

**Extract from the Minutes of the meeting of the Mayor & Cabinet April 9<sup>th</sup> 2014**

**Permanent Primary Places Holbeach, John Ball, Coopers Lane and Sir Francis Drake**

An overview of the proposals was given by Councillor Helen Klier, the Cabinet Member for Children & Young People. She highlighted the major challenges being presented by escalating birth rates and stated the authority's intention to provide places in good popular schools and wherever possible to avoid young children having to be bussed to school.

The Executive Director for Children and Young People's representative reported that while no responses had been received in connection with the Coopers Lane and John Ball proposals, multiple representations had been received regarding Holbeach and Sir Francis Drake Primary Schools. He pointed out an addendum had been tabled at the meeting containing an up to date summary of all the representations that had been received. The Mayor then indicated he would examine each school proposal individually.

**Sir Francis Drake Primary School**

The Mayor received a representation from Fraser Jupp, the Chair of Governors and Christine Barnes, the Head Teacher. Mr Jupp highlighted two concerns from their written response, firstly a query on the need for places in the locality given other provision coming on stream and secondly the possible flexibility in the Education Funding Agreement to enhance the scheme by providing an amended design proposal which would allow better and more imaginative use of space.

The Executive Director for Children and Young People's representative Confirmed to the Mayor that there was little prospect of the Education Funding Agency financing any enhancements and that refinements could only realistically be made with an injection of local authority funding.

The Mayor suggested that as it would take some years for the school to reach its optimum capacity, there might be scope to add features. Officers said they could attempt to negotiate future changes with the Education Funding Agency.

Councillor Klier pointed out that the consultation had also raised concerns about traffic management issues and about the siting of toilets which needed to be addressed.

Having listened carefully to the representations that had been made, the Mayor concluded he would approve the recommendation in relation to Sir Francis Drake School but that he expected the next stage report to have thoroughly explored all the concerns expressed by the school.



**Proposal to enlarge Sir Francis Drake Primary School from 1 to 2 forms of entry**

Notice is given in accordance with section 19(1) of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 that London Borough of Lewisham intends to make a prescribed alteration to Sir Francis Drake Primary School, Community school, Scawen Road, Deptford SE8 5AE from 01 September 2016.

Following a period of consultation, the London Borough of Lewisham proposes to enlarge Sir Francis Drake Primary School from 1 to 2 forms of entry. This is in response to increasing demand for primary school places in the area served by the school. Housing development in the area means that local demand will continue to increase during this decade with the risk that, without enlargement, choice for local families will become increasingly constrained. The additional accommodation required will be provided through the government's Priority Schools Building Programme. The existing school buildings would need considerable investment on maintenance in the near future. Participation in the Priority Schools Building Programme will mean that new school buildings can be provided.

The proposal will be implemented in September 2016.

The current capacity of the school is 210 and the proposed capacity will be 420. The number of pupils registered at the school at the time of the pupil census in January 2014 was 196. The current admission number for the school is 30 and the proposed admission number will be 60.

The proposal will apply to pupils admitted to the Reception Year in September 2016.

This Notice is an extract from the complete proposal. Copies of the complete proposal can be obtained from: Margaret Brightman, Place Manager, Children & Young People Department, 3rd Floor Laurence House, 1 Catford Road, London SE6 4EH.

Within four weeks from the date of publication of these proposals, any person may object to or make comments on the proposal by sending them to Margaret Brightman, Place Manager, Children & Young People Department, 3rd Floor Laurence House, 1 Catford Road, London SE6 4EH.

Signed:

Publication Date: May 14<sup>th</sup> 2014

## PROPOSALS FOR PRESCRIBED ALTERATIONS OTHER THAN FOUNDATION PROPOSALS: Information to be included in a complete proposal

### **Extract of Part 1 of Schedule 3 and Part 1 of Schedule 5 to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools)(England) Regulations 2007 (as amended):**

#### **In respect of a Governing Body Proposal: School and governing body's details**

1. The name, address and category of the school for which the governing body are publishing the proposals.

The Proposal is published by the London Borough of Lewisham

#### **In respect of an LEA Proposal: School and local education authority details**

1. The name, address and category of the school .

Sir Francis Drake Primary School, Scawen Road, Deptford SE8 5AE (Community School)

#### **Implementation and any proposed stages for implementation**

2. The date on which the proposals are planned to be implemented, and if they are to be implemented in stages, a description of what is planned for each stage, and the number of stages intended and the dates of each stage.

It is proposed that the school's planned admission number should be increased to 60 with effect from the 2016/17 intake of Reception pupils. The school will continue to admit 60 Reception pupils each year thereafter. As a result, the school will be two forms of entry throughout by September 2022.

#### **Objections and comments**

3. A statement explaining the procedure for making representations, including —
- (a) the date prescribed in accordance with paragraph 29 of Schedule 3 (GB proposals)/Schedule 5 (LA proposals) of The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended), by which objections or comments should be sent to the local education authority; and
  - (b) the address of the authority to which objections or comments should be sent.

Margaret Brightman, Places Manager, Children & Young People Department, 3rd Floor Laurence House, 1 Catford Road, London SE6 4EH.

### Alteration description

4. A description of the proposed alteration and in the case of special school proposals, a description of the current special needs provision.

The Local Authority proposes to increase the planned admission number of the school from 30 to 60 pupils each year. This is in response to the sustained increase in demand for school places in the locality. The proposal is for a new school to be built on part of the existing playground. Arrangements for play and sports during this period will be discussed with the Governing Body. When the new building is complete the school will move and the existing building will be demolished..

### School capacity

5.—(1) Where the alteration is an alteration falling within any of paragraphs 1 to 4, 8, 9 and 12-14 of Schedule 2 (GB proposals)/paragraphs 1-4, 7, 8, 18, 19 and 21 of Schedule 4 (LA proposals) to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended), the proposals must also include —

- (a) details of the current capacity of the school and, where the proposals will alter the capacity of the school, the proposed capacity of the school after the alteration;

The current capacity of the school is 210 pupils

The proposed capacity of the school after the alteration will be 420

- (b) details of the current number of pupils admitted to the school in each relevant age group, and where this number is to change, the proposed number of pupils to be admitted in each relevant age group in the first school year in which the proposals will have been implemented;

As at January 2014, the current number of pupils admitted to the school in each year group is as follows:

Reception	30
Year 1	30
Year 2	30
Year 3	30
Year 4	30
Year 5	30
Year 6	30

The proposed number of pupils to be admitted in each relevant year group in the first school year in which the proposals will have been implemented (2016/17) are as follows

Reception	60
Year 1	30
Year 2	30
Year 3	30

Year 4	30
Year 5	30
Year 6	30

- (c) where it is intended that proposals should be implemented in stages, the number of pupils to be admitted to the school in the first school year in which each stage will have been implemented;

It is proposed that the school will enlarge to 2 forms of entry across all year groups on an incremental basis through the admission of 60 pupils each year to the Reception Year Group. 60 pupils will be admitted from 2016.

- (d) where the number of pupils in any relevant age group is lower than the indicated admission number for that relevant age group a statement to this effect and details of the indicated admission number in question.

In 2016/17 the indicated admission number for years 1,2,3,4 & 5 will be 30. Should vacancies arise in those year groups children will be admitted up to an admission number of 30.

In 2017/18 the indicated admission number for years 2,3,4,5 & 6 will be 30. Should vacancies arise in that year group children will be admitted up to an admission number of 30.

In 2018/19 the indicated admission number for years 3,4,5 & 6 will be 30. Should vacancies arise in that year group children will be admitted up to an admission number of 30.

In 2019/20 the indicated admission number for years 4,5 & 6 will be 30. Should vacancies arise in that year group children will be admitted up to an admission number of 30.

In 2020/21 the indicated admission number for years 5 & 6 will be 30. Should vacancies arise in that year group children will be admitted up to an admission number of 30.

In 2021/22 the indicated admission number for year 6 will be 30. Should vacancies arise in that year group children will be admitted up to an admission number of 30.

