

MAYOR AND CABINET			
Report Title	Measures to increase the supply of permanent primary school places: Proposal to enlarge Sir Francis Drake Primary School		
Key Decision	Yes	Item No.	
Ward	Evelyn		
Contributors	Executive Director for Children and Young People, Executive Director Regeneration & Resources, Head of Law		
Class	Part 1	Date:	November 12 2014

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report describes the building proposals for the enlarged Sir Francis Drake Primary School and how they were developed.

2. Purpose

- 2.1 The report requests that the Mayor notes the discussions which have taken place to secure satisfactory building proposals for the enlargement of Sir Francis Drake from 1-2 forms of entry with effect from September 2016 and to agree to the element of local authority funding for the scheme proposed by officers.

3. Recommendations

That the Mayor:

- 3.1 notes the process of engagement with the school and the Education Funding Agency to develop a satisfactory building scheme to support the enlargement of Sir Francis Drake Primary School;
- 3.2 agrees that a maximum sum of £200,000 be committed by the London Borough of Lewisham to enhance the delivery of the scheme beyond that funded by the Educational funding Agency (EFA).

4. Policy Context

- 4.1 The proposals within this report are consistent with 'Shaping Our Future: Lewisham's Sustainable Community Strategy' and the Council's corporate priorities. In particular, they relate to the Council's priorities regarding young people's achievement and involvement, including inspiring and supporting young people to achieve their potential, the protection of children and young people and ensuring efficiency, effectiveness and equity in the delivery of excellent services to meet the needs of the community.

- 4.2 The Local Authority has a duty to ensure the provision of sufficient places for pupils of statutory school age and, within financial constraints, accommodation that is both suitable and in good condition.
- 4.3 In aiming to improve on the provision of facilities for primary education in Lewisham which are appropriate for the 21st century, the implementation of a successful primary places strategy will contribute to the delivery of the corporate priority Young people's achievement and involvement: raising educational attainment and improving facilities for young people through partnership working.
- 4.4 It supports the delivery of Lewisham's Children & Young People's Plan (CYPP), which sets out the Council's vision for improving outcomes for all children and young people, and in so doing reducing the achievement gap between our most disadvantaged pupils and their peers. It also articulates the objective of improving outcomes for children with identified SEN and disabilities by ensuring that their needs are met.

The Primary Capital Programme (PCP) and Lewisham's Primary Strategy for Change

- 4.5 A priority in the Primary Strategy for Change (PSfC) is the provision of sufficient places at the right time to meet future needs within and between Primary Places Planning Localities (PPPLs) in the Borough. As stated in Lewisham's June 2008 PSfC:
- "Ensuring that sufficient places are provided in localities at the right time will take precedence over significant investment in schools where the rectification of conditions and suitability issues will not produce additional places. "
- 4.6 Dependent upon future central government decisions on capital delivery, it is proposed that the borough's Primary Capital Programme will continue to be governed by the following criteria as set out in the 2008 PSfC:
- Provide sufficient places at the right time to meet future needs within and between planning localities in the Borough
 - Improve conditions and suitability of schools in order to raise standards
 - Increase the influence of successful and popular schools
 - Maximise the efficient delivery of education in relation to the size of the school, removing half-form entries and promoting continuity of education
 - Enable school extended services for pupils, parents and communities
 - Optimise the Council's capital resources available for investment.

5. Background

Statutory process

- 5.1. On June 25th 2014 the Mayor received a report on the statutory consultation process to the proposal to enlarge Sir Francis Drake Primary school from 1 to 2 forms of entry.
- 5.2 After consideration the Mayor agreed that the proposal to enlarge Sir Francis Drake Primary School from 1 to 2 forms of entry with effect from September 2016, subject to the development of satisfactory building proposals in partnership with EFA be approved.

