has worked successfully in many schools.
- 5.46 It is also clear that, the simplification of the schools' funding formula and in particular the reduction in allowable formula factors and further increase in delegation will benefit larger schools over smaller schools. This gives further confidence that the concerns of the school over its financial viability during and following expansion are in fact unfounded.

- 5.47 **Capital Funding** - Within the approved capital programme there is currently provision of £2.2m for this expansion project. The approach taken to providing funds for capital projects reflects the necessity to provide initial indicative provision within the capital programme which is updated as the design process crystallises the scheme and therefore the updated costs.
- 5.48 One of the concerns highlighted through the consultation process is that the resources identified are considered insufficient by some respondents to deliver a scheme of a scope and quality acceptable to stakeholders.
- 5.49 Officers have sought to reassure at the various consultation events that the figure within the approved capital programme is an indicative figure and that following the detailed design stages (Stage D RIBA), which are undertaken in conjunction with the schools, appropriate provision would be identified in order to progress an appropriately defined scheme.
- 5.50 It is unusual to amend the estimated provision within the capital programme until the detailed design stages have been completed however, given the strength of concern that has been expressed in relation to this issue, officers are recommending that the indicative budget for the expansion scheme be updated to a sum of £3.5m which is considered to be a more realistic estimate of the ultimate scheme cost. Please see the Chief Financial Officer's comments at section 6 below.
- 5.51 **GLA Projections** - Responses to the consultations included concerns that the school roll projections from the GLA dated 2012 shows that there are sufficient places within PA12 for reception aged children in the coming years and concern has been expressed that, by expanding Belmont Infant School, only a fraction of the 30 additional places will be filled and the school will slip into a deficit budget as a result of carrying a high surplus capacity. Please see appendix 15 for background information on school roll projections.
- 5.52 **GLA projections for planning area 12** - The data below sets out the GLA projections for school rolls in PA12 in the coming years (source: DMAG, GLA).

Year	Number of Births for the equivalent school year	GLA 4 year old roll projection	Planned admission number	Total number 1 st place preferences
2001/2		249	257	-
2002/3		246	257	259
2003/4	465	249	257	276
2004/5	414	234	257	256
2005/6	480	222	257	213
2006/7	480	235	257	229
2007/8	471	228	257	198
2008/9	508	228	236	229
2009/10	494	235	236	269
2010/11	468	235	236	262
2011/12	540	238	236	230
2012/13	520	230	236	263
2013/14	495	229	236	
2014/15	529	230	236	
2015/16		232	236	
2016/17		236	236	
2017/18		237	236	
2018/19		236	236	
2019/20		233	236	
2020/21		230	236	

2021/22		227	236	
---------	--	-----	-----	--

The most recent School Place Planning Report (SPPR) 2012 (available to view as a Cabinet Report tonight) sets out very clearly the overall shortfall of reception places across the borough now and for the coming years. Paras 14.7 to 14.44 of the report set out the pressure for reception places that we currently face and also project that this pressure will continue to increase up until at least the academic year 2017/18. We have actual birth rate data for up to the year 2009/10 (these children will enter reception classes in 2014/15) and so projections up until this time are very accurate. Thereafter accuracy drops slightly as we are relying on projected birth rates and not actual known birth rates.

The table at para 14.44 of the SPPR sets out the shortfall in capacity across our reception classes up until 2016. This shortfall is based on GLA projections but experience has shown us over recent years that GLA projections are conservative and we have been experiencing a year on year demand that slightly exceeds GLA projections. We are in discussions with the GLA to adjust projections to ensure that they are as accurate as possible. Based on GLA projections we project a total shortfall of 180 places (6fe) by 2016 based on our current known PAN (including E-Act's 60 places and 30 permanent places at Welbourne Primary from 2013).

Belmont Infant and Junior School falls within Planning Area 12 (PA12) for the purposes of place planning. PAs enable manageable analysis and planning of school places in the borough. PA12 birth data shows a flattening of the trajectory for births over the coming years. However, while PAs allow the effective planning of school places, each PA should not be viewed in isolation from other PAs and in particular from PAs surrounding it. Parental choice and preference for school places is not based on PAs. The boundaries of PAs and the allocation of school places is based on admissions criteria which means that allocation of school places often crosses one or more PAs and not all children are able to be accommodated within the PA within which they live. This position is exacerbated when there is a high demand for the number of school places that is available. The Belmont schools lie close to the boundary with PA13 where birth rates are projected to increase beyond the number of school places available – for example PA13 is projected to be 29 places above PAN in 2015/16. The data for PA13 is shown below –

5.53 GLA projections for planning area 13

Year	Number of Births for the equivalent school year	GLA 4 year old roll projection	Planned admission number	Total number 1 st place preferences
2001/2		120	141	-
2002/3		75	141	69
2003/4	177	87	141	79
2004/5	188	104	141	89
2005/6	197	96	141	77
2006/7	209	85	141	56
2007/8	168	88	111	61
2008/9	208	99	111	69
2009/10	194	107	111	74
2010/11	214	108	111	75
2011/12	201	136	141	83
2012/13	210	145	120*	96
2013/14	225	139	120	
2014/15	210	140	120	
2015/16		149	120	
2016/17		156	120	
2017/18		162	120	

2018/19		168	120	
2019/20		174	120	
2020/21		178	120	
2021/22		181	120	

*For September 2012, Noel Park reduced the PAN to 60 and for September Alexandra reinstated their PAN to 60.

In PAs where there is little or no projected change in children aged 4, typically those with little new development and stable birth rates, the end result tends to be a flat trend. However, the projections do not fully account for demand from residents of other planning areas and with large developments planned in PA8 (Tottenham Green), PA9 (Tottenham Hale) and PA13 (Heartlands in Noel Park), it is anticipated that some of these families will seek places in the surrounding PAs. Demand for reception places at Belmont Infant School has shown that almost two children are applying for every reception place available.

In summary, the birth rates of a single PA are not the sole consideration when planning overall sufficiency of school places across the borough. The deficit of projected places in adjoining planning areas must also be considered.

- 5.54 The authority listened to views expressed at the public meetings and exhibitions that were held as part of the consultations to expand the schools. We also considered the letters and emails of objection that were submitted in response to the consultations. However, on balance, the objections were weighed against the need to provide additional school places in Haringey generally and more locally in West Green ward. Evidence was also carefully considered as to why these additional places should be provided at Belmont Infant and Junior Schools.
- 5.55 A summary of consultation responses received 4th May until 1st June 2012 is set out in Appendix 17 to this report.

Current Position in other boroughs

- 5.56 We recently met with colleagues in neighbouring boroughs to discuss demand for school places in their boroughs. Pertinent to the possible expansion of Belmont Infant and Junior Schools is demand in Enfield as this borough has a boundary close to this school (within a mile). Enfield is also seeing a very high demand for school places and is planning for additional places in the form of expansions and bulges to meet this increasing demand.

Conclusion

- 5.57 We have seen that birth rates are continuing to rise at a level that exceeds previous projections for the borough – an increase of 635 births per year since 2000/1. Nationally birth rates are at a 40 year high, with birth rates up by 2.4% in the last year alone². Total fertility rates are also rising with the number of children women are having up from 1.96 in 2009 to 2.0 children per woman in 2013.
- 5.58 Our last known projections from the GLA (reproduced at Appendix 18) shows an increase of 121 births on the projected school rolls for 2009/10 and the actual school rolls for 2009/10. The latest projections from the GLA reflect this upward trend.
- 5.59 For September 2012 we sought to accommodate the vast majority of the expected demand in bulge classes to allow us to effectively manage the risk and to provide enough places in the short term, but not over provide if demand peaks in 2012 (projections become less certain the further into the future they predict). However, even allowing for bulge provision, we ran out of school places and have had to add additional bulge classes at several of our primary schools.

² Source: Office for National Statistics

³ Source: The Guardian 13 July 2011

In assessing on time applications for 2012 reception entry we already know that demand is higher for the coming academic year than it was for the current 2011/12 academic year.

- 5.60 The location of the free school to be provided by E-Act will provide an additional 60 reception places in 2012 and is now known to be in Northumberland Park ward in Tottenham, very close to the Enfield borough border – not near enough to West Green ward and to Belmont Infant School and Belmont Junior School to make any significant impact on local demand for school places.
- 5.61 We have looked very carefully at the objections that we have received in respect of the proposals. We have sought to mitigate concerns where possible and have balanced these against the other evidence that we have on birth rates, school rolls, admissions data and surplus capacity.
- 5.62 Serious consideration has been given to why the additional places should be delivered at Belmont Infant and Junior Schools.
- 5.63 On balance we are of the opinion that the expansions of Belmont Infant School should proceed with effect from September 2013 with the expansion of Belmont Junior school to follow from 2016. This will ensure that we provide additional places in the area local to the Belmont schools and ensure that we are able to provide sufficient school places at schools that are
- popular with proven and increasing demand
 - outstanding and successful
 - able to meet all the requirements for expansion under our own school place planning principles.
- 5.64 We have listened to the views that have been expressed and while we acknowledge that the expansion will bring challenges to the schools and their pupils, we are confident that the schools and their senior leadership teams are very capable of meeting these challenges and ensure that Belmont Infant and Junior schools succeed as three form entry schools. Further, demand for school places in the local area and its continued upward trajectory reassures us that there will be no significant impact on the demand for places at other local schools.