(2) Where the alteration is an alteration falling within any of paragraphs 1, 2, 9, 12 and 13 of Schedule 2 (GB proposals) /paragraphs 1, 2, 8, 18 and 19 of Schedule 4 (LA proposals) to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended), a statement of the number of pupils at the school at the time of the publication of the proposals.

At the time of the publication of the proposals the numbers of pupils on roll at Sir Francis Drake Primary School are as follows:

Reception	29
Year 1	29
Year 2	28
Year 3	28
Year 4	26
Year 5	27
Year 6	29

### Implementation

6. Where the proposals relate to a foundation or voluntary controlled school a statement as to whether the proposals are to be implemented by the local education authority or by the governing body, and, if the proposals are to be implemented by both, a statement as to the extent to which they are to be implemented by each body.

Not applicable. Sir Francis Drake is a Community school.

### Additional Site

7.—(1) A statement as to whether any new or additional site will be required if proposals are implemented and if so the location of the site if the school is to occupy a split site.

No additional site will be required.

(2) Where proposals relate to a foundation or voluntary school a statement as to who will provide any additional site required, together with details of the tenure (freehold or leasehold) on which the site of the school will be held, and if the site is to be held on a lease, details of the proposed lease.

Not applicable. Sir Francis Drake is a Community school.

### Changes in boarding arrangements

8.—(1) Where the proposals are for the introduction or removal of boarding provision, or the alteration of existing boarding provision such as is mentioned in paragraph 8 or 21 of Schedule 2 (GB proposals)/7 or 14 of Schedule 4 to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) —

- (a) the number of pupils for whom it is intended that boarding provision will be made if the proposals are approved;

Not applicable. Sir Francis Drake does not offer boarding provision .

- (b) the arrangements for safeguarding the welfare of children at the school;

Not applicable. Sir Francis Drake does not offer boarding provision .

- (c) the current number of pupils for whom boarding provision can be made and a description of the boarding provision; and

Not applicable. Sir Francis Drake does not offer boarding provision .

- (d) except where the proposals are to introduce boarding provision, a description of the existing boarding provision.

Not applicable. Sir Francis Drake does not offer boarding provision.

(2) Where the proposals are for the removal of boarding provisions or an alteration to reduce boarding provision such as is mentioned in paragraph 8 or 21 of Schedule 2 (GB proposals)/7 or 14 of Schedule 4 (LA proposals) to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) —

- (a) the number of pupils for whom boarding provision will be removed if the proposals are approved; and

Not applicable. Sir Francis Drake does not offer boarding provision

- (b) a statement as to the use to which the former boarding accommodation will be put if the proposals are approved.

Not applicable. Sir Francis Drake does not offer boarding provision

### **Transfer to new site**

9. Where the proposals are to transfer a school to a new site the following information—

- (a) the location of the proposed site (including details of whether the school is to occupy a single or split site), and including where appropriate the postal address;

Not applicable. There is no proposal to transfer Sir Francis Drake to a new site.

- (b) the distance between the proposed and current site;

Not applicable. There is no proposal to transfer Sir Francis Drake to a new site.

- (c) the reason for the choice of proposed site;

Not applicable. There is no proposal to transfer Sir Francis Drake to a new site.

- (d) the accessibility of the proposed site or sites;

Not applicable. There is no proposal to transfer Sir Francis Drake to a new site.

- (e) the proposed arrangements for transport of pupils to the school on its new site; and

Not applicable. There is no proposal to transfer Sir Francis Drake to a new site.

- (f) a statement about other sustainable transport alternatives where pupils are not using transport provided, and how car use in the school area will be discouraged.

Not applicable. There is no proposal to transfer Sir Francis Drake to a new site.

## Objectives

10. The objectives of the proposals.

The objective of this proposal is to meet the growing demand for school places in the area.

Sir Francis Drake is proposed for expansion because it is a popular school in an area of high demand. The school is consistently over-subscribed. 38 on-time first preference, 41 second preference and 26 third preference applications were received for 30 places for entry in September 2014.

The school was built in 1963 and is now reaching the end of its intended lifespan; it is starting to require expensive maintenance and upgrades. For this reason, the Local Authority submitted a successful bid to the government's Priority School Building programme to rebuild and enlarge the school, to take account of the major maintenance works that would become due in the near future.

The objective is to provide a modern school building which is fit for purpose within the Government's revised guidelines for space.

## Consultation

11. Evidence of the consultation before the proposals were published including—

- (a) a list of persons who were consulted;
- (b) minutes of all public consultation meetings;
- (c) the views of the persons consulted;
- (d) a statement to the effect that all applicable statutory requirements in relation to the proposals to consult were complied with; and
- (e) copies of all consultation documents and a statement on how these documents were made available.



A full account of the consultation parents, pupils, staff and the Governing Body, and all the relevant documents are included in the report **and addendum** presented to the Mayor on April 9<sup>th</sup> 2014 – **under Item 4.**

<http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/g2856/Public%20reports%20pack%2009th-Apr-2014%2018.00%20Mayor%20and%20Cabinet.pdf?T=10>

### **Project costs**

**12.** A statement of the estimated total capital cost of the proposals and the breakdown of the costs that are to be met by the governing body, the local education authority, and any other party.

The expansion of Sir Francis Drake will be funded by the Department for Education's Priority School Building Programme. The Education Funding Agency will manage the procurement and construction of the building. The Local Authority is managing the statutory process to enlarge the school.

The scheme development is not yet at a stage where these costs can be quantified.

The Local Authority will meet the cost of any planning conditions, including traffic management proposals.

**13.** A copy of confirmation from the Secretary of State, local education authority and the Learning and Skills Council for England (as the case may be) that funds will be made available (including costs to cover any necessary site purchase).

The Local Authority and the school have signed a memorandum of understanding with the EFA prior to the signing of contracts with the Secretary of State for the delivery of the school

### **Age range**

**14.** Where the proposals relate to a change in age range, the current age range for the school.

There is no proposal to change the age range of Sir Francis Drake Primary School.

### **Early years provision**

**15.** Where the proposals are to alter the lower age limit of a mainstream school so that it provides for pupils aged between 2 and 5—

- (a) details of the early years provision, including the number of full-time and part-time pupils, the number and length of sessions in each week, and the services for disabled children that will be offered;

Not applicable.

There is no proposal to alter the provision for pupils aged between 2 and 5 at Sir Francis Drake Primary School.

- (b) how the school will integrate the early years provision with childcare services and how the proposals are consistent with the integration of early years provision for childcare;

Not applicable.

There is no proposal to alter the provision for pupils aged between 2 and 5 at Sir Francis Drake Primary School.

- (c) evidence of parental demand for additional provision of early years provision;

Not applicable.

There is no proposal to alter the provision for pupils aged between 2 and 5 at Sir Francis Drake Primary School.

- (d) assessment of capacity, quality and sustainability of provision in schools and in establishments other than schools who deliver the Early Years Foundation Stage within 3 miles of the school; and

Not applicable.

There is no proposal to alter the provision for pupils aged between 2 and 5 at Sir Francis Drake Primary School.

- (e) reasons why such schools and establishments who have spare capacity cannot make provision for any forecast increase in the number of such provision.

Not applicable.

There is no proposal to alter the provision for pupils aged between 2 and 5 at Sir Francis Drake Primary School.

### **Changes to sixth form provision**

16. (a) Where the proposals are to alter the upper age limit of the school so that the school provides sixth form education or additional sixth form education, a statement of how the proposals will—

- (i) improve the educational or training achievements;

- (ii) increase participation in education or training; and
- (iii) expand the range of educational or training opportunities for 16-19 year olds in the area;

Not applicable

- (b) A statement as to how the new places will fit within the 16-19 organisation in an area;

Not applicable

- (c) Evidence —

- (i) of the local collaboration in drawing up the proposals; and
- (ii) that the proposals are likely to lead to higher standards and better progression at the school;

Not applicable

- (d) The proposed number of sixth form places to be provided.

Not applicable

17. Where the proposals are to alter the upper age limit of the school so that the school ceases to provide sixth form education, a statement of the effect on the supply of 16-19 places in the area.