6. Development of the Building Proposals

6.1 Priority Schools Building Programme: the role of the Education Funding Agency (EFA)

- 6.1.1 In 2010 the new coalition government launched the Priority School Building programme (PSBP). This is intended to replace school buildings in poor condition and also offered the opportunity to expand schools in areas of high demand. The government's original intention had been to finance the programme through a Private Finance Initiative (PFI).
- 6.1.2 The local authority bid successfully to the Priority School Building programme to rebuild and enlarge Sir Francis Drake, reflecting the extent of major maintenance works that would become due in the near future. The scheme is now to be delivered without a PFI. The EFA is project managing the procurement and construction of the building but has required the LA to undertake the statutory process to enlarge the school.
- 6.1.3 In view of the changing levels of demand in the area the LA has proposed enlargement from September 2016.
- 6.1.4 The building delivered by EFA 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 but are adapted to meet the specific circumstances of each site. The budget will not meet the cost of any additional planning conditions. The EFA has sought a commitment from the LA that it will meet the cost of any planning conditions, including traffic management proposals. The LA has agreed to meet the cost of the latter, but has insisted on mayoral approval of any further costs to the LA resulting from planning requirements beyond the scope of the EFA's standardised design brief.

6.2 Design Development

- 6.2.1 Priority School Building Programme Schemes are designed through a programme of engagement meetings completed over a 6 week period. The meetings for Sir Francis Drake involved a core group of the EFA, the contractor, the architect, a school governor representative, the head teacher and a local authority representative. Consultants working on landscape and ICT design were invited to approximately half of the meetings. The local authority's IT Strategic lead is working with the EFA ICT consultant to ensure system compatibility. The EFA is clear that the main decisions about the building will be made by the EFA's internal Design Team, along with external technical experts. They are responsible for ensuring that the contractor's proposals reflect the information contained in the surveys and are compliant with the Facilities Output Specification. The school's role is to input into the design process rather than to assess technical compliance. The LA was also invited to contribute to the meetings on the same basis.
- 6.2.2 The presentations made at each meeting were posted onto a secure website. This was also made available to local authority planners and nominated governors so that comments could be gathered. The EFA does not share other information gathered through surveys. The agreed approach is that, once a point is reached where there is no potential for commercial sensitivities to arise, the EFA will share factual information with schools at their request. This is done to safeguard commercially sensitive information. The only information to be shared immediately is

if any survey information highlights an issue that the school should respond to immediately (e.g. for health and safety reasons). In these circumstances, the EFA will share the information straight away.

- 6.2.3 The meetings were originally scheduled to take place in July and August but then re-scheduled to run from September 11th to October 16th 2014. In addition to the scheduled meetings, governors met with the EFA's Head of Operations for the Priority School Building Programme to discuss certain contested items including access to technical specifications. There were also meetings and teleconferences between LA officers and the governing body.
- 6.2.4 The proposals were discussed on two occasions with Lewisham's Design Review Panel. The National Planning Policy Framework recommends that each local planning authority should establish a Design Review Panel to provide an independent peer review of key developments. The panel assists and encourages developers and their design teams to achieve and deliver high quality design in their development proposal and their role is advisory. Further information on the Lewisham Design review panel can be found at the following link:
<http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/myservices/planning/conservation/Pages/Design-Review-Panel.aspx>
- 6.2.5 The starting point for the design was the proposal which came from the initial feasibility study completed by Mott MacDonald for inclusion in the tender pack. This located the new school on the western edge of the school site, currently the Key Stage 2 playground. It had been established in early discussions with Lewisham Planners that it would not be possible to decant the school into temporary buildings in Deptford Park. The LA does not have available a decant site which would be suitably close to the school and available within the required timescale. Locating the building on current playground space would mean that the current buildings could be retained until the new school is built, albeit with a constrained play area. The site development proposal also took into account the adjacent Neptune Wharf development. This will include a multi-storey building adjacent to the school making it more acceptable for the school to include three-storey elements. The EFA therefore opted for a location on the western edge of the site since it would avoid a decant and would offer greater design flexibility. This was discussed with the Design Review Panelⁱ who agreed that this was the most appropriate location and offered the opportunity to relate the school to the Neptune Wharf development providing a "Civic presence" at the junction of Grinstead Road and Scawen Road.
- 6.2.6 A preferred footprint was developed early on in the process which includes some three storey elements. The orientation of the building and the sequence/layout of the rooms were intended to reach design freeze after meeting 4. However at meeting 5 governors presented an alternative layout for consideration.
- 6.2.7 The site design, developed by the EFA's architect, maintains the pupil entrance in Scawen Road but introduces a separate visitor entrance on the junction of Grinstead Road and Scawen Road for day-time use. Locating the administrative functions of the school in this area also means that the two Reception classes and the two Year 1 classes have direct access to an external area (a requirement for the Reception curriculum and optional for Year 1). Governors had considered where the new design located the "core" of the school. They wished to maintain all access to the site from Scawen Road and to re-locate the school office so that it overlooked the playground for supervision of pupils and visitors. This would replicate the positions in the current building. This option was considered by the EFA to be unsuitable because it could raise safeguarding issues and also because it would mean that the Year 1 classes were separated. It would also generate other changes to the alignment of services throughout the building which were considered to be inefficient.