6 Comments of the Chief Financial Officer

- 6.1 The Chief Financial Officer has been involved in the drafting of this report and reflecting the current position in respect of the Capital and Revenue implications associated with this scheme. These issues are substantially addressed in paragraphs 5.41-5.49 of this report.
- 6.2 Specifically, it is confirmed that sufficient provision exists within the overall Children and Young People's capital programme to accommodate the proposed increase in the estimated capital costs associated with the expansion scheme, to £3.5m, that forms the basis of the recommendation at paragraph 3.4.
- 6.3 In common with all other capital projects, the costs will become firmer as design progresses and the financial implications of this will be highlighted to Members in subsequent reports e.g. at tender approval stage.

7 Head of Legal Services and legal implications

- 7.1 The Head of Legal Services has been consulted on the content of this report.
- 7.2 Section 14 of the Education Act 1996 states that a local authority shall secure that sufficient schools for providing primary and secondary education are available in the authority's area with particular regard to the need to secure special educational provision.

- 7.3 Paragraph 2.16 of the Department for Education's The School Admission Code dated 01 February 2012 states that admission authorities for admission in 2013/2014 must provide for the admission of all children in the September following their fourth birthday. The authority must make it clear in their arrangements that;
- (a) parents can request that the date their child is admitted to the school is deferred until later in the academic year or until the term in which the child reaches compulsory school age, and
 - (b) parents can request that their child takes up the place part-time until the child reaches compulsory school age.
- 7.4 Sections 18 and 19 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 (the 'EIA') provide for alterations to schools. Section 19 relates to the publication of proposals to make alterations. Sections 21, 24 and 27 allow the Secretary of State to make regulations governing the publication and determination and implementation of proposals.
- 7.5 The School Organisation (Prescribed Alteration to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 made under section 18 of the EIA provide that those bringing forward statutory proposals to expand a school must consult with interested parties and in doing so must have regard to the Secretary of State guidance. The authority must also have due regard to that guidance when considering or determining proposals and making decisions on matters of implementation. The guidance is attached at Appendix 19 to this report.
- 7.6 Paragraph 31 of Schedule 5 to the Regulations states that in determining proposals to which the Schedule applies the local authority may -
- (a) reject the proposals;
 - (b) approve the proposals without modification
 - (c) approve the proposals with such modification as the authority think desirable before approving any proposals with modifications the authority must consult the governing body
- 7.7 Where proposals are approved by the authority (whether with or without modifications) the approval may be conditional on the occurrence of an event prescribed in paragraph 38. Such specified events, cited in the regulations, include, as relevant, the grant of planning permission. If the approval is expressed to take effect only if a specified event occurs then the event must occur by the date specified in the approval.
- 7.8 Under paragraph 39 proposals may be withdrawn by the local authority which published the proposals provided that
- (a) such proposals are withdrawn before any determination is made, and
 - (c) written notices are placed at the main entrance to the school or, if there is more than one main entrance, all of them
- 7.9 Paragraph 40 states that with regard to the implementation of proposals they must be implemented in the form in which they were approved.
- 7.10 Paragraph 41 provides for revocation of proposals after approval on the basis that the local authority is satisfied that
- (a) implementation of the proposals would be unreasonably difficult; or
 - (b) circumstances have so altered since the approval was given that implementation would be inappropriate.
- 7.11 The paragraph also sets out the procedure for effecting revocation including what the revocation proposals must contain and how they should be published. Under this paragraph the authority may therefore determine that the duty to implement ceases to apply to the proposals.

- 7.12 The Department for Children, Schools and Families (now the Department for Education) Guidance Expanding a Maintained Mainstream School by Enlargement or Adding a Sixth Form A Guide for Local Authorities and Governing Bodies, attached at Appendix 19 to this report, contains both statutory and non statutory guidance for those considering publishing proposals to expand a school under section 19 of the EIA 2006, those deciding proposals and also in relation to information for those affected by proposals for the expansion of a school.
- 7.13 Paragraph 21 of the guidance states that where proposals require capital resources for their implementation the funding for the proposals should be in place when the proposals are decided.
- 7.14 Paragraph 2.6 states that there is no maximum limit on the time between the publication of a proposal and its proposed date of implementation but circumstances may change significantly if too long a period elapses and further states that the implementation date for the proposals should be within 3 years of their publication.
- 7.15 Paragraph 4.3 of the guidance states that if the LA fail to decide proposals within 2 months of the end of the representation period the LA must forward the proposals, and any received representations (i.e. not withdrawn in writing), to the schools adjudicator for decision. They must forward the proposals within one week from the end of the 2 month period.
- 7.16 Paragraph 4.7 of the guidance sets out four key principles which the authority should consider before judging the respective factors and merits of the proposal that the information is complete, that the notices comply with the statutory requirements, that the statutory consultation was carried out and whether the proposals are related to other published proposals. Attention is drawn to paragraphs 4.17 to 4.24 which provide guidance in relation to the effect on standards and school improvement, 4.27 in relation to equal opportunity issues, 4.28 to 4.36 the need for places, 4.57 to 4.65 funding and land and 4.66 to 4.67 special educational needs. Attention is also drawn to paragraph 4.77 which states 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. Appeals against the decision made by the authority may be made to the Schools Adjudicator. Any decision that Members take is liable to challenge by way of Judicial review

Due consideration must be given to responses received as a result of the consultation before any final decision is reached concerning the proposals outlined. An overview of the consultation is set out in paragraphs 5.25 to 5.55 of the report. Attention is drawn to paragraph 4.73 of the guidance which states 'The decision maker should not simply take account of the numbers of people expressing a particular view when considering representations made on proposals. Instead the decision maker should give the greatest weight to representations from those stakeholders likely to be most directly affected by the proposals.' Further information in relation to the consultation is provided in the Equality Impact Assessment at Appendix 7.

- 7.17 Due regard must also be had to the authority's public sector equality duty before a final decision is reached taking into account the Equality Impact Assessment attached at Appendix 7. Members are also referred in particular to the summary table at step 7 and the action plan set out at step 8. Details of the public sector equality duty under the Equality Act 2010 and to which the authority must have due regard are set out in Appendix 20 to the report.
- 7.18 Due regard must also be had to the authority's public sector equality duty under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 before a final decision is reached taking into account the Equality Impact Assessment attached at Appendix 7. S 149 says:-

149 Public sector equality duty

- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to—

- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it

(2) Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—

- (a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
- (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;

(c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

(3) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.

(4) Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—

- (a) tackle prejudice, and
- (b) promote understanding.

(5) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others; but that is not to be taken as permitting conduct that would otherwise be prohibited by or under this Act.

(6) The relevant protected characteristics are—

- age;
- disability;
- gender reassignment;
- pregnancy and maternity;
- race;
- religion or belief;
- sex;
- sexual orientation.

8 Equalities and Community Cohesion Comments

8.1 Providing local school places to meet local demand helps to contribute towards the development of sustainable communities.

8.2 An Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) for Belmont Infant and Belmont Junior Schools was carried out as part of the first round of consultation on the possible expansion of the school. This EqIA was updated following the further round of consultation on the expansion that took place between May and June 2012. A copy of the updated EqIA is included at Appendix 7 to this report.

- 8.3 Consideration of the ward profile data for West Green ward indicates that residents of Asian, Black, and White Other ethnicities, and Hindu and Muslim residents, are overrepresented compared to the overall Haringey profile, and hence would particularly benefit from the creation of additional school places in the local area.
- 8.4 All 16 pupils attending the Vale-Belmont Integration Scheme have a physical disability. 11 pupils attending Belmont Infant & Junior Schools have statements of SEN – this is slightly above the Haringey average (2.6% compared to 1.6%). The overall impact of the proposed expansion will be positive for pupils with disabilities, as the indicative plans include a number of improvements to the school environment – see section 3(a) of the EqIA for details.
- 8.5 The Council will use the detailed planning process used in the development of the Inclusive Learning Campuses to manage the expansion process. This will ensure that all issues that may impact upon pupils with disabilities are identified and addressed, both in relation to managing the potential disruption arising from the building works and ensuring that the completed building work meets the needs of pupils.
- 8.6 When compared to the Haringey school population, Belmont Infant and Junior Schools have a higher proportion of pupils of Asian and Mixed ethnicities. The building works will create some disruption for all students, therefore these students will as a group be disproportionately affected. However, a range of actions are in place to mitigate the potential negative impact of the disruption – see section 3(a) of the EqIA for details.