Not applicable

### Special educational needs

18. Where the proposals are to establish or change provision for special educational needs—

- (a) a description of the proposed types of learning difficulties in respect of which education will be provided and, where provision for special educational needs already exists, the current type of provision;

Not applicable.

- (b) any additional specialist features will be provided;

Not applicable.

- (c) the proposed numbers of pupils for which the provision is to be made;

Not applicable.

(d) details of how the provision will be funded;

Not applicable.

(e) a statement as to whether the education will be provided for children with special educational needs who are not registered pupils at the school to which the proposals relate;

Not applicable.

(f) a statement as to whether the expenses of the provision will be met from the school's delegated budget;

Not applicable.

(g) the location of the provision if it is not to be established on the existing site of the school;

Not applicable.

(h) where the provision will replace existing educational provision for children with special educational needs, a statement as to how the local education authority believes that the new provision is likely to lead to improvement in the standard, quality and range of the educational provision for such children; and

Not applicable.

(i) the number of places reserved for children with special educational needs, and where this number is to change, the proposed number of such places.

Not applicable.

**19.** Where the proposals are to discontinue provision for special educational needs—

(a) details of alternative provision for pupils for whom the provision is currently made;

Not applicable.

(b) details of the number of pupils for whom provision is made that is recognised by the local education authority as reserved for children with special educational needs during each of the 4 school years preceding the current school year;

Not applicable.

- (c) details of provision made outside the area of the local education authority for pupils whose needs will not be able to be met in the area of the authority as a result of the discontinuance of the provision; and

Not applicable.

- (d) a statement as to how the proposer believes that the proposals are likely to lead to improvement in the standard, quality and range of the educational provision for such children.

Not applicable.

**20.** Where the proposals will lead to alternative provision for children with special educational needs, as a result of the establishment, alteration or discontinuance of existing provision, the specific educational benefits that will flow from the proposals in terms of—

- (a) improved access to education and associated services including the curriculum, wider school activities, facilities and equipment with reference to the local education authority's Accessibility Strategy;
- (b) improved access to specialist staff, both educational and other professionals, including any external support and outreach services;
- (c) improved access to suitable accommodation; and
- (d) improved supply of suitable places.

Not applicable.

### **Sex of pupils**

**21.** Where the proposals are to make an alteration to provide that a school which was an establishment which admitted pupils of one sex only becomes an establishment which admits pupils of both sexes—

- (a) details of the likely effect which the alteration will have on the balance of the provision of single sex-education in the area;

Not applicable.

- (b) evidence of local demand for single-sex education; and

Not applicable.

- (c) details of any transitional period which the body making the proposals wishes specified in a transitional exemption order (within the meaning of section 27 of the Sex Discrimination Act 1975).

Not applicable.

**22.** Where the proposals are to make an alteration to a school to provide that a school which was an establishment which admitted pupils of both sexes becomes an establishment which admits pupils of one sex only—

- (a) details of the likely effect which the alteration will have on the balance of the provision of single-sex education in the area; and

Not applicable.

- (b) evidence of local demand for single-sex education.

Not applicable.

### **Extended services**

**23.** If the proposed alterations affect the provision of the school's extended services, details of the current extended services the school is offering and details of any proposed change as a result of the alterations.

Not applicable. The proposal will not affect the school's provision of extended services

### **Need or demand for additional places**

**24.** If the proposals involve adding places—

- (a) a statement and supporting evidence of the need or demand for the particular places in the area;

Sir Francis Drake is located in Primary Place Planning Locality 5, Deptford and New Cross. It is evident that demand in the New Cross and Deptford area is growing.

The number of on-time applications for places at schools in the area has increased over the last 3 years.

Year	No. of on-time applications (preferences 1-6)
2012/2013	1,567
2013/2014	1,637
2014/2015	1,862

The number of births in the area has increased by 29% (from 537 to 694) between September 1st 2000 and August 31st 2011.

Additional permanent places have been provided at schools in the area. In 2012/13 Kender Primary School was enlarged from 1 to 2 Forms of Entry. The Haberdashers' Aske's Federation opened a 2 Form of Entry Free School to serve the area. The school admitted its first 60 pupils in September 2013 and will be full by

2019.

Full information on the demand for places in the borough can be found in the report **and addendum** presented to the Mayor & Cabinet April 9th 2014 – under **Item 4**.

<http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/g2856/Public%20reports%20pack%2009th-Apr-2014%2018.00%20Mayor%20and%20Cabinet.pdf?T=10>

- (b) where the school has a religious character, a statement and supporting evidence of the demand in the area for education in accordance with the tenets of the religion or religious denomination;

Not applicable.

- (c) where the school adheres to a particular philosophy, evidence of the demand for education in accordance with the philosophy in question and any associated change to the admission arrangements for the school.

Not applicable.

**25. If the proposals involve removing places—**

- (a) a statement and supporting evidence of the reasons for the removal, including an assessment of the impact on parental choice; and

Not applicable.

- (b) a statement on the local capacity to accommodate displaced pupils.

Not applicable.

**Expansion of successful and popular schools**

**25A.** (1) Proposals must include a statement of whether the proposer considers that the presumption for the expansion of successful and popular schools should apply, and where the governing body consider the presumption applies, evidence to support this.

(2) Sub-paragraph (1) applies to expansion proposals in respect of primary and secondary schools, (except for grammar schools), i.e. falling within:

(a) (for proposals published by the governing body) paragraph 1 of Part 1 to Schedule 2 or paragraph 12 of Part 2 to Schedule 2;

(b) (for proposals published by the LA) paragraph 1 of Part 1 to Schedule 4 or 18 of Part 4 to Schedule 4

of the School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended).

Sir Francis Drake is a successful and popular school. It is judged by Ofsted to be a Good school. The most recent inspection occurred in October 2013 and can be accessed via the following link. <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/inspection-reports/find-inspection-report/provider/ELS/100712>. The school has been oversubscribed **on first preferences for entry in 2013 & 2014.**



## Sir Francis Drake Primary School enlargement proposal

**Governing Body response**

The governors have given very serious consideration to the possibility of enlargement and our views are summarised below:

Sir Francis Drake is a great school	It is in the <b>top 8%</b> of schools in the country in the 2013 SATs. It was recognised by the DfE as being among the <b>top 250</b> schools in the country measured by the progress made by disadvantaged pupils. It has great attendance and a waiting list for places in Reception. We recognise that it is a part of the local community and wants to provide a great education for as much of the community as it realistically can.
Where teaching is enabled, not impeded, by its buildings.	The current buildings may be worn, but the generous classrooms and flexible use of ancillary spaces allow a rich curriculum, and the individual attention to pupils that enable these results.
So enlargement risks replacing a successful small school with a larger but less successful one.	This is in nobody's interest. We notice that the other 1FE school in the area is also highly successful, but enlargement of Sir Francis Drake would leave only two 1FE community schools in this part of the borough. There is no guarantee that all places will be filled, and we are concerned that, if all spaces are not filled, we would have to have some vertical classes; this is a cause for concern for parents and teachers. Even now, there are spaces in several years that have not been filled.
We recognise the need for more places locally,	But are disappointed that opportunities to build enough capacity into new developments (particularly the Surrey Canal Triangle and Convoy's Wharf) have been missed, and other brownfield sites are not being considered.
And can see potential benefits in enlargement,	Enlargement could potentially bring better use of staff time (and better staff development opportunities), recruitment of specialist staff, lower overhead cost per child, greater energy efficiency and more productive use of some presently underused space.
As long as we protect the things we value.	Sir Francis Drake has a personal family feel that parents and children value. Most importantly the school has a strong ethos that relies on identifying children's individual needs and providing the support that enables them to thrive. The children are well behaved and well-motivated as a result. The school itself is well laid out for active play with varied play areas and planting.
But the proposed 'austerity' scheme threatens our success	By reducing class room size and breakout space the focused education we are proud of will be much harder. The proposed classroom sizes are smaller than those in use elsewhere; we will be guinea pigs for these design restrictions. This is particularly hard felt as many of our children live in cramped accommodation where finding study space is hard. We need enough space for the teaching assistants and other support, as well as teachers and pupils. The current hall is at capacity for curriculum and extra curriculum use; the proposed one provides even less resource. The whole school will not be able to meet in one place. The proposed play ground is larger, but is not large enough to

