

<b>MAYOR AND CABINET</b>			
<b>Report Title</b>	Early Years Centres		
<b>Key Decision</b>	Yes	Item No.	
<b>Ward</b>	All		
<b>Contributors</b>	Executive Director Children and Young People Executive Director Resources and Regeneration Head of Law		
<b>Class</b>	Part 1	Date:	30 May 2012

## **1. Summary**

- 1.1 The report sets out the background to the original decision by the Mayor to withdraw from the child care market as part of achieving savings for the period to March 2014 and reports on the progress in delivering the agreed strategy. It considers also the feedback from staff and parents at a number of consultation meetings where options were discussed as alternatives to closure.

## **2. Purpose**

- 2.1 The purpose of the report is to report on the consultation requested by the Mayor following recommendations by officers in February 2012 to begin consultation to close the three Early Years Centres at Honor Oak, Ladywell and Rushey Green. The report proposes next steps as a result of these consultations.

## **3. Recommendations**

The Mayor is recommended to:

- 3.1 note the feedback from the consultations that have taken place with the staff and parents at The Early Years Centres (Ladywell, Rushey Green and Honor Oak ) indicating an interest in exploring mutual and social enterprise models for the future running of the centres;
- 3.2 agree that parents and staff are given three months to explore the feasibility of developing mutual and/or social enterprise models for the future running of the centres and that officers bring back a further report in October which will assess the feasibility of different models and recommend whether to proceed with these or to consult on closure;
- 3.3 agree that officers take immediate action to bring down the costs of the Early Years Centres by reducing staffing costs through a reduction in

staff numbers using the Council's management of change procedures and by increasing the fees from September 2012 in line with inflation;

- 3.4 agree that the resource base for children with complex needs at Ladywell is maintained; that officers consider if any enlargement is required; and that officers commence a procurement exercise to secure a third party provider.

#### **4. Policy Context**

- 4.1 The Council's Sustainable Community Strategy "Shaping our Future" sets out a vision for Lewisham and the priority outcomes that we can work towards in order to make this vision a reality. This report contributes to the Corporate Priority "Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity. In considering how to achieve the budget savings we have worked to the nine principles agreed in the 14th July 2010 report to Mayor and Cabinet. The 2006 Childcare Act set out a clear role for the Local Authority to secure sufficient childcare and as the strategic lead in developing the childcare market, not as the provider of these services. The development of this proposal enables Lewisham to take that strategic lead and over this period cease to be a childcare provider. This report relates to the three Early Years Centres which provide childcare; it does not affect Lewisham's 19 Children Centres which provide a range of services for targeted families.

#### **5. Background**

##### 5.1 Original Decision to Withdraw from Child Care Market

- 5.1.1 In 2009, when examining options for savings, the Early Years Centres were identified as a potential area for savings as the net budget for the service was £1.8m per annum or the equivalent of a subsidy of £300 per week per place. At this time, charges by private, voluntary and independent (PVI) providers were in the range of £200-£225 per week. The use of the centres was largely determined by parent demand rather than social need. Effectively parents not in need and able to pay were being subsidised up to £300 per week by the Council when other parents using PVI provision were not.
- 5.1.2 On 17 February 2011 the Mayor agreed to the principle that the Council should no longer be a provider of subsidised child care in its Early Years Centres
- 5.1.3 The strategy for withdrawal agreed by the Mayor was to
  - a) Close Amersham Early Years Centre (EYC) on quality and popularity grounds
  - b) To increase charges to the level of equivalent Good or Outstanding PVI providers
  - c) To re-organise the centres in order to reduce costs
  - d) To pursue the transfer of Rushey Green, Ladywell and Honor Oak to alternative providers whilst maintaining specialist provision.

## 5.2 Progress on Original Recommendations

5.2.1 In August 2011 the Amersham Early Years Centre was closed after all parents requiring a nursery place for their child had been supported to find alternative and equivalent provision. Following the closure of Amersham, two new settings have opened within half a mile providing 125 places. This is one example of how the LA withdrawing from childcare provision can stimulate the market.

