

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET MEMBER SIGNING
THURSDAY, 11 DECEMBER 2014**

Present: Cllr. Ann Waters

Also Attending: Gavin Ball (Planning Policy Officer), Claire Barnes (Project Manager), Jennifer Duxbury (Head of Education services), Clifford Hart (Committee Services Manager), Anji Phillips (Assistant Director, Schools and Learning Service), Eveleen Riordan (Deputy Head, Education Services), Bhikhu Samat (Principal Lawyer), Natalie Layton (Clerk)

And 7 members of the public and press

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
HSP03.	URGENT BUSINESS NONE.	
HSP04.	DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS <u>Deputations</u> Received the following deputation from Reverend Gaz Daly on behalf of Governors and Parents of St James Church of England Primary School, N10: Governors strongly supported an expansion and wanted to continue to work with Haringey to find a viable option which had the support of parents and the local community. Governors felt that the school community would support an expansion to 2 form entry (2FE) in a proposal in which there was no loss of school land. The Survey carried out by the parent group Parent Consultation Committee (PCC) was included in the PCC formal representation to the consultation and showed that 75% of parents would support an expansion to 2FE. The school community was in favour of an expansion to 2FE. Governors felt that the report prepared by Officers in School Place Planning could be misinterpreted by suggesting that there was opposition to the principle of an expansion when, in fact, there was opposition to expanding the School to 3FE under the proposal presented to the School and local community. The Governors met with the parent group and all had agreed that the hope was that the School would be given the opportunity to re-consult on a 2FE proposal which would meet the demands of both the community and the much needed school places for local children which was evident by the School's bulge class being oversubscribed. Without a permanent expansion to 2FE, the siblings of some of the new pupils who joined Reception in September could miss out on joining their siblings in the School if the School was not to expand	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET MEMBER SIGNING
THURSDAY, 11 DECEMBER 2014**

from September 2016.

Governors were aware of the petitions by some parents but asked that the Cabinet Member note that they were in response to the fear that the School would lose much needed play space and yet triple the number of children on a smaller site. Governors appreciated the importance of adequate play space in primary education and the part it played in children's physical, mental and social development. Governors understood that parents did not want the area of space per pupil to be comprised in an expansion. Governors also noted the concerns of the local community and schools. The Governing Body wanted to give more local children the opportunity to be educated in St James School where they would be supported by great teaching staff and good facilities and resources that would allow them to reach their full potential. This had always been the objective of the Governors.

It was hoped that the School was given the opportunity to re-consult on a which would gain the support of all stakeholders and provide the much needed places in this part of the Borough.

The Cabinet Member, Cllr. Waters, thanked Rev. Daly for the deputation and emphasised the Council's duty to ensure there were enough local spaces in schools for children. Cllr. Waters expressed that it was clear from the responses to the consultation that a wider debate on the future provision of school places was required and officers would ensure a clear timeline for this debate would be recorded in these minutes.

Action: Jennifer Duxbury

Post-Meeting Note:

The Council will carry out wider consultation with a full range of stakeholders in the Muswell Hill area in January 2015. Full details of the consultation, including dates, will shortly be available on the expansions webpage at www.haringey.gov.uk/schoolexpansions2014

b. Questions

QUESTION 1 from Jessica McAllister

As Ms McAllister was not present the question was read out by an Officer:

We have been advised of the £4.8m surplus that will be created from the sale of houses and land which is currently St James School Infant playground and school rooms. Is the Council selling the land to support the development of the new school alone, or is the sale of the school land also paying for the development of housing in the area including Cranwood?

ANSWER

The current proposal includes the requirement for a parcel of land currently owned by the Diocese to be transferred to the Council. This contribution of land is required to support the proposed development. The residual value from the properties sold is intended to support the projected shortfall in funding the expansion of the School. Due consideration has been given to the quantity of houses required to

MINUTES OF THE CABINET MEMBER SIGNING
THURSDAY, 11 DECEMBER 2014

achieve the Councils objectives and to fill this funding gap. The principal of this proposal has been considered in full consultation with the London Diocesan Board for Schools and St James Church of England Primary School Governing Body.

QUESTION 2 from Stephen Harle Smith

As Mr Harle Smith was not present the question was read out by an Officer:

In para 5.34 and 5.35 the report suggests that the housing development will cross subsidise the school build by £4m. It then states "there has been some misconceptions that school land is being sold to fund the increase in school places."