9 Policy Implication

- 9.1 The proposed expansions of Belmont Infant School and Belmont Junior School have been recommended following careful consideration of all material factors including the overall need for additional school places in the borough, the areas of the borough where that need is evident, the most effective way to increase the number of school places that we currently have, and an assessment of the schools that have the management and performance to carry an expansion forward successfully and representations in the consultation and objection procedures.. By providing additional places at these schools that we project will be required we are contributing towards planning to meet the projected demand for future places from both children who have already been born and for those children that it has been projected will be born over the coming years. This underpins the Council's Children and Young People's Strategic Plan 2009 – 2020 which seeks to develop sustainable schooling (under the priority of Enjoy and Achieve) and empower families and communities through the provision of local school places (under the priority of achieving economic wellbeing)

10 Use of Appendices

Appendix 1 Belmont Design Options

Appendix 2 On time applications to Haringey for the last two years (set against overall PAN)

Appendix 3 ONS birth data for Haringey by ward and planning area

Appendix 4 Waiting List Numbers for Reception 2012 intake

Appendix 5 Preferences for Haringey Schools

Appendix 6 Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 results

Appendix 7 EqIA for Belmont Infant and Belmont Junior schools

Appendix 8 Belmont Junior School Mobility analysis

Appendix 9 Summary of consultation held 12th September to 2nd November 2011

Appendix 10 Minutes Public Consultation Meetings held on 21st September 2011

Appendix 11 Summary of consultation held 9th January to 6th February 2012

Appendix 12 Questions and Answers for Public Meeting 17th January 2012

Appendix 13 Statutory Notices for Belmont Infant School and Belmont Junior School

Appendix 14 Consultation documentation distributed during the May-June

- Appendix 15** Background information on school roll projections
- Appendix 16** Questions and comments from the consultation board 4th May to 1st June 2012
- Appendix 17** Summary of consultation responses received 4th May to 1st June 2012
- Appendix 18** GLA Projected Rolls
- Appendix 19** Expanding a mainstreamed school by enlargement or adding a sixth form
- Appendix 20** The Public Sector Equality Duty
- Appendix 21** Draft Communication Plan
- Appendix 22** – Summary of comments received from governing bodies of The Vale and Belmont Infant School, with Council response
- Appendix 23** Complete proposals for Belmont Infant and Junior Schools

11 Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

- 11.1 Previous School Place Planning Reports, School PLASC returns, GLA birth data and school roll data and projections, ONS birth data.

HARINGEY COUNCIL

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM



Service: Admissions and School Organisation

Directorate: Children & Young People's Service

Title of Proposal: Shaping the future of Belmont Infant and Junior Schools - Consultation on a possible school expansion

Lead Officer (author of the proposal): Jenny Duxbury

Names of other Officers involved: Eveleen Riordan; Carlene Liverpool; Jen Johnson; Tom Fletcher; Arleen Brown

Step 1 - Identify the aims of the policy, service or function

State what effects the proposal is intended to achieve and who will benefit from it.

NOTE: This Equality Impact Assessment was originally completed in December 2011 following the completion of the first period of public consultation on the proposed expansion of Belmont Infant & Junior Schools. It has now been updated following the completion of the statutory four week representation period that ended on 1st June 2012 (see timeline on page 3).

Belmont Infant and Junior Schools are located on Rusper Road N22. The Infant School (ages 4-7) currently takes 56 pupils into its two reception classes in September each year. At the Junior School (ages 8 – 11) there are 60 pupils in each year, again spread across two classes. Across the two schools, 16 places are available for pupils on roll at the Vale Special School, under the Vale-Belmont Integration Scheme (more information about this arrangement is provided on page 3 below). The proposal being put forward is to create additional school places in West Green Ward by expanding Belmont Infant and Junior Schools from their current 2 forms of entry to 3 forms of entry.

If the proposal to expand Belmont Infant and Junior Schools to 3 forms of entry is implemented, the first 3 form reception entry at Belmont Infant School would start in September 2013, offering 84 places. Belmont Junior School would also, in time, expand to accommodate the 3 forms of entry coming up from the Infant School. The first year group of 90 children would enter the Junior School in 2016 as they move from Year 2 to Year 3. The schools would eventually provide for 612 Reception to year 6 children by 2019.

Before we create more places, the local authority must ensure that:

- There is a demand for additional places in the local community
- The change can be made in a way that maintains and enhances educational standards at all schools affected by the outcome.
- The proposals makes the best use of the resources available, and:

- There is well-established and successful leadership and management at the school that we are expanding

All of the schools within West Green ward and the adjoining Bruce Grove ward are popular, successful and oversubscribed schools, with Belmont being the most popular. In 2010/11 the total percentage of unfilled places at reception level for all schools across these two wards was 1.7% with only 4 reception places vacant out of a possible 236 places. We know that if we do not provide additional places in the local area we are likely to run out of places to offer to all of those children who need one. Also, having so few spare reception places is likely to mean fewer parents will be offered a place at their preferred local school. On 18 April 2012 ('offer day' for primary places) a total of 239 families had listed Belmont Infant School as one of their preferred schools. Of these 239, 110 families had put Belmont Infant School as their first place preference – the school they would most like to go to.

Across the borough there are almost no vacant reception places and our birth data tells us that the demand for places is going continue to increase, a pattern that we have seen for several years. We have a statutory duty to provide sufficient school places for every child of school age who lives in the borough. The annual School Place Planning Report, available to view at www.haringey.gov.uk/schoolplaceplanning, provides more detail on the way that we plan to ensure that there are enough school places to meet demand. The report also sets out those areas of the borough where we know that we are likely to run out of school places if we do not increase the number of places that we have.

When thinking about how best to provide additional school places in the borough, the local authority considers a number of factors including:

- The current number of spare places in the local area
- The demand for places in the school and for other schools in the local area
- The location of the school and the physical capacity on site to expand
- The performance of the school and the ability of the school to cope with an expansion

When considered against the above, Belmont Infant and Junior Schools were identified as schools where it was considered that the strong leadership of the schools could manage the expansion while still maintaining the schools' high standards, and where there is an identified demand in the local area for additional school places. By expanding Belmont Infant and Junior Schools we would be meeting our duty to ensure that a school expansion will contribute to raising standards of provision.

The table below sets out the timeline for the proposed expansion. Following the initial consultation, Cabinet agreed to proceed to stage 2. Statutory notices were published in accordance with section 19(1) of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 outlining the Council's intention to make a prescribed alteration to Belmont Infant and Junior Schools from 01 September 2013. Following the publication of the statutory notice, a four week representation period was undertaken 9 January – 6 February.

Feedback from both of those consultations was very clear: the school community was strongly opposed to the expansion of either of the schools. To respond to concerns, the council's Cabinet agreed in March 2012 to withdraw the statutory notices and carry out further consultation with the schools and their communities, and to provide more information about how the expansions might be delivered, as requested by stakeholders during the consultation.

On 4 May 2012 the Council issued two further statutory notices setting out the intention to expand Belmont Infant School and Belmont Junior School. These notices marked the start of a further 4 week representation period to seek the views of parents, carers, staff, governors and other members of the wider community. This period ended on 1 June and this EqlA has been updated to reflect the consultation responses received. The final decision will be taken by the Cabinet.

Statutory Stage	Description	Date
1	Start of consultation	12 September 2011
	Public meetings	20 September 2011 from 3.30 – 4.30pm and repeated between 6 – 7pm
	End of consultation	2 November 2011
	Cabinet decides whether to proceed and publish statutory notices	20 December 2011
2	The publication of a statutory notice setting out the final proposal	January 2012
3	Representation – a further four week opportunity to express views on the proposals.	January – February 2012
4	Decision – the Council's Cabinet make a decision on whether the expansion should go ahead, having considered all of the relevant information. This stage has to be completed within two months of the representation period finishing. The decision was taken to withdraw the statutory notices and carry out a further representation period, and to provide more information about how the expansions might be delivered.	March 2012
2	The reissuing of publication of a statutory notice setting out the final proposal	May 2012
3	Representation – a further four week opportunity to express views on the proposals.	May-June 2012
4	Decision - the Council's Cabinet make a decision on whether the expansion should go ahead, having considered all of the relevant information	July 2012
5	If determined upon, implementation – the schools expand	September 2013

The Vale

The Vale Special School caters for pupils with physical disabilities, some of whom have additional medical and/or learning needs. One of its two primary sites is co-located at Belmont Infant and Junior Schools. Overall there are 16 primary aged Vale pupils at Belmont Infants and Belmont Junior schools, where they are included full-time. This is usually arranged with eight children in each Key Stage and on average there are not more than two Vale children in a class. Admissions are co-ordinated by Haringey SEN Panel. It is possible for more than 16 pupils to be admitted however this happens very rarely and has to be agreed by all parties – the school, SEN panel, and the pupil's parents/carers.

Vale pupils attending Belmont require some specialist facilities and adaptations, and with varying levels of support, equipment and curriculum modifications, are full members of the school communities. Members of the Vale Inclusion Team provide teaching input and liaise with therapists and external agencies to provide the necessary conditions and support, which enables these pupils to benefit from a mainstream environment. Belmont has been adapted in order to make the site fully wheelchair accessible with ramps, a lift and disabled toilets.