	<p>accommodate all children at once, and the separation of KS1/2 will be harder to achieve. The inside toilets are not accessible from the play area.</p> <p>We would like to add that while we understand that detailed design work under the EFA scheme is still to take place, we have only had a site sketch to base our response on. We have not been able to undertake any detailed planning or assess the full impact of the project.</p>
<p>So we are opposed to enlargement under the present scheme unless...</p>	<p>We believe that the EFA funded scheme <b>worsens the school's ability to deliver outstanding education</b>. If enlargement is unavoidable, we would look to the local authority to enhance the scheme so that sufficient flexibility can be designed in from the outset. This would be good value for the local authority, as the bulk of the capital costs are still being met by the EFA.</p> <p>We ask LBL to undertake to:</p> <p>Allow and fund appropriate use of Deptford Park for additional play/sports space during and after construction</p> <p>Fund additions to the scheme that will enable larger classes now and later addition of flexible spaces (such as services provision in other parts of the site)</p> <p>Resolve traffic issues on Scawen &amp; Grinstead Roads to ensure child safety and funds the necessary adaptations</p> <p>Confirm resources will be available for fit out (where current equipment can't be re-used (e.g. wall bars, Southampton cage, IT suite).</p> <p>Confirms adequate funding arrangements while numbers are still increase (but overheads are potentially higher).</p> <p>Investigate and funds appropriate energy saving and other enhancements (such as rainwater harvesting) that will reduce running costs in the future.</p>

Fraser Jopp  
Chair of Governors  
Sir Francis Drake Primary School  
21 May 2014

Appendix Five  
Petitions raised during the Representation period

Petition posted on Lewisham.gov.uk

We are parents of children at Sir Francis Drake (SFD). Most of us have chosen SFD because it is a small primary school with a good record of academic achievement and has been part of our local community for over 50 years now. The School is located on a small site which we believe is appropriate for the current size of the School (210 pupils). Our children enjoy good inside and outside space and although the school might not be sleek and modern it is still in a good condition and has all the facilities necessary to ensure that its pupils and staff can work together as one happy family.

We are very concerned about the proposed plans to enlarge SFD. We believe that doubling the school to 420 pupils will completely change the school's personality. The size of the school and the close-knit community that arose from this, were the key reasons why we chose SFD in the first place. The expansion would result in having a large building on the same size of land which could potentially lead to significant reduction class spaces, cramped common areas and smaller outdoor facilities, which would simply not accommodate 420 children appropriately.

We are particularly concerned about the lack of information on the proposed building plans and how the Lewisham Council proposes to carry out building works alongside the ongoing functioning of the school. A number of us tried to obtain this information from your department but none was provided. In order for it to be a fair consultation process rather than a tick-box exercise we request the following:

- Details of proposed building works and detailed plans of the proposed school layout
- The budget for these works and who will be providing it
- How the proposed changes will affect the current classroom sizes and the outdoor space
- What is the added value that the proposed expansion will bring to the CURRENT users of the school
- How the Council is going to handle the teaching process while the proposed building works take place
- How and when would new staff be recruited to deal with the additional numbers

Until we receive the above information we will continue to strongly oppose the expansion of our School.

Although we understand that there is a need for further primary school places in the area we do not feel that it is fair for our school to bear the responsibility to provide these in the manner which is currently being proposed. The Council has approved a lot of new building in the area close to SFD but failed to secure the provision of new schools to meet the demand. This is utterly irresponsible and can only be met with opposition from the local residents and particularly from families with children in SFD.

Online 38 DEGREES

# SAVE SIR FRANCIS DRAKE PRIMARY SCHOOL FROM DEMOLITION

**TO: STEVE BULLOCK MAYOR OF LEWISHAM**

*Dear Mayor,*

*Please don't demolish our well maintained school to replace it with the governments first ever "Baseline design" Austerity school.*

## **Why is this important?**

Statutory Public notice is on the school gate and ends on June 10 Local people have not been made aware of the councils plans and so have not been able to be fully engaged in the process of consultation.

Sir Francis Drake Primary school is in one of Lewisham boroughs most deprived areas Evelyn Ward, it a local one form entry community school with capacity for 210 children.

52% of school pupils are have English as a second language,

41% are on free school meals and the proportion of disabled pupils and special educational needs is above average.

Despite the disadvantages -Currently it is in the top 8% of school in the country for the 2013 SATS and recognised by the DFE as in the top 250 schools in the country measured by the progress made by disadvantaged pupils. The RT Hon David Laws MP Secretary of State congratulated the school for "being exceptionally effective in educating disadvantaged children providing them with a good start in life and a strong springboard into secondary education".

Ofsted: Pupils thoroughly enjoy school and this is reflected in their attendance, which is above average.

The school provides a very positive and vibrant learning environment, and pupils therefore feel safe and secure. All pupils are equally valued, as the school motto indicates, 'Everyone is valued and all succeed.' This ensures that the school strongly promotes equality of opportunity, and does not tolerate any form of discrimination.

Pupils have extremely positive attitudes towards learning, and engage thoughtfully in all activities. Their behaviour around the school is often exemplary. They get on well together, and show considerable respect and care for each other.

	DESCRIPTION	RESPONSE	AGE GROUP	SEX	ETHNICITY	COMMENTS	APPENDIX SIX
1	Parent/Carer	No	Not stated	F	Not stated	<p>We wish for our objections to this proposal to be included as a representation. We object to the proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school is on a small site and it would be unreasonable to expect this site to accommodate more pupils without an adverse impact on health and safety and learning through physical movement and free play;</li> <li>• The expansion will change the unique character, culture and ethos of the school and is likely to impact standards: larger schools consistently underperform in measures of attainment and outcomes;</li> <li>• The classrooms will be smaller and fewer per capita constraining the numbers of targeted interventions that school can reasonably offer to small groups of learners;</li> <li>• Impact on local traffic volume and severe risk to the lives of pupils walking near roads from said increased traffic as the pavements in this area are often completely inaccessible due to incessant fly tipping; there is much irresponsible driving behaviour locally anyway due to skip lorries hurtling towards the Surrey Canal area at dangerous speeds;</li> <li>• There is a dearth of school places, agreed, but many sites locally have been allowed unprecedented freedom via local planners to expand and develop masses of high density housing in a fashion that creates this situation due to lack of associated infrastructure (schools and community resources);</li> <li>• Large school sites (Deptford Green KS4, the old Tidemill site on Frankham Street) are being sold to developers to make way for more high density housing, rather than being reconfigured as new build stand alone schools</li> </ul>	

	DESCRIPTION	RESPONSE	AGE GROUP	SEX	ETHNICITY	COMMENTS	APPENDIX SIX
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The budget nature of this proposal is concerning on a number of levels: no one has seen more detailed plans so there is a risk that the proposed development will go ahead to be followed by a cheap, ugly building that carries substantial costs to maintain;</li> </ul>	
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The long term maintenance and management plan is also of concern and carries risk incumbent on the school re upkeep and repayments;</li> <li>There is insufficient evidence available that it would not be financially viable to repair and refurbish the current school building;</li> </ul> <p>The consultation process has been poor - most local residents have had no information about the proposals, and what limited info has been provided has been most partisan on the side of enlargement; All this disruption and upheaval for an additional thirty places per year, it hardly seems worth it, except for those who hold the purse strings, we suspect.</p>	
2	Parent/Carer	No	Not stated	M	Not stated	Comment as above – joint submission	
3	Parent/Carer	No	Not stated	F	Not stated	<p>I am writing to register my opposition to the plans to knock down and expand Sir Francis Drake School, and to utterly condemn the way in which the LA has acted, allowing massive expansion and the development of thousands of flats without planning adequate infrastructure - including schools - to service the needs of a community allowed to grow exponentially. I am a local resident and parent of three children, two of whom attend this school, and am appalled at the lack of vision and creative thinking being applied to the problem of insufficient school places.</p> <p>Needless to say, I oppose the plan to demolish a perfectly sound building which houses a thriving and successful school community and to erect a 'budget build' in its place. There are numerous vacant sites which could house a two or three form entry school, one being the old Charlotte Turner</p>	