I do not think, in the light of the limited information supplied by the Council to parents, that either of these statements is fair or balanced.

The report makes clear that the land swap will see a reduction in the overall size of the St James site. So, in reality, St James would transfer valuable land to the housing development. We have not been given any information about the value of that land if it were sold as a commercial transaction. It therefore seems reasonable to conclude that the School is partly funding the expansion through the transfer of valuable land to the housing development. Presumably, the housing development would also have had to make a contribution anyway to St James (as the St Luke's developers did)? Without knowing the value of the land and what contribution they would have made I think it is unreasonable to claim the housing development cross subsidises the build by £4m.

Second in paragraph 5.37 the report claims that the Cranwood site has been designated under Local Plans for housing for a number of years.

When I searched for the Local Plans I found recent Unitary Development Plans that clearly state the site was designated for education and not housing. So I would like to understand when and why the change was made and think the report should set out that the site was designated for education and the date and process by which any change was made.

Finally, the report states the development of the Cranwood site as housing will proceed independently of any further consultation on expansion of St James. I am struggling with the logic of this approach. I appreciate Haringey's desire to meet affordable housing needs in the Borough. But there is a shortage of school places in that area and adding additional housing and demand for school places without having put in place plans to provide sufficient places for existing residents seems unreasonable.

MINUTES OF THE CABINET MEMBER SIGNING
THURSDAY, 11 DECEMBER 2014

Please could you explain the Council's consultation and decision making process for proceeding with housing development on the Cranwood site so that I can understand how and when I can engage in the process?

ANSWER

The current proposals include the requirement for a parcel of land currently owned by the Diocese to be transferred to the Council. In discussion with the Diocese this was not expected to be a cash transaction. The advantages of expanding St James Church of England Primary School are detailed in the display material previously made available at public meetings and include the benefit of providing the pupils, staff, Diocese and Governors with a brand new school building. The value of this land is being assessed presently by the District Surveyor. If the project proceeds it was expected that these values would be included in a Charities Act Report produced by the Diocese.

This contribution of land is required to support the proposed development. Due to the capital investment available (£9m) the development in addition needs to achieve a percentage of private sale properties units in order to meet the projected shortfall in funding.

Section 106 contributions, now referred to as a Community Infrastructure Levy would be determined once a planning application is submitted. Any money from planning gain would not be sufficient to meet the full cost of this project and must be used for local infrastructure and relying on such funding would jeopardise the whole project.

The proposed contribution of land from the Diocese was an important factor in the success of this development. Without this contribution the scheme to expand St James C of E Primary School in the way it was currently proposed was not considered viable.

The Cranwood House site had previously been earmarked for education in the borough's Local Plan. In November 2013, the Council's Cabinet approved the Housing Investment and Estate Renewal Strategy which identified the site as a possible location for new affordable housing in the borough. As part of the consultation on the Council's emerging Sites Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD), due for adoption in 2015, the site has been identified for residential use. The Council had a duty to build more housing in the Borough, as well as the duty to provide more school places.

Consideration had previously been given in terms of assessing the likely demand for local school places from housing developments at Cranwood House and St Lukes. This information had contributed to the Council's decision to consult on expanding St James C of E Primary School and would continue to be assessment throughout the proposed wider consultation process. Even if an expansion of St James School did not

MINUTES OF THE CABINET MEMBER SIGNING
THURSDAY, 11 DECEMBER 2014

proceed, the development of housing on Cranwood House site would continue.

QUESTION 3 from Rose McCarthy

What are the terms of reference and object of the second and "wider consultation with parents, residents, local stakeholders in early 2015", as distinct from the consultation process that has concluded. Please advise in the public meeting what those terms are, what is proposed by this period of wider consultation, what additional designs, financial information and/ or other details will be considered at that consultation that have not already been considered. Please publish and furnish the requested terms of reference, prior to the proposed consultation by a working week to be available all parents and stakeholders. Please ensure public notification is given as to when this date will be.

Secondly, having regard to paragraph 5.50, why is Haringey expressly committing to continue to develop and progress works for the redevelopment of the Cranwood site to provide residential development, prior to the outcome of the wider consultation. When there may be benefits to a possible expansion through ensuring at the outset that all opportunities for potential agreement and therefore expansion for the school are available to that process.