Step 2 - Consideration of available data, research and information

You should gather all relevant quantitative and qualitative data that will help you assess whether at presently, there are differential outcomes for the different equalities target groups – diverse ethnic groups, women, men, older people, young people, disabled people, gay men, lesbians and transgender people and faith groups. Identify where there are gaps in data and say how you plug these gaps.

In order to establish whether a group is experiencing disproportionate effects, you should relate the data for each group to its population size. The 2001 Haringey Census data has an equalities profile of the borough and will help you to make comparisons against population sizes.

http://harinet.haringey.gov.uk/index/news_and_events/fact_file/statistics/census_statistics.htm

2 a) Using data from equalities monitoring, recent surveys, research, consultation etc. are there group(s) in the community who:

- **are significantly under/over represented in the use of the service, when compared to their population size?**
- **have raised concerns about access to services or quality of services?**
- **appear to be receiving differential outcomes in comparison to other groups?**

Those who may be affected by or have an interest in the proposal to expand Belmont Infant and Junior schools can be considered as two groups: the children who are currently attending the schools (including those attending the Vale-Belmont Integration Scheme) and their families, and the wider local population (including prospective pupils and their families, and other local residents). This section will use school census data to consider the profile of the school populations, and data relating to West Green ward to give an indication of the profile of the local population.

The school census data is from January 2011. It is noted that although the school census provides the most up to date profile of the school population, many of these pupils will have left by the date of the proposed school expansion. Ward data is mostly from the January 2001 census, though in the case of age and gender more recent (2011) GLA population projections are used.

For the purposes of this EqIA, the profiles of Belmont Infant and Junior School will be combined to produce a profile of children from ages 3-11. Details of pupils attending the Vale-Belmont Integration Scheme are included separately.

Age

School Profile

The data below shows that the age profile of Belmont Infant and Junior Schools is broadly representative of the wider Haringey Primary School population.

Age Category	Belmont Infant and Junior	Haringey School Population
	%	%
2	0.0%	1.4%
3	12.1%	10.7%
4	13.8%	13.2%

5	13.1%	13.2%
6	13.3%	13.3%
7	12.6%	12.8%
8	12.1%	12.0%
9	10.7%	11.6%
10	12.4%	11.7%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%

The table below shows the ages of pupils attending the Vale-Belmont Integration Scheme.

Age	Number at Vale-Belmont	% at Vale-Belmont	Haringey School Population
4	1	6.3%	13.20%
5	0	0.0%	13.20%
6	5	31.3%	13.30%
7	2	12.5%	12.80%
8	2	12.5%	12.00%
9	3	18.8%	11.60%
10	3	18.8%	11.70%

Ward Profile

The 0-19 ward population is slightly over represented when compared to the wider 0-19 population (27.0% as compared with 24.1%) and the 20-39 population is slightly under-represented when compared to the wider profile (39.1% compared to 41.8%).

Age Group	West Green Ward	Haringey Total
0-4	8.3%	8.0%
5-9	7.2%	6.1%
10-14	6.0%	5.2%
15-19	5.6%	4.8%
20-24	8.5%	8.6%
25-29	12.0%	12.9%
30-34	10.7%	11.4%
35-39	7.9%	8.9%
40-44	6.6%	7.3%
45-49	6.2%	6.3%
50-54	4.9%	4.8%
55-59	3.9%	3.7%
60-64	3.2%	3.3%
65-69	2.7%	2.5%
70-74	2.8%	2.2%
75-79	1.8%	1.8%
80-84	1.0%	1.2%
85-89	0.4%	0.7%
90+	0.4%	0.4%

Ward and borough population by age (GLA 2011 Round SHLAA Ward Population Projections)

Disability

School Profile

As of 2011, the Schools Census now includes the facility for schools to submit data on disability, but not all schools are as yet doing so. More complete data is available on Special Education Needs (SEN). Whilst these are not interchangeable terms it should be assumed that children with SEN have a disability for the purposes of the public sector equality duty.

The proportion of pupils at Belmont Infant and Junior School with identified SEN is broadly in line with the Haringey school population overall (23.3% compared to 22.2%). Within this, fewer pupils are at School Action (the lowest level of identified need) and more are at School Action Plus relative to Haringey overall. 11 pupils have Statements of SEN – these are the pupils with the highest level of need. This comprises 2.6% of the school population, slightly in excess of the Haringey figure of 1.6%.

SEN Status	Belmont Infant and Junior		Haringey School Population	
	No.	%	No.	%
No identified SEN	329	76.7%	17557	77.8%
School Action	40	9.3%	2955	13.1%
School Action Plus	49	11.4%	1688	7.5%
Statement of SEN	11	2.6%	371	1.6%
Grand Total	429	100.0%	22571	100.0%

The 11 children with statements are all on roll at Belmont Junior School (none attend the Infant School). Of these, there are four with a diagnosis of autism, one with behaviour, emotional and social difficulties, four with moderate learning difficulties, one with speech, language and communication difficulties and one with a visual impairment.

All 16 children attending the Vale Inclusion Scheme at Belmont have statements of SEN. They all have physical difficulties and one pupil also has a diagnosis of autism.

No Ward level data for Disability is available.

Ethnicity

School Profile

The data shows that a higher proportion of children attending Belmont are of Asian and Mixed ethnicities compared to the wider Haringey School population (18% compared to 6% and 18% compared to 10% respectively). In contrast to this, children of Black ethnicities are under represented compared to the wider Haringey school profile (12% compared to 30%). The proportion of children of White UK, White Other, and Other ethnicities is broadly in line with the overall Haringey profile.

Ethnicity Haringey Groupings	Belmont Infant and Junior		Haringey School Population	
	No.	%	No.	%
Asian Bangladeshi	30	7.0%	632	2.8%
Asian Indian	19	4.4%	249	1.1%
Asian Other	5	1.2%	349	1.5%
Asian Pakistani	23	5.4%	211	0.9%

Asian TOTAL	77	17.9%	1441	6.4%
Black Caribbean	25	5.8%	2419	10.7%
Black Other	4	0.9%	377	1.7%
Black African	5	1.2%	1120	5.0%
Black Congolese	3	0.7%	437	1.9%
Black Ghanaian	2	0.5%	819	3.6%
Black Nigerian	1	0.2%	523	2.3%
Black Somali	10	2.3%	1073	4.8%
Black TOTAL	50	11.7%	6768	30.0%
Mixed Other	41	9.6%	841	3.7%
Mixed White African	11	2.6%	298	1.3%
Mixed White Asian	10	2.3%	331	1.5%
Mixed White Caribbean	16	3.7%	714	3.2%
Mixed TOTAL	78	18.2%	2184	9.7%
Other	8	1.9%	620	2.7%
Other Kurdish	12	2.8%	402	1.8%
Other Latin American	2	0.5%	353	1.6%
Other Vietnamese	3	0.7%	119	0.5%
Other Chinese	9	2.1%	188	0.8%
Other TOTAL	34	7.9%	1682	7.5%
White British	71	16.6%	4377	19.4%
White TOTAL	71	16.6%	4377	19.4%
White Albanian	2	0.5%	249	1.1%
White Greek Cypriot	0	0.0%	109	0.5%
White Gypsy/Roma	0	0.0%	165	0.7%
White Irish	4	0.9%	251	1.1%
White Irish Traveller	1	0.2%	67	0.3%
White Kosovan	6	1.4%	226	1.0%
White Other	69	16.1%	2592	11.5%
White Turkish	22	5.1%	1626	7.2%
White Turkish Cypriot	9	2.1%	107	0.5%
White Other TOTAL	113	26.3%	5392	23.9%
Refused/Not obtained	6	1.4%	727	3.2%
Grand Total	429	100.0%	22571	100.0%

School population by ethnicity (Jan 2011)

The table below sets out the ethnicity profile of the 16 pupils attending the Vale-Belmont Integration Scheme. Overall Haringey school population figures are included for reference however given the small number of pupils it is not possible to draw conclusions about over or under representation of particular groups.

Ethnicity of pupils attending Vale-Belmont Integration Scheme

Ethnicity	Number at Vale-Belmont	% at Vale-Belmont	Haringey School Population
Black - Somali	1	6.3%	4.8%

Black Caribbean	4	25.0%	10.7%
Other Black	1	6.3%	1.7%
Gypsy / Roma	1	6.3%	0.7%
Traveller of Irish Heritage	1	6.3%	0.3%
White British	1	6.3%	19.4%
White Other	2	12.5%	11.5%
Turkish	3	18.8%	7.2%
White and Black Caribbean	1	6.3%	3.2%
Bangladeshi	1	6.3%	2.8%

Ward Profile

Ward-level data shows a small overrepresentation of Asian residents in West Green ward (8.7% of the community, compared to 6.7% across Haringey). Residents of Black ethnicities are over represented when compared with the wider Borough profile (25.3% compared to 20%), as are residents of White Other ethnicities (25.1% compared to 20.4%). The profile shows that White British ethnicities are under represented when compared to the wider profile (32.3% relative to 45.3%) and the Mixed ethnicity and Other Ethnic groups are in line with the wider Haringey profile (4.4% compared to 4.6%). This data is taken from the 2001 Census as more up to date population projections are not available for Ethnicity. Given this, it is important to note that it is not appropriate to directly compare this data with the school profile above.