5.2.2 In April 2011, charges were increased to make them comparable with PVI provision across the borough. The new fees were:

£205 for 3 and four year olds,  
£225 for 2 to 3 years olds  
£250 per week for baby places.

5.2.3 In the fees and charges report considered as part of the 17 February 2012 budget report it was stated that there was a shortfall on the expected income levels of £190k and that as it was proposed to transfer or close the three remaining centres then no further increase was to be recommended. In light of the recommendations of this report to consider the future of the Early Years Centres in the Autumn of 2012 it is now proposed that an inflationary increase in fees is implemented from September 2012 in order to contribute towards reducing the net costs incurred by the Council.

5.2.4 It is proposed that childcare fees should be increased in line with inflation of 4.3% from September 2012. This would increase fees to:

£221, for 3 and four year olds,  
£243 for 2 to 3 year olds  
£270 per week for baby places.

5.2.5 These increases will not remove the subsidy that is being provided currently. The increased fees will however assist with the transition of the childcare services as the new rates will bring fee charges more in line with other providers of similar quality childcare services. The new fee rate will ensure a progressive increase of fees rather than a new service provider needing to apply substantially high increases to bring fee charges in line with other providers. Parents may benefit from support with childcare costs through the working tax credit. The childcare element of the tax credits can be up to 70% of the childcare costs to a maximum of £175 for one child or a maximum £300 for two children or more. There is no general figure for help with childcare cost, for example, a couple with one child, paying £175 a week for childcare, will still get some tax credits with an annual income as high as £41,000.

5.2.6 Officers have examined the potential for re-organisation to reduce costs. This examined options for reduced management, fewer staff, redefining job roles to include more work for the same cost or fewer

duties at lower cost. An examination of job descriptions indicated that, within the Council's single status scheme, the scope of duties was appropriate and a redefinition would not lead to reduced costs. The numbers of staff employed were appropriate to meet staff : child ratios. Some management roles could be reduced. The result was that insufficient savings were possible to enable a sustainable service to be achieved. In the meantime agency staff have ceased to be used unless essential to the safe delivery of the service and vacant roles have been covered using existing staff wherever possible..

- 5.2.7 In the PVI settings the equivalent roles are paid less well even though the range of responsibilities and requirements are similar. Also, providers take different approaches to pension arrangements for staff and so incur lower employment overheads.
- 5.2.8 During August and September 2011 the proposed transfer of Rushey Green Early Years Centre was pursued by a competitive bid for the lease of the property. The competitive process required bidders to accept a TUPE transfer and to run a child care business. The process was advertised both locally and nationally and elicited 38 enquiries and 17 information packs were sent out to interested parties. Of these 6 signed the confidentiality agreement to secure the TUPE pack information but on the closing date only two bids were received. One bid indicated the intent to run an after school club with the premises and the second bid indicated that it was not based upon a TUPE transfer. There were therefore no compliant bids received at the culmination of the process.
- 5.2.9 Following this disappointing outcome a number of those who had expressed an interest were approached for feedback on the process. Overwhelmingly, the feedback from potential bidders was that the terms and conditions and staffing numbers represented an unsustainable business model for nursery provision.
- 5.3 Need to adjust the Strategy
- 5.3.1 The progress on the transfer by competitive process set out above indicates that it is very unlikely that, if a further transfer proposal was pursued, in the market, that it would be successful. The potential providers involved in the previous process were clear that the current terms and conditions were seen as not capable of providing a sustainable business model for the provision of child care.
- 5.3.2 Similarly, the examination of options for re-organisation indicated that insufficient change could be achieved within the Council's employment framework that would produce a sustainable business model for provision.
- 5.3.3 The closure of Amersham did lead to new providers appearing in the vicinity of the former Early Years Centre which provides some limited evidence that Council provision may have been providing a barrier to

the development of cost effective provision by the PVI sector as they are unable to compete for places with subsidised provision.