					<p>School, another being the vast Convoys Wharf development which seems almost entirely geared to providing ever more flats. Why there has been no inclusion of a school building in this development is a complete mystery,</p> <p>The current SFD school site cannot house twice as many children safely: the outdoor place space is really rather tiny as it stands. The new classrooms are, I understand going to offer 'reduced space' to pupils. When can the increased population of children move around then? Neither inside nor out it seems. And this in the context of a rise in sedentary childhood and early childhood obesity. Shameful.</p> <p>There is good evidence to show that smaller schools lead to better outcomes for children, both academic and in terms of social and emotional wellbeing and adjustment. I therefore do not understand why the LA feel the best course of action is to knock down a small, successful school and replace it with a much larger one, altered in character and diluted in terms of resourcing and infrastructure. The proposal is all about achieving economies of scale rather than promoting better pupil outcomes and high achievement for economically disadvantaged inner city pupils.</p> <p>It is clear that there is commitment to this scheme from Lewisham Council and that it is being pushed through very quickly without effective process, transparency of plans and proper information sharing and consultation with local residents. Local families and residents haven't been made aware of the proposal, no one seems able to say what kind of school is being planned to go in the place of SFD and there has been next to no information provided re: the implications for increased traffic volume, car parking space and associated road safety concerns for local children. My own child had a very near miss recently when a parent dropping off reversed dangerously over the zig zag markings and hit the railing he was standing behind. It provokes real anxiety to think how children will travel safely to school with increased traffic volume for a school of double the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>size.... Particularly in an area routinely targeted by fly tippers, making pavements nearby (Kezia St) often completely inaccessible to pedestrians due to mattresses, sofas and other rubbish blocking the way.</p> <p>The 'consultation' process within the school community was extremely skewed, with the benefits of expansion given maximum airplay, with no detail of the plans offered to inform the discussion and no exploration of the challenges, risks and potential hazards of rebuilding (asbestos removal, reduced space for physical play, for example). Children and families were not encouraged to each have a proper say, as only two children per class completed the consultation, and only one (biased) letter + consultation form went home per family. And local residents were not consulted or engaged at all. I think that Lewisham are hoping to benefit from a local populace who are poorly informed, rather apathetic and - in many cases - made up of short term lessees who have little investment in, or wish to shape, the local community.</p> <p>I vehemently oppose the planning application for this proposal. I would like to register my educational concerns. I would also like to be notified as soon as the LA obtains the planning application for this proposed scheme, so that I can look at this in detail and again raise my strongest objections.</p>
4	Parent/Carer	No	Not stated	F	Not stated	<p>I chose Sir Francis Drake school for my son for how close and caring the teachers are towards their pupils. My son education has improved massively thanks to the school. I believe my son and the other pupils education will suffer if the enlargement goes ahead. I am against the enlargement. Why should the children have smaller classroom, dinner hall and corridors? Every term the years have a school assembly with all the years there to watch. If the enlargement happens there will not be enough space to accommodate all the pupils which will be a disappointment. I believe this brings all the pupils together; all the pupils know each other names; Year 6 know the names of reception pupils. I think it is unfair the</p>



					<p>children of Sir Francis Drake and the teacher will suffer due to the Government wanting to save money. It is disgusting that the Government want to make a flat pack school by doing this. These children spend most of the early life in school; they deserve to have a well built and equipped school like everyone else in this borough has.</p> <p>Sir Francis Drake is also on the corner of a busy and dangerous road. It's dangerous now to get across; how will it be with the double of pupils and parents trying to cross?</p> <p>It really is unfair that the Government are not thinking or willing to protect the pupils who are already at Sir Francis Drake. The education and safety of these children should be considered too.</p>
5	Parent/Carer	No			<p>I would like to state my case AGAINST the school enlargement of Sir Francis Drake.</p> <p>My daughter first attended [REDACTED] Primary School. In Year 1 she was being bullied by her 'best friend' and when I raised this with the school, showing pictures of marks on her neck where her 'friend' tried to strangle her, told them of her having nightmares, explained how this other child (Vietnamese) was racist against black children, (my child was the only white child in the class and when she tried to play with other children the 'friend' would get angry with my daughter) nothing was done about it. I decided to move her out of the school.</p> <p>My daughter moved to SFD half way through Year 1 and started in Jan 2013. She loved it from week one, has developed greatly, speaks confidently and truly enjoys all aspects of her varied curriculum.</p> <p>I don't believe she would have adapted to the change as well had she moved to a school similar to that of [REDACTED] Primary School.</p>

						<p>I believe that the current size of SFD is what makes it such a successful school. Successful in results; successful in its comfortable feel; successful in its personal, family feel; successful in its production of well rounded, intelligent, respectful and polite students. The first thing I noticed, anyone notices, when first visiting the school is how friendly and open the children are. Everyone knows everyone and helps everyone when needed. The 'whole school assembly's' are great and teach the students to be respectful of each other and support each other.</p> <p>The staff at SFD are all approachable (to both students and parents) and deal with any situations straight away and follow up on them. They believe in fairness, diversity, and focusing on the development of individuals as well as supporting group work.</p> <p>Increasing the school size, just aesthetically will immediately eradicate its friendly, relaxed, family, personal feel. It has the risk of becoming just another inner city, under achieving school with cramped teaching space and limited space for the vast number of intended students to come together in one assembly. And one with teachers too busy to get know students individually, too busy to get to know their families, and who aren't interested in helping where help is needed. In teaching students the basics but not having the time to invest in giving each student the individual attention they need to become the best they can be.</p> <p>I believe SFD should remain as it is, a successful school.</p>
6	Parent/Carer	No	Not stated	F	Not stated	<p>Firstly, it should be noted that the Statutory Notice outside SFD does not explain or make it clear to parents or the local people that the proposal is to <u>DEMOLISH</u> Sir Francis Drake Primary School (SFD) in order to find just 30 additional places per year.</p> <p>It is difficult to think that once Lewisham Council has succeeded in demolishing Sir Francis Drake Primary School for the sake of just 30</p>

					<p>additional places per year, they will then need to address this matter fully and actually find a way to build the new primary schools necessary to cater for the rising local demand from the many new families that are being introduced in to the area.</p> <p>When these new schools are finally built as the real solution to find the primary places for local children sadly, for Sir Francis Drake Primary School, this will all come too late as it will have already been demolished and permanently changed into a different type of school entirely. The proposed 're-build' retains nothing of the original school.</p> <p>It is understood that the proposed new school building will be an 'Austerity' build with reduced sized classrooms. The new building will also have to be located far to one side of the school site in order for double the amount of children (420) to receive enough 'allowable' space.</p> <p>The question is: Why would a council do this to the existing 210 children or to the proposed 420 children of SFD? This proposal is being enforced without any money from Lewisham Council or due consideration to the existing thriving, hard working school in an already notably deprived area. The children at SFD need <u>more</u> given to them and not less in order for them to continue to thrive. This proposal is being so coldly handled that does not deliver or even address the care needed for the children at SFD.</p> <p>Despite the Mayor visiting the school recently, several of the older children were quite upset afterwards and the younger children are too young to know they are about to lose their school as they know it.</p> <p>All schools require money to maintain them but the notice is unclear as to the 'considerable investment' it refers to? This is an important issue because the proposal will use PSBP funding. PSBP funding 'addresses the needs of those schools in the very worst condition'. Therefore a strong and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>determined case would have needed to be made by Lewisham Council in the case of SFD in order to obtain this funding? This is confusing because it is obvious that SFD is not at all in 'the very worst condition' and it is also documented by Lewisham Council that SFD is 'a well maintained school'? Obviously without the obtained PSBP funding there would be no proposed demolition of Sir Francis Drake Primary School.</p> <p>In addition, this proposal is not very transparent and does not give the necessary information needed to have any kind of informed input and in fact it does not appear to be a very democratic process overall. This can only make one think that the proposal will be <u>imposed</u> at whatever the cost to this school.</p> <p>I am therefore confirming that I am opposed to the proposal and I would like to ask the Mayor and Lewisham Council to kindly re-consider this proposal and to find an alternative solution regarding Sir Francis Drake Primary School.</p>
7	Parent/Carer	No			<p>I am objecting to the Statutory Notice Proposal for Sir Francis Drake Primary School.</p> <p>As you may or may not know Evelyn Ward is named in a lottery bid application through Better Start (CYP Frankie Sulke) and has undergone an extensive investigation to discover what is the Toxic Stress for preventing children 0yrs - 8yrs from reaching their full potential. Evelyn Ward is the most deprived area in the borough 37% of children living in poverty families are in overcrowded housing on low income, high levels of lone parent families, neglect and abuse, high levels of domestic abuse , substance misuse, mental health and reduced social community engagement.</p> <p>Sir Francis Drake's Evelyn Ward are the children <b>are living in this "Toxic Stress" and can add the following</b></p>