Ethnic Group	Ethnicity	West Green Ward %	Haringey Population %
Asian	Indian	3.8	2.9
	Pakistani	1.0	1.0
	Bangladeshi	2.1	1.4
	Other Asian	1.9	1.6
Asian Total		8.7	6.7
Black or Black British	Caribbean	9.1	9.5
	African	14.7	9.2
	Other Black	1.4	1.4
Black Total		25.3	20.0
Mixed	White and Black Caribbean	1.3	1.5
	White and Black African	0.9	0.7
	White and Asian	0.9	1.1
	Other Mixed	1.3	1.3
Mixed Total		4.4	4.6
Other ethnic group		4.4	3.1
White British		32.2	45.3
White Other		25.1	20.4

Ward and borough population by ethnicity (2001 census)

Gender

School profile

The data below shows the school profile is proportionate to the wider Haringey School Population.

Sex	Belmont Infant and Junior		Haringey School Population	
	No.	%	No.	%
Female	205	47.8%	10925	48.4%
Male	224	52.2%	11646	51.6%
Grand Total	429	100.0%	22571	100.0%

School population by gender (Jan 2011)

Of the 16 Vale pupils attending Belmont, 9 are female and 7 are male.

Ward Profile

The Ward gender profile is based on the 2011 population projections and shows that the West Green ward population is representative of the wider Borough profile in terms of gender.

Sex	West Green	West Green %	Haringey Population	Haringey Population %
Female	6733	51.3%	123668	51.7%
Male	6386	48.7%	115488	48.3%
Grand Total	13119		239156	

Religion or Belief

Religion or Belief is not recorded as part of the Pupil Level Annual Census and therefore data on the representation within the school population is not available.

2001 Census data shows that most groups in West Green Ward are proportional to the wider Haringey profile. People of Hindu and Muslim faiths are slightly over represented (3.1% compared to 2.1% and 16.3% compared to 11.3%). People of Jewish faith are under represented (0.3% compared to 2.6%) as are people of no religion (15.5% compared to 20.0%).

Religious Group	West Green %	Haringey Population %
Christian	50.0	50.1
Buddhist	1.4	1.1
Hindu	3.1	2.1
Jewish	0.3	2.6
Muslim	16.3	11.3
Sikh	0.4	0.3
Other religions	0.5	0.5
No religion	15.5	20.0
Religion not stated	12.6	12.1

Other equalities strands

Data was not available (or not applicable) at School or Ward level for the following equality strands and assessment of impact on these service user groups is not therefore possible:

- Gender Reassignment
- Sexual Orientation
- Maternity & Pregnancy
- Marriage and Civil Partnership

In summary:

- when compared to the Haringey school population, Belmont has a higher proportion of pupils of Asian and Mixed ethnicities, and children with statements of SEN
- All 16 pupils attending the Vale-Belmont Integration Scheme have a physical disability.
- when compared to the Haringey borough profile, West Green ward has a higher proportion of residents of Asian, Black, and White Other ethnicities, and of Hindu and Muslim residents.

2 b) What factors (barriers) might account for this under/over representation?

Factors that determine the equalities profile of a local population could include things such as property prices, the type of housing available, local amenities, employment opportunities, and historical connections of groups to particular areas. The equalities strands also impact on each other – for example, the number of children people have (which affects the age profile of an area) varies by ethnicity⁴.

The population of primary schools is determined by the application of Haringey’s School Admissions Criteria (see box below) to the preferences stated by parents/carers on their application forms for school places. The fifth criterion (distance) means that the majority of pupils attending a primary school live locally to that school. In any locality there will be a number of nearby primary schools – there are 3 within West Green ward, and a further 3 just outside its borders. The equalities profile of the school will therefore be influenced, but not wholly determined, by the make-up of the local area. It is also worth noting that faith schools will obviously have many more pupils of a particular religion, and that special schools will have many more pupils with disabilities, as is the case with the Vale.

Haringey School Admissions Criteria

The Local Authority has a duty to put in place admission arrangements that comply with the mandatory provisions set out in the School Admissions Code 2012. These consist of Admissions Criteria and a Coordinated scheme and aim to provide a clear admissions system and oversubscription criteria which are transparent to those parents applying for a school place. The Determined Admission Criteria vary slightly according to the type of provision (nursery, primary, secondary etc) they apply to. However the main principles are set out below:

Statement of Special Education Needs - Where a child has a statement of Special Educational Needs which names the school, they will be admitted in accordance with section 324 of the Education Act 1996.

If the number of applicants without statements of educational needs naming the school is higher than the number of places available, the following rules are applied, in the order of priority to decide who will be offered a place:

- 1. Looked After Children** – Children in the care of a local authority

⁴ See Table 3 Family type and average family size, by ethnic group of head of family unit, found on page 22 of ‘Ethnicity & Family’, a report published by the Equality & Human Rights Commission – available at: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded_files/raceinbritain/ethnicity_and_family_report.pdf

2. **Social Medical** - Children who the Authority accepts have an exceptional medical or social need for a place at one specific school. Applications are supported by a written statement from a relevant independent professional and assessed at a SocMed panel.
3. ****Linked school** - This rule applies only to junior school admissions. Children attending an infant school will be prioritised under this rule for admission to the linked junior school.
4. **Siblings** - Children who will have a sibling attending the school at the point of admission. This category includes foster brothers and sisters, half brothers and half-sisters or stepbrothers and stepsisters. They must also be living at the same address as the applicant.
5. **Distance** - Children living closest to the school. Distance is measured in a straight line.

These are the admission arrangements for entry to school in 2012. Please note that Criterion 1 has been determined for 2013 to meet our duty to prioritise previously looked after children.

Step 3 - Assessment of Impact

Using the information you have gathered and analysed in step 2, you should assess whether and how the proposal you are putting forward will affect existing barriers and what actions you will take to address any potential negative effects.

3 a) How will your proposal affect existing barriers? (Please tick below as appropriate)

Increase barriers?	Reduce barriers? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No change?
--------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------

Comment

(I) Creation of additional school places

The creation of additional school places at Belmont Infant and Junior schools would contribute to ensuring that the council provides enough school places to meet demand, and enable more pupils to access outstanding provision. It is likely to mean that more parents/carers are offered a place at their preferred local school, and to reduce the likelihood of children having to travel longer distances to attend school.

Consideration of the ward profile data for West Green ward indicates that residents of Asian, Black, and White Other ethnicities, and Hindu and Muslim residents, are overrepresented compared to the overall Haringey profile, and hence would particularly benefit from the creation of additional school places in the local area.

(II) Pupils with disabilities

Impact of the building work

Building works will bring a level of disruption to all pupils on site, including those with disabilities and additional needs on roll at Belmont Infant and Junior Schools and at the Vale. Without mitigation the effect of building works could be negative effect on all pupils, including those with disabilities.

Before any building work is undertaken there will be a very detailed plan drawn up with the schools which will be closely monitored during the entirety of the work. The type of communication can be evidenced in the draft communications plan to be found at appendix 21 to the Cabinet report of 19 July 2012. The Equalities Impact Assessment will be reviewed periodically and any necessary actions added to the action plan.

The school would be involved in the contractor selection process. Only contractors who would enhance the children's education by, for example, providing information about the works being undertaken would be used. As part of the design development at Broadwater Farm we arranged for the teaching staff to be taken to see similar schools which had been through the process. This is a dynamic process to assist in highlighting good practice and good construction techniques which can be used to inform the process further.

Specific measures to minimise the potential negative impact of building work include:

- Carefully planning the building work e.g. undertaking the maximum amount of noisy work during the school holidays and outside of school hours (school expansions generally take twice as long as other similar-sized projects because of this consideration)
- Works not being undertaken at all at certain key times such as SATs weeks

- Pupils including disabled pupils and staff understanding in advance exactly what will be happening on each day
- In terms of movement around the school, management plans will look at the flow of pupils including disabled pupils to ensure that where necessary time tables are amended so that at times where corridor space is limited, a reduced number of pupils use the space at any one time.
- There are currently four children with a diagnosis of autism on the roll of Belmont Junior School and one on the roll of the Vale Special School. Children with autism can find change of routine difficult and be sensitive to loud noises. The negative impact of the building works will be mitigated by making sure the children are aware of the project, and have the use of social stories and visual support to prepare them for changes to their building. Noise disruption will be managed by detailed timetabling to ensure that children with autism are not in the area where there is a potential for loud noises during the school day. Parents and carers will also be involved so that they can support their children at home and monitor any anxiety or changes in behaviour. This approach has been used successfully in the building project on the Primary Inclusive Campus at Broadwater Farm which involved 100 children with complex needs including children with autism.