5.3.4 On this basis, it is clear that the strategy needs to be amended to secure the original objective of the Council ceasing to be a child care provider. Either an alternative method of transfer was needed or an option for closure considered. The report in February 2012 recommended closure but the Mayor asked that informal consultations with parents be undertaken before he considered whether to consult more formally on closure. He also asked that further information on the demographics and operation of the centres was produced and that there be consultation with parents and staff about alternatives to closure. The additional information requested by the Mayor is set out in Appendix 1. A summary of the consultation responses is set out below .

#### 5.4 The case for Closure

5.4.1 The original decision to withdraw from the direct provision of child care was driven largely by the financial issues and a need to reduce the Council's overall expenditure. In agreeing the strategy, the level of subsidy being provided to parents using the centres was a key issue of equity as it was a subsidy not available to other families in the community.

5.4.2 Although steps have been taken to reduce the overall costs of the centres, the cost per week still represent a subsidy of approximately £311 per week.

5.4.3 The data set out in Appendix 1 demonstrates that there is sufficient alternative provision for the children at the three centres. At Rushey Green further work on places for children with additional needs would be necessary if closure was progressed. This further work is discussed below.

5.4.4 A proposal for closure would necessitate staff redundancies and these are estimated at £1.03m across the three centres. This would represent a one off cost whereas the annual level of subsidy in running the services is £1.5m. On that basis the one off costs of redundancy would be recovered from the ongoing savings in the subsequent financial year.

#### 5.5 Provision of Places for Children with Additional Needs

5.5.1 The provision at Ladywell for children with complex needs is proposed to continue. Given the growth in the primary age population a review of demand for complex needs places for children under five years of age is being undertaken to establish whether an expansion at Ladywell and/or additional provision is required.

5.5.2 There have been 63 referrals for children with additional/complex needs since September 2011 who have places in PVI settings.

Every PVI setting has a Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator (SENCO) who will identify the needs of a child through an initial assessment and complete a Common Assessment Framework form. It is proposed under the review of complex needs currently in train that the development of the autism outreach service from Drumbeat will include support for children under 5 that the PVI sector will be able to access.

- 5.5.3 In terms of provision for under 5s with high level additional needs the PVI sector already has capacity in terms of Lewisham Opportunities Pre School (LOPS) and the Pre School Learning Alliance and it is proposed that as part of not providing child care directly that a third party provider should be sought to manage the complex needs provision at Ladywell.

## **6. Outcomes of Meetings**

- 6.1 Meetings took place throughout March and April 2012 with staff and parents at each of the three Centres. There were 45 parents in attendance at Rushey Green, 15 at Honor Oak and 12 at Ladywell.<sup>1</sup> Officers sought views and solutions for the challenges facing the Centres. These have been collated and where further action was required from officers this has been undertaken.

### **6.2 Summary of responses from Parents' meetings**

There were questions raised around the ongoing provision of childcare for children with SEN.

Response: The Council would continue to support the provision of childcare for children with special educational needs and a review of demand for complex needs places is being undertaken.

Feedback from parents, at all of the meetings, stated that they wanted to explore a social enterprise that would allow staff to take on the responsibility for running the nurseries.

Response: Lewisham will work with any nursery staff who want to explore the option of a social enterprise / mutual model of service delivery.

The issue of fees was raised by parents and whether the subsidy for Centres could be offset through increasing fees.

Response: In order to bridge the gap in subsidy, the service would need to charge fees of £500 per week that would make the provision prohibitive to many parents seeking childcare.

Parents raised the issue of means testing and had the Council considered only providing child care for the disadvantaged.

---

<sup>1</sup> Figures were based on those who registered their contact details at each meeting.

Response: If means testing was adopted it is estimated that the numbers then eligible would be sufficient for one centre rather than the three at present. Means testing would also involve an increase in administrative costs to process and agree applications which would require parents to divulge a range of personal financial data.

Parents raised the issue that the quality of childcare at Centres was better than that of provision within PVI settings.

Response: It is not true that provision is better. Within the borough there are 120 PVI settings with 16 'Outstanding' PVI settings and 61 'Good' PVI settings. The Early Years Improvement Team continue to support settings within Lewisham to improve standards of provision within the borough.