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>52%</b> of our school pupils are have <b>English as a second language</b></li> <li>• <b>41% are on free school meals</b> and</li> </ul> <p>The <b>proportion of disabled pupils and special educational needs is above average.</b></p> <p><b>In spite of the toxic stress this small school</b> was Ofsted inspected 2013 as good with a number of number of outstanding features.</p> <p><b>Reception pupils</b> join with skills <b>below levels typical</b> for their age by the time they reach Year 1 they have reach typical levels.</p> <p><b>Year 1 higher than national proportion</b> of pupils who well in the phonics screen check.</p> <p>By the end of year 6 most pupils reach standards <b>above those found nationally in English and Maths.</b></p> <p><b>Disabled pupils and those with SEN are effectively supported and make better than expected progress.</b></p> <p>Currently it is in the top 8% of schools in the country in the 2013 SATs and is recognised by the DfE as being among the top 250 schools in the country measured by the progress made by disadvantaged pupils.</p> <p>My son has a Statement of Education needs for Autism Spectrum Disorder <b>in a class of 28 (with 7 peers on school action plus)</b> he is thriving in this wonderful small school. It is inclusive and diverse catering for the most and less needy together. It works brilliantly it provides a small family environment all supporting each other from reception to year 6. But now my son is already full of anxiety at the prospect of his school being "knocked down, being made smaller in space and having lots of lots strangers in it".</p> <p>The school needs some little maintenance done but demolishing it to provide 30 reception places to join in Sept 2016 is the worst case scenario for this successful inclusive and diverse little school.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p><b>How is that funding justified to demolish to avoid maintaining a great school?</b></p> <p>To consider allowing the EFA to build the first pilot Austerity school in the country as a replacement is a sorry reward for all the hard work achieved thus far - One of the council pledges is to improve secondary results by 10% to do, this you need to copy the formula of this primary school not demolish it.</p> <p>9.2.9 The building delivered by the Education Funding Agency will be in line with the specifications agreed by the James Committee. The focus will be on the delivery of a modern functional building which meets the government's revised guidelines for space which have recently been revised down from those previously published. The standardised designs offer less flexibility in design in order to reduce construction costs. The budget will not meet the cost of any additional planning conditions.</p> <p>The Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) is seriously concerned about the unproven 'Austerity School' scheme. RIBA President Angela Brady said:</p> <p>'Our students, teachers and local communities deserve great schools - environments that are beneficial to the best-quality teaching and learning. In these times of austerity of course we need to cut our cloth on all spending; however, the government's proposals for the design and construction of future schools are far too restrictive with too much focus on short-term savings.</p> <p>The school is never full to capacity Ofsted shows 202 for 210 this area has a highly transient population children come and go leaving in year gaps.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>We note that the LA advisors are <b>justifying demolition</b> our little school to <b>serve primarily the</b> needs of the Surrey Union Triangle where major housing developments of Marine Wharf and The Wharves are bringing in residents and future needs.</p> <p>However the projections I find in your <b>January 15 2014</b> council meeting shows with currently Kender Primary school and Haberdasher Aske's expansions <b>no additional requirements are projected</b> right up until 2020/21!</p> <p><b>January 15 2014</b></p> <p>Projected demand for Reception</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>PAN</th> <th>Projection</th> <th>Additional Requirement</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2014/15</td> <td>510</td> <td>476</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015/16</td> <td>510</td> <td>500</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016/17</td> <td>510</td> <td>487</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2017/18</td> <td>510</td> <td>500</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2018/19</td> <td>510</td> <td>504</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The LA has not retained sites available at old Tide Mill primary school and old Deptford Green sites to build a new school(s). But there are sites locally that Lewisham Council have for Sale big enough to accommodate a two form baseline design school in close proximity to the housing developments planned.</p> <p>We think joined up thinking would be better;- we are lucky to be in the Surrey Union Triangle in close proximity of Greenwich and Southwark of which many of our local families are accepted in to their schools; Greenwich are returning schools places back in to operation at Charlotte Turner and Royal Hill schools there is a International Greenwich free</p>	Year	PAN	Projection	Additional Requirement	2014/15	510	476	0	2015/16	510	500	0	2016/17	510	487	0	2017/18	510	500	0	2018/19	510	504	0
Year	PAN	Projection	Additional Requirement																										
2014/15	510	476	0																										
2015/16	510	500	0																										
2016/17	510	487	0																										
2017/18	510	500	0																										
2018/19	510	504	0																										

					<p>school supported by Michael Gove looking for site to open and Southwark have a plan for 2FE in Rotherhithe for summer 2016 and there is a plan for Convoys Wharf to build a 2FE school in our area too.</p> <p>Refer your advisors to  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/185804/CUBEC-11-2012.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/185804/CUBEC-11-2012.pdf</a></p> <p>Why would popular schools ever choose to expand when there are no obvious incentives to do so, the are the questioning costs reducing the learning space children will have, of adding considerable extra administrative and management burden, financial issues and the potential for reducing academic achievement. Is it the primary role to make schools better or bigger (in our case smaller)? I think it is to make schools better so there is no incentive for this proposal.</p> <p>There are so many better solutions that Lewisham can do to reduce "Toxic Stress" start with protecting Sir Francis Drake's Evelyn Ward children 1 FE school, please halt the process - now take a look with new eyes at this proposal and the real need for an additional <b>new</b> school for planned housing developments.</p>
8	Parent/Carer	No			<p><b>Parents of Reception Class (signed by 25 parents)</b>  We are writing to you with regards to the proposed plans to enlarge Sir Francis Drake Primary School.</p> <p>We are parents of Reception Class children at Sir Francis Drake (SFD). Most of us have chosen SFD because it is a small primary school with a good record of academic achievement and has been part of our local community for over 50 years now. The School is located on a small site which we believe is appropriate for the current size of the School (210 pupils). Our children enjoy good inside and outside space and although the school might not be sleek and modern it is still in a good condition and</p>



					<p>has all the facilities necessary to ensure that its pupils and staff can work together as one happy family.</p> <p>We are very concerned about the proposed plans to enlarge SFD. We believe that doubling the school to 420 pupils will completely change the school's personality. The size of the school and the close-knit community that arose from this, were the key reasons why we chose SFD in the first place. The expansion would result in having a large building on the same size of land which could potentially lead to significant reduction of class spaces, cramped common areas and smaller outdoor facilities, which would simply not accommodate 420 children appropriately.</p> <p>We are particularly concerned about the lack of information on the proposed building plans and how the Lewisham Council proposes to carry out building works alongside the ongoing functioning of the school. A number of us tried to obtain this information from your department but none was provided. In order for it to be a fair consultation process rather than a tick-box exercise we request the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of proposed building works and detailed plans of the proposed school layout</li> <li>• The budget for these works and who will be providing it</li> <li>• How the proposed changes will affect the current classroom sizes and the outdoor space</li> <li>• What is the added value that the proposed expansion will bring to the CURRENT users of the school</li> <li>• How the Council is going to handle the teaching process while the proposed building works take place</li> <li>• How and when would new staff be recruited to deal with the additional numbers</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Until we receive the above information we will continue to strongly oppose the expansion of our School.</p> <p>Although we understand that there is a need for further primary school places in the area we do not feel that it is fair for our school to bear the responsibility to provide these in the manner which is currently being proposed. The Council has approved a lot of new building in the area close to SFD but failed to secure the provision of new schools to meet the demand. This is utterly irresponsible and can only be met with opposition from the local residents and particularly from families with children in SFD.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Correspondence to Joan Ruddock from Evelyn Parents

Joan Ruddock

28/3/14

We are asking for Sir Francis Drake Primary (SFD) to be **spared** in the process of the Lewisham Council's School Enlargement Scheme.