Any changes to the building will take account of the Vale Belmont Integration Scheme and will include detailed planning and consultation with stakeholders to ensure that the school layout continues to provide efficient and full access for children with disabilities. Staff from the Vale and Belmont are experienced in jointly planning building and curriculum access for children with disabilities while maintaining a full curriculum experience for all the children in the school. This work will continue and include efficient use of playground space, use of adapted playground equipment, timetabling and joint training. Belmont Infant and Junior schools have been identified as schools where it is considered that the strong school leadership could manage the expansion while still maintaining high standards. The Council has significant experience in the successful management of building projects, including those involving children with additional needs and disabilities.

The Council will use the detailed planning process used in the development of the Inclusive Learning Campuses to manage the expansion process. These projects involved much larger numbers of children with more complex needs and disabilities. Identified good practice from these projects includes full and regular communication with all stakeholders, detailed project planning, and identifying key issues and risks. The plan was overseen by a steering group comprising senior managers from the Building design and project teams, Head teachers and senior managers, Chairs of Governors, LA Sponsor, Additional Needs and Disabilities Service, Communication team and School Improvement Service.

Work at the Secondary Inclusive Learning Campus comprising Riverside Special School and Woodside High Academy has been completed and the Primary Inclusive Campus comprising the Brook Special School and the Willow mainstream school is nearing completion. The special schools cater for a large number of children and young people with profound and multiple needs, autism, and learning difficulties.

Both these large projects involved building works taking place in the holidays and term time. Detailed planning between all involved ensured that the building works took full account of and adapted to the curricular needs of the whole school. Regular meetings took place between school staff, project managers and Council officers working to a detailed project plan which identified risks, key issues and mitigating actions. The project plan formed the focus of each meeting and amendments were made based on feedback from the steering group. Parents, carers, staff and the wider community were kept informed and involved through regular newsletters and focus meetings.

In addition, the building works were used as a learning opportunity for the children and they were involved in understanding and watching the development of their new building and facilities.

Impact following completion of the expansion

The overall impact of the proposed expansion will be positive for pupils with disabilities, as the indicative plans include a number of improvements to the school environment.

- Proposals 2 and 3 (see appendix 1 to the Cabinet report of 19 July 2012) plan to improve access to the school for all disabled pupils through the installation of a mezzanine walk way / extension of corridor on the first floor of the junior school. This will enable access to the whole floor without the need to go through classrooms and enable access to the lift for the whole of the first floor.
- The new layout will ease circulation and movement around the school for children with disabilities. The classroom layouts will also improve classroom flow, particularly where there are children who require wheel chairs, standing frames or other mobility aids.
- The indicative plans allow for an enhancement for the medical and therapeutic provisions for Vale children
- By better space utilisation and bringing year groups closer together than they are currently we expect to be able to provide more age related and stabilised environments for the children
- At the Infant School, depending on the proposal developed, 4 – 5 of the classes will have equal or better space than at present. The remaining 3 – 4 classrooms already have more than sufficient space in terms of current design guidance.
- We propose to maintain as a minimum and enhance where possible the outdoor play equipment for use for students with disabilities.
- There will also be opportunities to review existing arrangements and consider improvements for movement around the school and playground.

It is very important that the design solution that is selected works for the school, meets the needs of pupils and staff, and caters for the increased number of pupils. The indicative plans include the following measures which will mitigate against any potential negative impact of the expansion:

- The construction of a self contained foundation stage block with its own discrete entrance and play area – this would segregate a number of the pupils thereby decreasing pressure on the corridors.
- How the year 2 pupils are located and access and egress routes to both the classrooms and play space in order to minimise demands on communal areas
- We are aware that the current toilet facilities would be insufficient for a 3 form entry school and additional facilities would be included in any design
- Once the works are complete, some corridors will be wider, allowing greater room for manoeuvre. The increased overall pupil numbers will be carefully managed by school staff to time table movement to ensure that corridors are not over crowded.

(III) Children of disproportionately represented ethnicities

The building works will create some disruption for all students. Therefore students of Asian and Mixed ethnicities, who are disproportionately represented in the student population, will as a group be disproportionately affected. Steps will be taken to minimise disruption as described above.

3 b) What specific actions are you proposing in order to respond to the existing barriers and imbalances you have identified in Step 2?

The proposals may affect disabled people and people from certain ethnicities disproportionately because of their numbers in the affected population. Section 3(a) above sets out the steps that will be taken to mitigate any negative impact of the proposals, and details the improvements that will be made to facilities for disabled pupils.

3 c) If there are barriers that cannot be removed, what groups will be most affected and what Positive Actions are you proposing in order to reduce the adverse impact on those groups?

Please see section 3(a) above for actions to minimise or negate potential adverse impacts of the proposed expansion.

Step 4 - Consult on the proposal

Consultation is an essential part of impact assessment. If there has been recent consultation which has highlighted the issues you have identified in Steps 2 and 3, use it to inform your assessment. If there has been no consultation relating to the issues, then you may have to carry out consultation to assist your assessment.

Make sure you reach all those who are likely to be affected by the proposal, ensuring that you cover all the equalities strands. Do not forget to give feedback to the people you have consulted, stating how you have responded to the issues and concerns they have raised.

4 a) Who have you consulted on your proposal and what were the main issues and concerns from the consultation?

(I) Consultation – first stage

The first period of public consultation ran from 12th September to 17th October 2011. Consultation documents (with attached questionnaires) were circulated to:

- parents and carers, both at Belmont Infant and Junior schools and at other local schools
- Local MPs
- Adjoining boroughs
- All Head teachers in Haringey
- All Councillors
- Diocesan Boards of Education
- 40 residents associations across the borough

Leaflets were distributed to all local residents and placed in libraries and children's centres. The proposal was publicised in Haringey People, the local press and on the Haringey website. Consultation materials were made available on the Haringey website and two public consultation meetings were held.

There were 127 responses to the consultation, including responses from the Governing Body of the Vale, the Governing Body of Downhills Primary School and the Diocese of London Board for Schools. A petition with 111 signatures was also received. The table below shows the numbers of respondents for and against the proposal.

Response	Belmont Parents	Other respondents	All responses
Objections	68	33	100
Supporters	14	5	19
Neither support nor do not support	2	1	3
Don't know/ didn't express view	0	5	5
Total	83	44	127

The fact that 83 of the 127 respondents came from parents of children currently attending Belmont indicates, as would be expected, that this is the group that is most interested in whether or not the expansion goes ahead. However, it should be noted that the total school population is 426, meaning that the majority of parents and carers did not respond to the consultation.

Overall, 78% of respondents were not in favour of the proposed expansion. Support for the expansion was stronger amongst parents of children currently attending Belmont, with 18% in favour, than amongst other respondents, where 12% were in favour.

The **main points made in objection** to the proposal were:

- Increase in traffic and congestion.
- No concrete plans have been provided.
- Concerns that in current economic climate building works will be under-resourced/financed.
- School functions well because it is small. This will be damaged by the enlargement.
- An expansion will mean a loss of outdoor/green space.
- Noel Park & North Haringay's Published Admission Numbers have been reduced. This undermines the argument for expansion.
- Improve the standards at Noel Park and North Haringay. This will be more cost effective.
- Disruption during construction works (including health and safety implications, and impact on local residents.)
- Impact on quality of the children's education.
- Impact on partnership with The Vale
 - Disruption of building work on children with Special Educational Needs
 - Loss of space and the implications on access/egress & health & safety.
 - Expansion will have a negative impact on inclusion.

The **main points made in favour** were:

- The importance of allowing children school places close to their homes
- That a larger school would allow more children to benefit from an excellent school
- A disagreement with any plans for a free school in the area as it will divide the community and will be disadvantageous for children from poorer backgrounds
- Belmont provides a wonderful ethos based on fairness and diversity and it would be terrible if other young children in the area were not given the opportunity to be part of this.

The responses received from the Governing Body of the Vale, the Governing Body of Downhills Primary School and the Diocese of London Board for Schools are shown in more detail below:

Governing Body of Downhills Primary School:

- There are no new housing developments planned.
- Any expansion of Belmont would result in a net loss of pupils to Downhills and other neighbouring schools.

- The development of the Free School in the locality and the possible expansion of Belmont could negatively impact the school.
- There is a large site at the rear of the Downhills Primary School which could be developed enabling the school to expand.