There were some queries from parents, at all meetings, as to where the number of available childcare places had been sourced. Many parents said that when they had tried to locate alternative places they either could not find a vacancy or that it was not of the quality they were seeking.

Response: The figures for the number of available childcare places within the local area had been collected in January 2012 from settings within a 1.5 mile radius of each Centre. Should a recommendation of closure be made in October then individual support would be given to each parent to help them secure appropriate alternative provision.

There were questions regarding the potential to reduce staffing costs to make the Centres sustainable.

Response: Any reduction in staff costs would affect other areas of the Council as all staff salaries are linked via an evaluation system. If a reduction was made in one service area to save costs, this would have a knock on effect on other salaries in other parts of the Council.

Parents asked about the estimated costs of redundancy and how this represented a poor use of Council money.

Response: The redundancy costs estimated at £1.033m would be a one off cost whereas continuing to operate the Centres would cost the Council £1.5m every year.

## **7. Summary of responses from Staff Meetings**

- 7.1 There are 78 staff employed in the 3 remaining Early Years Centres, of which 2 are currently on maternity leave. The levels of staffing vary between the centres in that Ladywell has higher staff numbers to support the complex needs unit children in the centre. Numbers at the

other two centres reflect past staffing levels and staff are now used flexibly between the centres as circumstances require and to minimise the use of agency staff.

<b>Centre</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>FTE</b>
Honor Oak	22	19.8
Ladywell	34	29.7
Rushey Green	22	18.6

There were a number of questions raised by both parents and staff. Where the response to staff was the same as the response to parents (as set out in section 6) these have not been duplicated in this section.

Staff stated that they required greater support in order to explore the feasibility of a social enterprise / mutual model of service delivery.

Response: The staff at each of the three centres were pointed to the available information on the Council web site in regard to establishing some form of mutual or social enterprise model for the future running of the Centres. Staff have been offered the opportunity to meet further with officers and managers from one centre have followed this up already. Further opportunities will be provided if the recommendations are agreed.

It was raised that since 2004, Lewisham Council were not allowing any more houses to be converted into nurseries.

Response: The Council would always consider a change of use for domestic premises. However, some properties may be easier to acquire planning permission (e.g. if they're detached or semi-detached) due to factors such as access.

Staff felt that the Council should continue to be a childcare provider.

Response: In November 2010 the Government announced that Councils are no longer legally obliged to provide childcare in Sure Start Centres. This has been reflected in the reduction of funding available. The 2006 Childcare Act set out a clear role for the Local Authority to secure sufficient childcare and as the strategic lead in developing the childcare market, not as the provider of these services. The Mayor agreed this approach in the 17 February 2011 budget report. Lewisham had agreed to come out the Childcare market and under current legislation the Council is not mandated to deliver childcare and should be considered a provider of last resort.

There were some staff who felt that this was not a genuine consultation and questioned whether their views would be taken into account.



Response: We reassured staff that the views expressed would be incorporated into the report to the Mayor and Cabinet on the 30<sup>th</sup> May and inform the report's recommendations.

- 7.2 Subsequent to the staff consultation meetings a further meeting with managers at Rushey Green has been held with officers to express their wish to develop a proposal that could see them assume responsibility for the running of the Centre.

## 8. Conclusion from Consultation

As a result of the consultation it is clear that parents and staff at Honor Oak, Ladywell and Rushey Green would need more time to develop their ideas and proposals for alternative arrangements to run the centres. It is therefore recommended that parents and staff are given some additional time to explore the feasibility of developing mutual and/or social enterprise models for the future running of the centres and that officers bring back a further report in October which will assess the feasibility of different models and recommend whether to proceed with these or to consult on closure;