- 6.2.8 The final scheme presented at meeting 6 reflects the comments received at a second presentation to the Design Review Panel which showed layout, elevations and proposed finishes. This will form the basis of the planning application from the EFA.
- 6.2.9 At the conclusion of the engagement meetings with the EFA, governors still have concerns relating to some of the constraints which are a condition of the EFA funded scheme. These concerns include limitations on classroom and corridor sizes, and the lack of provision of outside toilets. However, they accept that considerable progress has been made on the details of both interior and playground design to meet the school's needs, including modifications to ground floor toilets to make them accessible from the playground, and the proposed provision by the LA of canopies for the Reception classes. They understand that the fulfilment by the LA of any Planning requirements related to Highways modifications will follow in due course, as will the finalisation of proposed arrangements for the temporary use of part of Deptford Park during the build. With the Mayor's agreement, the LA will also consider a request from the governors to pay for future proofing through reinforced foundations for part of the new building should it prove affordable

6.3 Proposed Building

- 6.3.1 The building meets the guidance published in March 2014 *Baseline Designs for schools*. This can be accessed via the links below. The technical specification for Sir Francis Drake's building is equivalent to the specification for EFA funded Free Schools and Academies. The footprint of the building is minimised by the use of 3 storeys in some areas but not throughout.. This has increased the amount of available external space by 500m²

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/baseline-designs-for-schools-guidance/baseline-designs-for-schools-guidance>

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/324056/BB103_Area_Guidelines_for_Mainstream_Schools_CORRECTED_25_06_14.pdf

- 6.3.2. Classroom sizes conform to the area guidelines published earlier this year (Building Bulletin 103). These are the classroom sizes offered in new buildings schemes funded through the Local Authority's Basic Need allocations. The Reception classrooms are 62m² and Infant / Junior classrooms are 55m². The main hall will be 181m² supplemented with a studio hall of 56m². The pupil entrance is from Scawen Road and the secure visitor entrance is on the junction of Grinstead and Scawen Road. Deliveries will be made from Trundley's Road with the current entrance moved closer to the new kitchen.
- 6.3.3. The proposed external finish is a mix of timber and panel cladding in flame resistant and weather proof materials. Windows will be fixed and operable louvre with a powder coat or anodised finish. Modelling has been done to test the ventilation to the rooms to ensure that it meets the Building Bulletin guidelines. The acoustics have been modelled to take account of external noise including traffic and the adjacent train main line. This has identified the required control measures which have been incorporated.
- 6.3.4 The landscape design incorporates legacy items such as the trim trail bought by the school in the last 5 years and the pavilion currently used for outdoor teaching. The scheme incorporates considerable elements of the existing planting. The largest play ground area includes a separated area for Reception pupils, a fenced Multi-Use Games area, and a playground for Junior and Infant pupils with mixes soft play/habitat and hard surfaces. There is an area for outdoor dining and quiet learning between the school and the boundary with Grinstead Road.

6.4 Issues considered during the design process

6.4.1 As noted above, governors proposed an alternative ground floor lay-out for the school which was considered but not accepted. Other smaller proposals for change were incorporated and endorsed by the EFA Technical Design Panel.

6.4.2 Governors raised a number of issues which are deemed to be outside of the EFA remit, but could be funded through the Local Authority.