We are asking this because Lewisham Council has earmarked SFD for complete demolition, a decision that cannot be reversed.

#### Consultation Process

The consultation process has been conducted in an unacceptable way.

- The consultation document gave every appearance of being simply an **"issues paper"**. It contained **no actual proposals or visible plans** and the information given to consultees was **wholly insufficient** for anyone to make an **informed** response.
- The **lack of detail** in the proposal hides the real plan to **demolish the entire school** which in fact should have been the highlight of the proposal as this is what makes the SFD enlargement **different** to the previous Lewisham schools earmarked for enlargement

**Every** previous school expansion **proposal** has been **agreed** at the **Mayors council meeting despite strong opposition** (Jan 15 204 council meeting) from pupils, parents and reservations from concerned governors.

The document does not say if your views will influence the proposal at the Mayors next council meeting in April.

**Majority of Parents feel that it is pointless as it is a foregone conclusion so didn't bother to fill out the form**

**Some parents** reported had tried to do online consultation but couldn't get it **to submit**

**ESOL parents 52%** have no idea what the consultation is about paper **was in English only**

- 3 sessions (on one day) was hosted at the school by Margaret Brightman LA. This was not highly emphasised as being the **only opportunity** to question and engage in **conversations** about the proposal, which meant many parents failed to recognise the **importance of attending** or making arrangements eg for work or for childcare to attend- in addition there were no interpreters offered (52 %of SFD parents are ESOL). This ensured low turnout and only those that attended got information.
- The SFD consultation even its poor format has not been extended and **circulated to the members of the local community** even though there is provision for them to be **included** in the consultation which ended on the 17<sup>th</sup> March we are concerned that this is against the equalities monitoring policy.
- The consultation presents no concrete evidence that the demolition is needed - this is an irreversible decision.

## Question of Need?

From the consultation document Lewisham Council says there has been a 29% increase in births from 2000/01 **however currently SFD is not at full capacity** as stated in October 2013 Ofsted report pupil numbers are 202 out of 210.

According to the Mayor and Cabinet meeting of 15 Jan 2014 - see below - the information suggests there is **no real need** for additional requirement.

**Therefore demolition of SFD is not justified.**

Mayor & Cabinet January 15th 2014  
Sir Francis Drake Primary School

### 9.1 Additional Requirement – Deptford and New Cross

9.1.1 Sir Francis Drake Primary School is located in Primary Place Planning Locality 5, Deptford and New Cross. Typically there is a low level of on-time applications compensated for by a high level of late applicants. This year there has also been a high number of in-year applicants from the area. There is a considerable housing development in the area, including brown-field sites for which Sir Francis Drake will be the nearest school. Whereas the birth rate in some areas has stabilised, it continues to increase in this part of the borough.

#### Births

Births September 1st 2000 to August 31st 2001 537

Births September 1st 2009 to August 31st 2010 655

Births September 1st 2010 to August 31st 2011 694

Increase 2000/01 to 2010/11 29%

Increase 2009/10 to 2010/11 6%

### 9.1.2 Additional permanent places have been provided at schools in the area

In 2012/13 Kender Primary School was enlarged from 1 to 2FE. The Haberdashers' Aske's Federation opened a 2FE Free School to serve the area. The school admitted its first 60 pupils in September 2013 and will be full by 2019.

### 9.1.3 Projections to 2017/18 suggest that, with these enlargements, the supply of places is sufficient to meet demand.

However current experience is that additional Reception places will be required in the 2013/14 school year to meet the demand created by **in-year** applications. This suggests that the increase in population forecast for the end of the decade has started earlier. This may be due to the high levels of rented accommodation in the area.

#### Projected demand for Reception

Year	PAN	Projection	Additional Requirement
2014/15	510	476	0
2015/16	510	500	0
2016/17	510	487	0
2017/18	510	500	0
2018/19	510	504	0

2019/20	510	510	0
2020/21	510	513	0

### Missing from Lewisham Council calculations

- **A proposed 2FE** (420 places of which **187 will be used by new residents** and remaining to LBC )
- Joined up thinking with our very close neighbouring boroughs **Greenwich** with empty Charlotte Turner and Royal hill school coming back in to use and proposal for a new school the International Academy of Greenwich.
- **Southwark council** also have new school planned for Rotherhithe to combat 270 place shortfall for Sept 2016
- **Empty school sites** at Deptford Green old split site and old Tidemill primary school

### Financial

There is a need for transparency as this is Tax payer’s money under the governments Priority building programme and this seems to be a **moulding** of the figures **to qualify for funding stream criteria**.

This is in question because once the school has been demolished funding will have to be found to rebuild.

What are financial arrangements? - build costs, contract type, break clauses within the contract, maintenance forecasts, and all the other linked financial arrangements and cost model details for the proposed contract.

The formula applied by Partnership for Schools (PFS) is that the required threshold for bidding for funds is that the value of planned refurbishment works (given by the council to be estimated at £765,810) comprises no less than 30% of the cost of the rebuild. The local authority have not provided adequate information to show that this is indeed the case for our school.

### Background information

**Sir Francis Drake is in Evelyn Ward** which is currently an area that has been identified as an area that fulfils necessary criteria for a 10 year programme for the **Better Start lottery bid January 2014 to end "Toxic Stress"**.

**Better Start Lottery Team comprises of Voluntary Action Lewisham, Lewisham Council CYP (Frankie Sulke) Greenwich and Lewisham NHS Trusts, The Children’s Society & Pre-school learning Alliance.**

**They commissioned a Well being study study of 0-8 year olds in Bellingham / Downham the Evelyn/ New Cross Wards and detailed lottery application examining well being of children and all the external factors that are impeding them to thrive “Toxic Stress”**

The intensive investigation the Lewisham Better start team has undertaken shows majority of **Evelyn Ward families are in overcrowded housing on low income and in the CYP's (Frankie Sulke) most deprived areas in Lewisham.** Evelyn Ward identified as the **most deprived ward in Lewisham with 37% of children living in poverty, high levels of domestic violence, substance abuse and mental health issues and reduced social community engagement.** It showed children have **high levels of Obesity, Communication and Language difficulties, behavioural and development difficulties** including readiness for schools (3-8years).

**Despite the depravation and “Toxic Stress” in Evelyn Ward Sir Francis Drake transforms their local Evelyn Ward children and has them hitting above national standards of learning and achievement – Supporting the case of** Almost without exception, the studies show that small school size is unambiguously good for students from low socio-economic status backgrounds and communities with relatively high levels of disadvantage.

### **Ofsted report is overall good with outstanding for Behaviour & Safety**

Sir Francis Drake

**Name of School** Sir Francis Drake Primary School

**Gender** Mixed

**Age range** 5 - 11

**Type of School** Primary

**Type of Establishment** Community School

**Total number of pupils** 202

**Capacity of School** 210

**OFSTED ranking** Good

**Date of last OFSTED inspection** 15 October 2013

**Free School Meals** 41%

**English as Additional Language** 51.2%

This is an average-sized primary school.