## 9. Financial Implications

- 9.1. The original proposal in respect of the Early Years Centres was to achieve a saving of £1.8m over the period 2011/12 to 2013/14. In 2011/12 the closure of Amersham and the increase in fees was intended to achieve a saving of £512k. In 2012/13, a further saving of £584k was planned based upon a transfer of Rushey Green, a reorganisation to reduce running costs and the ongoing impact of the fee increase in April 2011. The transfer of the centres at Honor Oak and Ladywell was then intended to secure the final year saving of £712k.
- 9.2 As a result of the failure to transfer Rushey Green and the limited scope for cost reduction there was an over spending of £1.04m.
- 9.3 If no action was taken the expenditure profile for the three centres in 2012/13 is projected to be as follows:

<b>Centre</b>	<b>Gross Expenditure</b>	<b>Income</b>	<b>Net Expenditure</b>	
	£000k	£000k	£000k	
Honor Oak	706	351	355	
Ladywell	994	205	790	
Rushey Green	783	388	395	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2484</b>	<b>944</b>	<b>1540</b>	

Costs per week per child attending is shown below.

<b>Centre</b>	<b>Gross Expenditure</b>	<b>Cost per week attendance</b>	
	£000k	£	
Honor Oak	706	441	
Ladywell	994	1033	
Rushey Green	783	330	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2484</b>	<b>502</b>	

- 9.4 Some analysis of child care costs across the borough has been undertaken and this shows that PVI settings are making charges in the range of £165 to £320 per week per child for a full time place.

<b>Centre</b>	<b>Charge per week low</b>	<b>Charge per week high</b>	<b>Lewisham charge per week</b>
	£	£	£
Under 2	230	320	250
2 - 3 year olds	165	305	205
3 - 4 year olds	175	305	225

- 9.5 The charges at the Early Years Centres are currently £205, £225 for 3 and four year olds respectively or £250 per week for baby places. With an average weekly cost of provision at £502 per week the Early Years Centres are only recovering half of the costs per week per place filled.
- 9.6 A closure proposal if pursued would necessitate the redundancy of the staff currently employed in the Centres. The anticipated redundancy costs for a complete closure are estimated to be £1.033m. The report recommends that a decision on the future of the Centres is postponed to allow staff and community groups to develop proposals for sustainable provision outside of the Council. The likelihood is that regardless of a subsequent decision in the autumn of 2012 it would have little practical impact upon the projected deficit set out above.
- 9.7 The proposal to increase charges by 4.3% is based upon the consumer price index movement between April 2011 and March 2012. If the current levels of usage of the centres were to continue the increase in charges would be expected to raise £42k. The increase in the weekly charge ranges from £16 to £20 per week for a full time place.
- 9.8 The proposed delay in securing a transfer of the costs of running the Early Years Centres will mean that the savings from the proposal to withdraw from the child care market, expected in 2012/13 (£712k) will not be achieved until 2013/14 financial year.

## **10. Legal Implications**

- 10.1 Under the provisions of the Childcare Act 2006 a local authority has to make arrangements in an integrated manner with a view, broadly, to securing maximum benefit for users of early childhood services and making their availability widely known. Local authorities are required to facilitate and encourage the involvement of parents and prospective parents, early years providers and others engaged in activities which may improve the well-being of young children in the development of those arrangements.
- 10.2 In responding to its responsibilities under the Childcare Act 2006 the local authority must have regard to the quality and quantity of early childhood services which are provided or expected to be provided, in their area and their location.
- 10.3 Section 8 of the Childcare Act 2006 enables a local authority to assist any person who is providing (or proposing to provide) childcare, or to make arrangements with a person for the provision of childcare (including, in either case assisting financially).
- 10.4 Local authorities are permitted to provide childcare themselves, but (except in the case of day care for children in need under s18 (1) or (5) of the Children Act 1989) only if there is no other provider willing to provide it or the local authority considers in all the circumstances, that it is appropriate to do so. In exercising any of these powers the local authority must have regard to guidance issued by the Secretary of State.
- 10.5 In respect of the proposals to increase fees any such proposed increase must be reasonable and sufficient notice of any such increase must be given.
- 10.6 In respect of the proposals to seek to reduce staffing costs through seeking voluntary redundancies the Councils corporate employment procedures will be followed including consultation with affected staff.
- 10.7 The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) brings together all previous equality legislation in England, Scotland and Wales. The Act includes a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty), replacing the separate duties relating to race, disability and gender equality. The duty came into force on 6 April 2011. The new duty covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 10.8 In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due

regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

- 10.9 As was the case for the original separate duties, the new duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the Mayor, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.
- 10.10 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) issued guidance in January 2011 providing an overview of the new public sector equality duty, including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. The guidance covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance was based on the then draft specific duties so is no longer fully up-to-date, although regard may still be had to it until the revised guide is produced by the EHRC. The guidance can be found at <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/newequality-act-guidance/equality-act-guidance-downloads/>.
- 10.11 The EHRC guidance does not have legal standing, unlike the statutory Code of Practice on the public sector equality duty which was due to be produced by the EHRC under the Act. However, the Government has now stated that no further statutory codes under the Act will be approved. The EHRC has indicated that it will issue the draft code on the PSED as a non statutory code following further review and consultation but, like the guidance, the non statutory code will not have legal standing.
- 10.12 A further report will be brought to the Mayor and Cabinet on the results of the feasibility of developing mutual and/or social enterprise models for the future running of the centres and full legal implications associated with those proposals will be set out in that further report.
- 10.13 In coming to a decision on the recommendations set out in this report the Mayor has to be satisfied that they are reasonable decisions to reach having regard to all relevant considerations and disregarding irrelevant considerations.

## **11. Crime and Disorder Implications**

- 11.1 There are no crime and disorder implications arising from this report.

## **12. Equalities Implications**

- 12.1 A full equalities assessment was undertaken relating to the original decision by the Mayor, in February 2011, to cease to be a direct provider of childcare. The recommendations of this report do not change that assessment. If a subsequent decision to change the position is made then a new equalities analysis assessment would be required.
- 12.2 In respect of the recommendation to increase fees and charges these will tend to have a disproportionate impact on people with lower incomes as a greater proportion of disposal income will be taken up by the increase. In addition, of the groups in the nine protected characteristics women and pregnant women could be seen to be disproportionately affected. In mitigation, the charges remain within the range of charges made by PVI providers of child care in the borough. Parents may benefit from support with childcare costs through the working tax credit. The childcare element of the tax credits can be up to 70% of the childcare costs to a maximum of £175 for one child or a maximum £300 for two children or more. There is no general figure for help with childcare cost, for example, a couple with one child, paying £175 a week for childcare, will still get some tax credits with an annual income as high as £41,000.

## **13. Environmental Implications**

- 13.1 This report has no environmental implications.

## **14. Conclusion**

- 14.1 The meetings held with parents and staff have indicated strong support for the provision of child care at the three early years centres. Many parents and some staff have indicated a strong interest in exploring mutual or social enterprise type solutions for the future running of these centres in order to continue the provision.
- 14.2 It is recommended that parents and staff are given three months to explore the feasibility of developing mutual and/or social enterprise models for the future running of the centres and that officers bring back a further report in October which will assess the feasibility of different models and recommend whether to proceed with these or to consult on closure. The data set out in Appendix 1 demonstrates that closure is a viable option given that alternative provision is available if this option had to be taken in October.

<b>Background Documents</b>			
<b>Name</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Author</b>
<b>Mayor and Cabinet Budget Report</b>	<b>17 February 2011</b>		<b>Alan Docksey</b>

If there are any queries on this report please contact Paul Yiannakou on 020 8314 3686.

**ADDITIONAL DATA REQUESTED**

**Demographics of the Current Centres**

1. Childcare places in Lewisham's EYCs

1.1 Currently, the number of children attending the three EYCs is 157 with varying attendance patterns, some full and some part time:

<b>Centre</b>	<b>Total Children</b>	<b>Part Time/Full Time</b>
Honor Oak	46	18/28
Ladywell	26	11/15
Rushey Green	85	63/22
<b>Total</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>92/65</b>

1.2 By 31 August, the numbers will fall to 80 as children move on to statutory education. However, it is likely that a similar number of new children will be taking up places in September 2012. The distribution of the children remaining after August 2012 across the three centres is as shown below.