The Vale Governing Body:

- During the “feasibility” studies, there was no discussion with Headteacher of Vale or staff representatives about the needs of the Vale students and the potential impact on the partnership prior to the consultation.
- The consultation document did not mention the school as a stakeholder.
- If expansions were to proceed, the issue of space for small groups and separate spaces for therapy work and medical intervention would have to be considered.
- An expansion would mean building upwards or on play space. Both of these scenarios have an impact on accessibility for the Vale pupils.
- The vale pupils have physical disability affecting mobility and spatial/perceptual awareness. They are either wheelchair users or have walking aids to move independently and require more space than the average mainstream child.
- A smaller playground with more children is potentially dangerous for the Vale pupils.
- Parking facilities are currently not suitable and requires carefully management to ensure safety for all members of the school community. Further pupils will exacerbate the current situation, adding to the existing risks, both within the car park and in the streets outside the school.
- The Vale building includes a demountable class, especially designed to meet the needs of physically disabled pupils, providing access to the mainstream school. Any further construction would need to consider this.
- Levels of funding available for the Inclusive Learning Campus and Rokesly (examples of successful change) are unlikely to be replicated for this proposed expansion and may not be sufficient to generate a positive impact.

London Diocese Board for schools:

- “We would agree this should expand.”

(II) Representation period (1)

Following the initial consultation, Cabinet agreed to proceed to stage 2. Statutory notices were published in accordance with section 19(1) of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 outlining the Councils intention to make a prescribed alteration to Belmont Infant and Junior Schools from 01 September 2013. Following the publication of the statutory notice, a statutory four week representation period was undertaken between 9th January – 6th February which gave all stakeholders a further opportunity to express views on the proposals.

Feedback from both of these consultations was very clear: the school community was strongly opposed to the expansion of either of the schools. In summary, the grounds of opposition to the proposed expansions raised during the first and second period of consultation included, but were not limited to:

- Disruption to school life and pupils during construction works;
- The impact of a larger school on the quality and standard of the children’s education;
- The unique sense of community that a two form entry school has, and which is evident in both schools, will be lost as part of the expansion;
- There will be a negative impact on surrounding schools as a result of the expansions
- Other schools are being reduced in terms of intake, but it would make economic sense to retain their annual intake number and even increase it;
- An expansion to three forms of entry will mean the loss of the small schools grant and so the school will lose out financially;

- A new school should be built locally to accommodate increasing demand;
- The impact of the expansion on the relationship with The Vale Special School and its pupils has not been fully considered;
- An increase in traffic and congestion in the local area;
- In the current economic climate the building/expansion works will be under resourced/financed;
- Any expansion will mean the loss of outdoor/green space;
- Improving standards at surrounding schools is more cost effective.

(III) Representation period (2)

To respond to concerns, the council's Cabinet agreed in March 2012 to withdraw the statutory notices and carry out further consultation with the schools and their communities on the proposed expansions of the schools, and to provide more information about how the expansions might be delivered. On 4 May 2012 the Council issued two further statutory notices setting out the intention to expand Belmont Infant School and Belmont Junior School. These notices marked the start of the further 4 week consultation period to seek the views of parents, carers, staff, governors and other members of the wider community.

As part of the additional period of statutory consultation, the council prepared some concept drawings indicating how the expansions might take place on both school sites.

- From 10 May, concept drawings were exhibited at both schools during school hours, and also after school hours on 17 May (from 3.30pm to 7pm) to allow access for the wider community and for those parents and carers who can't view them during the school day.
- Council officers were at the Infant School on Thursday 17 May from 2.30pm to 7pm and the Junior School on Friday 18 May from 2pm to 4pm, to answer questions on the indicative drawings.
- The leader of the Council provided a question and answer session at the Infant School on the 17 May and at the Junior school on the 18 May.

38 individuals or families responded to the Belmont Infant & Junior statutory consultation and 3 'others', making a grand total of 41 responses. The 3 others were The Governing Body of Belmont Infant School, The Governing Body of the Vale, and the Belmont Home School Association. One petition objecting to the proposal with 449 signatures was received during the statutory period which ran from 4th May to 1 June.

Of the 38 individuals or families that responded, 37 were in opposition and 1 was in favour.

OBJECTIONS

Overall, the main points from those who objected were:

- The school is already at capacity physically and there is no space to expand into
- Any expansion would create overcrowding
- The £2.2 million proposed budget is insufficient
- The £2.2 million budget is a fraction of what was spent on expansions in the West of the borough
- Plans do not include enlargement of school's internal/shared spaces such as dining hall and corridors
- Threatens the inclusive partnership with The Vale
- Negative impact on standards
- Loss of small schools grant
- Loss of outdoor/play space
- Increase in traffic and congestion
- Detrimental effect on school (e.g. loss of staff, loss of parents and drop in school standards)

- Threatens school cohesion , e.g. loss of whole class assemblies, lunch times are already staggered
- Junior school experiences high mobility. Concerns around financial viability if school does not fill at 3fe
- School functions well because it is small. This will be damaged by the enlargement.
- Disruption during construction works
- Noel Park & North Harringay's Published Admission Numbers have been reduced. This undermines the argument for expansion.
- Bring Noel Park and North Harringay to 3 forms of entry
- Improve the standards of all Haringey primary schools.
- Redevelop the Professional Development Centre for school use
- Strong opposition to this proposal
- Explore other options

IN FAVOUR

Overall, 1 individual expressed support for the proposal and the following main points were made:

- The importance of providing the future generation with school places close to their homes
- Enhance job opportunities, in particular in the building industry
- Provide opportunities for pupils from diverse cultural backgrounds to learn from other children

RESPONSES OTHER THAN FROM INDIVIDUALS/FAMILIES

Three representations were received from the following groups: 1) The Governing Body of Belmont Infant School, 2) The Governing Body of the Vale School and 3) the Belmont Home School Association. All were opposed.

The main objections from The Governing Body of Belmont Infant School were:

- An expansion is likely to jeopardise the success of the school
- It will negatively impact neighbouring schools
- It will detrimentally impact upon Special Educational Needs provision in the borough
- Proposal threatens very success used to justify expansion
- Result in a loss of outdoor play space
- Compromise quality of outdoor provision, central to ethos of school
- Proposal does not include SEN children or nursery children, therefore understating the true numbers of the school
- The current school buildings do not provide sufficient circulation and ancillary space as per BB99 with 2fe. The budget of £2.2 million for both sites is only sufficient for 3 new classrooms and does not provide funds for revision to circulation or ancillary spaces, thus not compliant with BB99
- The expansion is opposed by the Vale Governing Body.
- The Vale students benefit from the small friendly nature of Belmont Infants and the inclusive education
- Any expansion must protect spaces devoted to inclusion
- The Vale students require more space in the playground than mainstream children and overcrowding presents health & safety issues.
- Plans have not taken into account mobility needs of disabled children or nursery aged children
- The council acknowledges (in Cabinet report) that there would be a negative impact on Vale students.
- Failure to have due regard to its duties under s.149 Equality Act 2010
- No shortage of places in PA 12 according to planning data (GLA 4 year old roll projection for PA12 in the years after 2013 is line with the combined PAN for PA12 schools.)

- Councillors misunderstanding of legislative framework surrounding the formation of new schools – Haringey can invite proposals for new schools, in the event that none are forthcoming, it can seek other proposals, and ultimately, were none forthcoming, it could make proposals itself.
- Uncertainty around whether the council are objecting to new schools because they are likely to be academies and outside of Local Authority control or because of a misunderstanding of the law
- Council should explore other options
- Failure to consider surplus capacity at Noel Park before it became an academy
- Downhills primary school has objected to the expansion citing that an expansion would have a negative effect
- Belmont Junior school currently carries surplus capacity. There is concern that this problem will be exacerbated with a higher Planned Admission Number
- Concerns over school's financial viability if it does not fill at 3 forms of entry
- Potential financial threat from neighbouring academies with space to expand such as Noel Park and Downhills
- Lack of support in the school and in the community for the proposals

The main objections from The Governing Body of the Vale School were:

- The Local Authority needs to understand the special partnership between the Vale and Belmont Infant & Junior Schools taking into account the Special Educational Needs of the pupils from the Vale School, as well as those at Belmont
- The Vale school have not been seen as key stakeholders nor fully consulted with during the different stages of the consultation
- The facilities for the Vale pupils are currently not fit for purpose. Building work due to take place in 2011 remains outstanding
- Consideration should be given for separate spaces for small groups, therapy work and medical intervention
- Additional space can only be created by going up or building on the playground. Both of these scenarios would have a negative impact on accessibility for the Vale children
- Plans show the Vale inclusion room in the Juniors could be relocated upstairs, this presents a health and safety issue especially for wheel chair users in a fire evacuation situation
- The Vale students require more space in and outdoors than mainstream children.
- Opportunities to socialise and mix with mainstream peers in a safe and secure space is essential to the Vale children's well being.
- Access and egress issues must be considered. An increase in pupil numbers would add to the existing risks
- The proposed budget is insufficient
- The main objections from the Belmont Home School Association were:
- Growth of an east west divide in Haringey schools (The £2.2 million budget is a fraction of what was spent on expansions in the West of the borough and does not involve the purchase of land or improvement of facilities)
- School already at capacity
- Any expansion will involve an increase in noise and disruption
- Reception children already find outdoor play noisy and challenging. This will worsen with an expansion.
- Any expansion will create overcrowding and threaten the inclusive ethos of the school
- Negative impact on the Vale pupils
- Junior school experiences high mobility. Concerns around financial viability if school does not fill at 3fe
- Parents, teachers and governing body do not want an expansion
- Make use of the PDC
- Bring North Harringay to 3fe again
- Threat of nearby academies becoming 3fe

- Belmont Infant & Junior schools are victims of the coalition policies
- Explore other options such as building new schools
- School thriving despite being in a deprived area
- Teachers may leave if expansion approved

4 b) How, in your proposal have you responded to the issues and concerns from consultation?