Finally, having regard to the next stage. I would seek that the governors of the school are provided with all information and be included in the planning and consideration process of the proposed "wider" consultation immediately, and as far as possible with planners in Haringey and architects to ensure that if an expansion is possible it meets the assessed needs of St James, as assessed by the governors of that school. I refer to the report of the Governors and consider it a disgrace that the Governor report to the Consultation have identified difficulties in being sufficiently involved and needed to expressly request this in writing, as it should have been integral to a quality assured and seamless process prior to the involvement of parents at the pre-consultation stage .

ANSWER

Cranwood House Site development would go ahead despite the wider consultation although the initial proposals had taken advantage of the opportunity to develop both sites (Cranwood House and the School) at the same time. The Cranwood House site would only be used for residential development and not for education use and without the site the Council would not have the funding to expand the School in the way it is currently being proposed.

The Cabinet Member acknowledged that 75% of parents were in favour of a 2FE and this would be taken into account as part of the wider consultation, where the Council's aims (in terms of what they want the consultation to achieve) would be clear and the possibility of expanding other school's would be considered.

MINUTES OF THE CABINET MEMBER SIGNING
THURSDAY, 11 DECEMBER 2014

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION

Could the Terms of Reference be circulated prior to the wider consultation in January?

ANSWER

The Terms of Reference would be drafted once the recommendations before the Cabinet Member were agreed and would be included alongside the Council's published Consultation Charter document as part of the wider consultation. The Consultation Charter is available to view on the Council's website at

http://www.haringey.gov.uk/index/council/haveyoursay/our_commitment_to_you.htm

QUESTION 4 from Stephanie Meehan

As Ms Meehan was not present the question was read out by an Officer:

I believe that there is a factual error in the report itself, and one in the appendices which gives me concern as to the basis on which the Council is making decisions.

In the report itself paragraph 5.33 states that the external space available to St James School in the proposed design includes a Sport England tennis court. I believe that this is owned by the St Lukes site, not the Council and the use of this facility was not mentioned in any of the consultation meetings at the school, nor at the design drop-in held.

In the appendices page 241 in response to a question regarding 2 form entry - Jennifer Duxbury states that a 2 form entry would only provide with Haringey with an additional 15 local spaces. This is incorrect - as a 50/50 split has been agreed by the governors a 2 form entry expansion would provide Haringey with an additional 30 spaces for local children.

Expanding to 3 form entry would only provide a further 15 spaces to local in addition to the 30 provided by a 2 form expansion.

Answer:

In response to the question on the tennis court - the LA was in discussion with Hanover representatives in terms of maximising use of this facility during the school day and negotiating use of the tennis court during any construction.

The information referred to related to minutes from a public meeting which had been a public record since September 2014. To clarify, the point related to faith and community places.

The proposal in the consultation was to move the School from 1FE to 3FE which would provide 60 additional places, 50% of which would be faith places and 50% community places. All of these children would need high quality school places.

MINUTES OF THE CABINET MEMBER SIGNING
THURSDAY, 11 DECEMBER 2014

HSP05.	SCHOOL EXPANSIONS RESOLVED that the Cabinet Member for Children and Families: 1. Noted the views, opinions, and evidence received in response to consultation carried out between 15 September and 7 November on the possible expansion(s) of: • Bounds Green Infant and Junior School N11 • St James C of E Primary School N10 • St Mary's CE Primary School N8 2. Noted the: • analysis of the views, opinions and evidence of the feedback received; • analysis of other factors including the demand for and supply of reception places across Haringey and in particular in and around the wards within which the above three schools are sited; • projections for school rolls in our primary schools for up to ten years ahead based on actual and projected birth rates; 3. In considering 1 & 2, agreed to the publication of a statutory proposal (Stage 1 of the statutory steps outlined in the Department for Education's Guidance¹) in January 2015 immediately followed by a (fixed) four week period of representation (Stage 2) in respect of the following two schools: • Bounds Green Infant and Junior School, and • St Mary's CE Primary School; 4. Noted that a Cabinet report will be prepared for March 2015 making recommendation(s) on whether or not these two schools should be expanded; 5. Agreed that, having regard to representation received as a result of consultation, that a statutory notice for the expansion of St James C of E Primary School should not be published at the present time; 6. Noted that a wider school place consultation will be undertaken with stakeholders in Planning Area1, with a particularly focus on the Muswell Hill area and a report produced where appropriate.	
HSP06.	NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS NONE.	