<b>Centre</b>	<b>Estimated Children Sep 2012</b>
Honor Oak	33
Ladywell	13
Rushey Green	34
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>

2. Alternative places in the area

2.1 An analysis of alternative places available to families within 1.5 miles of each Early Years Centre the data below has been collated. The analysis also shows the provision within 1 mile.

<b>Centre</b>	<b>Children estimated as at Sep 2012</b>	<b>Vacancies within 1 mile and settings</b>	<b>Vacancies 1-1.5miles and settings</b>	<b>Total Vacancies and settings</b>
Honor Oak *1 *2	33	62 in 7 settings	8 in 5 settings	70 in 12 settings
Ladywell	13	59 in 10 settings	25 in 2 settings	84 in 12 settings
Rushey Green	34	40 in 10 settings	50 in 10 settings	90 in 20 settings

- \*1 It is understood that a new provision with 30 full time places will open within the next 6 months within 200 yards which is not provided in the totals above.
- Five schools including Gordonbrock are within the area for Rushey Green but none had vacancies in January 2012

### 3. Residence Distance from Centre Attended

3.1 The table below shows the distances from resident post code to the centre for the children attending .

<b>Centre</b>	<b>Total Children</b>	<b>Home address within 1 mile</b>	<b>Home address 1-1.5miles</b>	<b>Home address beyond 1.5 miles</b>
Honor Oak*1 *2	46	32	7	7
Ladywell	26	12	5	9
Rushey Green	85	45	20	20

3.2 In the case of Honor Oak and Ladywell the analysis shows that there are sufficient places in the locality not only for the children that would still be attending the centres in September 2012 but for a cohort of pupils equivalent to those that are expected to leave in August 2012 to be replaced. In the case of Rushey Green the position is more complex. The pupils that are expected to remain at the Centre in September 2012 totals 34 and there are 50 places within 1.5 miles of the centre.

3.3 It is likely however the 50 children going on to statutory education would be replaced by a similar number of three year olds. Within 1.5 miles of the centre there are a total 70 places identified as available for the 85 children currently at Rushey Green. However it should be noted that 19 of the children have a resident address which is over the 1.5 miles regarded as a reasonable distance to travel for families with their children. Indeed nine are beyond the 2 mile distance deemed suitable for primary age children to walk to school. If our sufficiency criterion of distance was to be cast as widely as the current distances travelled then it is clear that there is a sufficiency of places to replace those at Rushey Green. This excludes school nursery places as at this time there were no vacancies at the schools within these distances of the centre.

### 4. Paid for and Supported Places

4.1 The table below analyses how the places taken are paid for. So that at Rushey Green parents are paying full or part time fees in respect of 46 children. A further 36 are occupying places paid for through their free entitlement for 3 or 4 year olds. Finally, there are three children who



have been placed by the Council which is supporting the costs as being in the best interests of the family for social care reasons.

- 4.2 The Council commissions childcare places for those families who have high level need. Currently 11 places of the 157 occupied that are currently being supported by the Council. In addition we commission places for high need families in PVI provision which is closer to the families requiring that type of support.

<b>Centre</b>	<b>Total Children</b>	<b>Parent paid for</b>	<b>Free entitlement 2/3/4 year olds</b>	<b>Council Supported priority places</b>	<b>Complex Needs</b>
Honor Oak *1 *2	46	31	14	1	
Ladywell	26	19	0	2	5
Rushey Green	85	46	36	3	
<b>Total</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>

5. Provision of Places for Children with Needs

- 5.1 Each of the centres supports children who are recognised to have some additional educational needs and in the case of Ladywell there is a dedicated provision for children under 5 with complex needs.

<b>Centre</b>	<b>ASD</b>	<b>Downs Syndrome</b>	<b>Social Communication</b>	<b>Complex Needs</b>
Honor Oak	6	0	0	0
Ladywell	0	0	0	5
Rushey Green	7	4	2	1

- 5.2 It is not proposed to remove the facilities for complex needs at Ladywell as part of the Council's withdrawal from the child care market.