The comment at section 3(a) of this document addresses many of the issues and concerns raised through the consultation. Paragraphs 5.34-5.55 of the Cabinet report of 19 July also respond to some specific concerns and the following appendices to that report set out individual responses to comments received.

Appendix 10 - Minutes Public Consultation Meetings held on 21st September 2011

Appendix 12 - Questions and Answers for Public Meeting 17th January 2012

Appendix 16 – Questions and comments from the consultation board 4th May to 1st June 2012

Appendix 22 – Summary of comments received from governing body of The Vale and Council response

If the expansions are given approval by the Cabinet, work will begin to develop detailed designs for the proposed expansion. The leadership teams and governing bodies of Belmont Infant and Junior schools and the Vale will be key to this process, and there will also be opportunities for pupils, parents and carers, and other stakeholders to get involved (see section 3(a) above). Once designs have been completed, they will be submitted in a planning application. The application will be subject to the normal planning process, which includes a period of public consultation. A further report will also be submitted to Cabinet to agree the award of contract.

4 c) How have you informed the public and the people you consulted about the results of the consultation and what actions you are proposing in order to address the concerns raised?

Updates on the expansions consultation have been communicated via the Council's expansions consultation website, in addition to newsletters, face to face consultation meetings and the publication of statutory notices in local newspapers and at the school entrances.

Please see documents referred to in 4(b) above for details of proposed actions to address concerns raised.

Step 5 - Addressing Training

The issues you have identified during the assessment and consultation may be new to you or your staff, which means you will need to raise awareness of them among your staff, which may even training. You should identify those issues and plan how and when you will raise them with your staff.

Do you envisage the need to train staff or raise awareness of the issues arising from any aspects of your proposal and as a result of the impact assessment, and if so, what plans have you made?

Should the proposed expansions go ahead, we will work closely with the head teachers and governors at Belmont Infant and Junior schools and at the Vale to support the schools through the expansion process.

Step 6 - Monitoring Arrangements

If the proposal is adopted there is a legal duty to monitor and publish its actual effects on people. Monitoring should cover all the six equality strands. The purpose of equalities monitoring is to see how the policy is working in practice and to identify if and where it is producing disproportionate adverse effects and to take steps to address the effects. You should use the Council's equal opportunities monitoring form which can be downloaded from Harinet. Generally, equalities monitoring data should be gathered, analysed and report quarterly, in the first instance to your DMT and then to the Equalities Team.

What arrangements do you have or will put in place to monitor, report, publish and disseminate information on how your proposal is working and whether or not it is producing the intended equalities outcomes?

▪ ***Who will be responsible for monitoring?***

Should the proposed expansions go ahead, the Council will use the detailed planning process used in the development of the Inclusive Learning Campuses to manage the expansion process (as set out in section 3(a) of this EqIA).

School governing bodies have general responsibility for the conduct of the school with view to promoting high standards of educational achievement. The governing bodies of Belmont Infant and Junior schools and the Vale will continue to monitor this through their usual procedures throughout the process of the expansions and beyond, and this will provide a further means of identifying and addressing issues arising from the expansion. Further monitoring of school performance is carried out by Ofsted (through its inspection regime) and the council's school standards service.

Monitoring the subsequent impact on demand/supply of school places is the responsibility of the Head of Admissions & School Organisation.

▪ ***What indicators and targets will be used to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the policy/service/function and its equalities impact?***

Key indicators for the expansion are whether the project is on schedule and within budget – milestones and RAG status indicators are used to show this.

For demand and supply of school places the relevant information considered is the numbers of applications for school places and numbers of unfilled places, both within certain schools or areas and across the borough as a whole.

Data/information relating to school performance such as key stage results, attendance, exclusions and inspection reports will also be monitored, as they are presently.

▪ ***Are there monitoring procedures already in place which will generate this information?***

Yes – all of the monitoring referred to above forms part of the 'business as usual' of the respective services, with the exception of the steering group that is yet to be established.

▪ ***Where will this information be reported and how often?***

The frequency of meetings of the steering group that will be set up to oversee the expansion will be determined in discussion with all participants.

Highlight reports on construction projects are produced monthly and reported to the Primary Capital Board. Information on supply/demand for school places is produced annually for the school place planning report which goes to the council's cabinet – this information also goes

into the annual School Admissions Return to the DfE. Attendance data is produced on a termly basis; key stage results are annual.

Step 7 - Summarise impacts identified

In the table below, summarise for each diversity strand the impacts you have identified in your assessment

Age	Disability	Race	Sex	Religion or Belief	Sexual Orientation	Gender Reassignment	Marriage and Civil Partnership	Pregnancy and Maternity
Children attending Belmont and the Vale are aged 3-10 however parents/carers and local residents of various ages may be impacted	<p>16 children with disabilities attending Vale Inclusion Scheme. 11 pupils attending Belmont Junior have statements of SEN, slightly in excess of the Haringey average.</p> <p>Beneficial impacts: improved facilities</p> <p>Negative impact: Some disruption from expansion which will be mitigated against</p>	<p>Belmont has a higher proportion of pupils of Asian and Mixed ethnicities than Haringey primary schools overall. Accordingly students of these ethnicities will be disproportionately impacted by the disruption of expansion.</p> <p>West Green ward has a higher proportion of residents of Asian, Black, and White Other ethnicities. Accordingly these groups will particularly benefit from the increase provision of school places in the local area.</p>	No issues identified	No data for school available. West Green ward has a higher proportion of Hindu and Muslim residents compared to Haringey overall. Accordingly these groups will particularly benefit from the increase provision of school places in the local area.	Data not available; no issues identified	Data not available; no issues identified	Data not available; no issues identified	Data not available; no issues identified

Step 8 - Summarise the actions to be implemented

Please list below any recommendations for action that you plan to take as a result of this impact assessment.

** Please see timetable in section 1 for details of the next stages of the consultation and decision-making process that runs through to July 2012.

Issue	Action required	Lead person	Timescale	Resource implications
Need for oversight of process and forum where issues can be raised and addressed	Establish steering group comprised of key stakeholders to oversee process of expansion	Head of Admissions & School Organisation	September 2012	Officer time
Need to ensure all stakeholders are informed of progress and have opportunity to contribute	Compile communications plan	Head of Admissions & School Organisation in consultation with steering group	October 2012	Officer time
Need to ensure that all issues raised in relation to the expansion are addressed	Compile project plan to capture all issues and feed into plans for expansion work	Steering group	October 2012	Officer time
Need to ensure that equalities issues continue to be picked up and addressed	Review EqIA and action plan periodically	Steering group	Ongoing	Officer time
Need to progress plans for the expansion	Capital Programme Team to develop plans for expansion work, taking full account of the points raised through all periods	Capital Programme Team	July 2012 – November 2012	Cost of expansion (see Cabinet report)

Issue	Action required	Lead person	Timescale	Resource implications
	of public consultation and working in consultation with steering group			
Need to obtain planning and building regulations approval	Planning and building regulations approval sought – including further period of consultation (planning app submitted)	Capital Programme Team	October 2012	Cost of expansion (see Cabinet report)
Need to obtain planning and building regulations approval	Planning and building regulations approval sought – including further period of consultation (planning app approved)	Capital Programme Team	December 2012	Cost of expansion (see Cabinet report)
Need to appoint builders	Builders appointed (contractor appointed)	Capital Programme Team	February 2013	Cost of expansion (see Cabinet report)
Need to complete expansion	Implementation – the school expands (accommodation available for first cohort of the expanded schools)	Capital Programme team	September 2013	Cost of expansion (see Cabinet report)
Need to complete expansion	Full expansion completed	Capital Programme Team	September 2014	Cost of expansion (see Cabinet report)

Step 9 - Publication and sign off

There is a legal duty to publish the results of impact assessments. The reason is not simply to comply with the law but also to make the whole process and its outcome transparent and have a wider community ownership. You should summarise the results of the assessment and intended actions and publish them. You should consider in what formats you will publish in order to ensure that you reach all sections of the community.

When and where do you intend to publish the results of your assessment, and in what formats?

Assessed by (Author of the proposal):

Name: Jenny Duxbury

Designation: Head of Admissions & School Organisation

Signature:



Date: 13/07/12

Quality checked by (Equality Team):

Name:

Designation:

Signature:

Date: 13/07/12

Sign off by Directorate Management Team:

Name: Jan Doust

Designation: Deputy Director, Prevention & Early Intervention



Signature:

Date: 13/07/12