- Pupils are from a wide range of minority ethnic backgrounds. Many speak English as an additional language. The largest groups are pupils from any other Black and Black Caribbean backgrounds.
- The proportion of pupils supported by the pupil premium is higher than in the majority of schools. This is additional funding provided for children looked after by the local authority and pupils known to be eligible for free school meals. In this school, it applies to both groups.
- The proportion of disabled pupils and those with special educational needs supported through school action is above average. The proportion supported at school action plus or with a statement of special educational needs is around average.

All groups of pupils achieve well so that by the end of Year 6, **most reach standards above those found nationally in English and mathematics.** Attainment in reading is usually higher than writing and mathematics, but the gap is closing quickly. More pupils now make outstanding progress as a result of more effective planning and marking.

- Children join the Reception class with skills below the levels found typical for their age. They learn quickly within a lively and stimulating setting, so make good progress. By the time they

enter Year 1 the majority **have caught up and have skills more typical for their age.**

- Pupils enjoy their lessons and settle down quickly to work. They particularly relish the challenge in mathematics lessons of activities that are known in the school as ‘hot’. This helps them to use their numeracy skills to solve complicated problems. Sometimes more able pupils are not given the activities which are ‘too hot to handle’ until they complete the easier work. This sometimes leads to them not making the progress of which they are capable, or being able to work on their own.
- Disabled pupils and those with special educational needs are given very effective support in small groups and one-to-one. Their needs are identified quickly. As a result, work is well matched to their needs, and **they make better than expected progress** from their varying starting points.
- Pupils funded through the pupil premium are **now making rapid progress and the gap in achievement with their peers is closing quickly.** In 2012, the most recent year for which comparative data are available, these pupils were six months behind the others in English, and one year behind in mathematics. However, their needs are now assessed accurately and money is spent well to provide additional help in small groups.
- Achievement is rising rapidly, so now all groups of pupils, including those who speak English as an additional language, and small minority ethnic groups, make at least good progress.
- Pupils enjoy reading and are given many opportunities to practise their understanding of letters and the sounds they make. This is evident in the **higher-than-national proportion of pupils who did well in the phonics screen check in Year 1.** By the time they reach the end of Year 2, pupils’ standards in reading **are above the national average.**

### Response to Joan Ruddock

Dear Joan Ruddock

Thank you for your email to the Mayor of 8th April 2014 to which the Mayor has asked me to reply on his behalf. I am sorry for the delay in responding occasioned by the Easter holiday.

The Mayor considered your letter and the attached representations carefully before making his decision at the Mayor and Cabinet meeting of 9th April to take forward the proposal to expand Sir Francis Drake to the next stage of the issue of a public notice.

I will answer the points made by the representations broadly in the order they were made in the attachment to the email.

Consultation was undertaken fully in line with statutory regulations. The consultation period was 6 weeks from Feb 3<sup>rd</sup> to March 17<sup>th</sup>. This is deemed to be an adequate time for responses. Written responses to the consultation could have been made not only on line, but by letter and by email.

The consultation leaflet invited views on the expansion of SFD. It was not intended to be ‘issues oriented’, and was explicit that the expansion would mean *‘that the existing school buildings could be demolished and replaced with a new school’*. Other Lewisham schemes have also involved demolition, for example at Beecroft Garden in Brockley.

A first stage consultation is very much focused on obtaining the views of governors, parents and children, although there is an opportunity for other stakeholders to submit their views. It is unusual to provide interpreters at a parents' consultation meeting. However, the LA would have responded to a request from the school.

In line with normal Lewisham practice and statutory requirements:

- Consultation leaflets were sent to the school.
- Ward MPs and Councillors were notified via email.
- Neighbouring authorities were notified via email.
- Trade unions were notified via email.
- All Lewisham schools were notified.
- The DFE was notified via email.

As was made clear in the consultation document, following the Mayor's agreement to take forward the proposal to the next stage, there is a further opportunity for representations to be made following the publication of a public notice. The Mayor will consider representations before making a decision on whether or not to proceed with the proposal. In addition, should the proposal reach the stage of a planning application, an outline design is required and is made publically available. As part of the planning process, interested parties are asked to comment to the Planning Department who are required to take them into account in considering the application.

The consultation document sets out in general terms the need for demolition of the existing buildings – *'the buildings have become increasingly less suitable for the delivery of the Primary curriculum... (they are) now 50 years old and starting to require expensive maintenance and upgrades'*.

The Council's estimated cost of refurbishment of the school, which were required as part of the bid for funding, was rigorously audited by central government and found to be accurate. This was a condition of grant. The Council is not at liberty to share details of costs and contracts which are commercially confidential and which are being managed through the Educational Funding Agency on behalf of the government.

Building Regulations BB99 (Revised) are now superseded, and new guidance from the EFA is awaited. However, indicative designs for a 2FE primary school have been published. It is the view of Council officers that the site of Sir Francis Drake is sufficiently large to deliver a successful, new 2FE school both in terms of the internal and external area.

The Mayor and Cabinet report (April 9<sup>th</sup> 2014) provides evidence that there is a need for an expanded school in this locality looking forward to the end of this decade. The due diligence conducted by the government's Education Funding Agency, which would manage the new build, also confirms this. This current year the school has 202 pupils which is within the usual margin which takes account of pupil mobility (the Published Admissions Limit is 210).

The Council has a severe shortage of sites for new schools. The old Tidemill site and Deptford Green site are not available for educational purposes. The Convoys Wharf development, when it is delivered, will only provide sufficient additional places to meet the needs of the new site residents. Neighbouring Local Authorities also have severe pressures to provide additional school places to meet the needs of their residents. For example, the proposed International Academy of Greenwich has not been able to find a site despite searching for two years. Few places, if any, are likely



to be created by neighbouring boroughs which are accessible by Lewisham residents in this locality.

An additional 30 places would be created in September 2016 under this proposal, and the school would thereafter increase by 30 places each year to 2022 when it would reach its full capacity of 420 children. This gradual change would be carefully managed, as would the building phase, to ensure that there is no adverse impact on the welfare and learning of the children. Over three quarters of Lewisham primary schools have already expanded their premises, and a few have been entirely or almost entirely replaced. The Council has therefore built up a wealth of successful experience in supporting schools during this process. The recognition that they can better meet the needs of their localities in providing additional places has been the motivation for good and outstanding schools to expand. Lewisham schools have risen to the resultant challenges to the extent that, during this period of unprecedented change, standards have continued to rise so that in 2013 Lewisham's key stage 2 results were the fourth highest in the country.

A 2 Form of Entry school is not a large school. It is the norm in Lewisham. The very many successful 2 FE (and 3FE) schools in Lewisham demonstrate that a school of this size can continue to deliver an inclusive and caring culture where the children achieve high standards. The argument that Sir Francis Drake children have high needs underscores the need for a new school fit for 21<sup>st</sup> century learning.

Yours sincerely ,

Chris Threlfall  
Lewisham

Head of Education Infrastructure, London Borough of

We also note from this online government document there is no benefit for good schools to expand

[www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/185804/CUBEC-11-2012.pdf](http://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/185804/CUBEC-11-2012.pdf)

### **How can we encourage good schools to expand?**

A CUBeC Short Report

Rebecca Allen, Institute of Education, University of London

Simon Burgess, Centre for Market and Public Organisation, University of Bristol

September 2012

### **Conclusions of this report**

The question “why don’t popular schools expand?” implies a context in which there are good reasons for popular schools to expand, but for some reason, they choose not to.

In fact, our results suggest the opposite and that the question is better put the other way around:

“why would a popular school ever choose to expand?” There are no obvious incentives to do so unless the headteacher is simply interested in school size per se. And there are potential costs, in terms of adding a very considerable extra administrative and management burden, financial issues, and the potential in some cases for reducing school academic performance.

There is also a question of the communication of objectives. In a system where more and more schools are becoming autonomous, they will be increasingly driven by the perceived ‘mission’ of the headteacher and governors. Of course, the accountability mechanisms in the system (league tables and Ofsted) place a limit on the extent to which schools can aim for different things. But one question is: do the headteachers and governors of high performing and popular schools believe it is their primary role to make their school better, or bigger? We suspect that it may be the former. In which case not only may there be no incentive to do this, but also no one has told them that they should be trying to do so.