6.4.2.1 Use of Deptford Park

The playground available during the construction period will be very limited. Initial discussions with Planners had led the EFA to believe that Deptford Park would be completely unavailable. Planners have clarified that they would have no objection to the short-term use of the park for play whilst the school site is re-developed. This would cover the construction of the new building, the demolition of the current buildings and the subsequent landscaping of the site. The EFA has indicated that they will meet the capital costs of this provision, though the detail has yet to be finalised. Discussions are in hand to agree the area to be fenced off. The specification will include the type and amount of medium height fencing and the nature of a covering to protect the grass. Toilets have been requested by the school. This is not acceptable to Planners or Park managers. Ward Members have been kept informed of the proposal and will continue to be consulted on the proposals for the use of the Park. There will be a local consultation as part of the Planning Application process. The LA will be liable for any revenue costs such as additional playground supervision. The Headteacher has visited other schools with restricted outdoor play areas. Together with LA officers, she will develop a management plan, drawing on established good practise, including managing limited access to toilets, which the EFA will include in its Planning Application.

6.4.2.2 Landscaping and Playground. The design proposal presented to the final engagement meeting incorporates legacy equipment from the current playground. It also includes representations of other items such as seating for quiet reading which may not be funded by the EFA. The EFA has undertaken to provide a costed list of the items included in their scheme for review.

6.4.2.3 Opportunities for future development

Governors asked whether opportunities to “future proof” the building could be included, specifically deeper foundations which might offer the opportunity to build over areas of flat roof to provide additional rooms. The EFA has undertaken to provide an estimate of the cost for consideration by the LA.

6.4.2.4 Compliance with LBL insurance specification

The relevant specification has been supplied and is under review to ensure that it meets the specification of the LA’s insurer of school buildings. The building proposal does not include the provision of CCTV.

6.4.2.5 Road Safety Measures

Governors asked for information about the road safety measures which might be implemented. Planning Officers have confirmed that a number of road improvements are proposed in the area which will benefit Sir Francis Drake. A Table crossing is to be installed, as part of the Neptune Wharf development, in Grinstead Road adjacent to the junction with Scawen Road. Some of the railway arches will be opened up to improve pedestrian access through the development and avoid the bottleneck as Trundleys Road passes beneath the railway. Transport for London proposes to fund “Quietways” for cyclists in the area. The consultation is currently open and can be accessed via the following link.

<http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/inmyarea/regeneration/deptford/north-lewisham-links/Pages/Cycling-Quietway.aspx> . Planning officers will consider other necessary

measures in Scawen Road as part of the determination of the Planning Application. The LA has agreed to its liability for the cost of these improvements as a condition of the delivery of the scheme by the EFA.

6.4.2.6 It was established during the design process that the EFA specification does not include canopies outside Reception class rooms. Officers advise that these are essential to ensure that the Early Years curriculum can be delivered and are included in all Lewisham schemes funded through Basic Need funding. Officers recommend that the LA should underwrite the cost of canopies to the Reception classrooms within the funding recommendation set out at Paragraph 3.2.

6.4.2.7 Playground markings

Currently the Junior and Infant play areas are separated. Governors have requested that the LA should fund similar demarcation in the new playground. Officers advise that this is not necessary or appropriate.

6.4.2.8 Outside Toilets

Governors requested that an outdoor toilet block should be provided for use during play-time, especially for children playing at the far end of the playground. The EFA was not prepared to fund this but has amended the ground floor layout so that toilets can be accessed from the playground without entering the building. Officers advise that this is an appropriate solution. Other recent LA builds have included ground floor toilets which can be accessed from the playground. The addition of a toilet block would have taken up valuable playground space at a cost which would have had to be met by the LA.

6.4.2.9 Visitors' Entrance

The Design Review Panel recommended that the Design Team should establish whether the design of the visitor's entrance was compliant with Department for Education (DfE) requirements regarding the protection of playing fields. The Secretary of State (SoS) has a general presumption against the need to change the current pattern of school playing field provision by disposal or change of use. The site area at the corner of Scawen Street and Grinstead Road is currently classified as informal and social area under S77 and, therefore, approval to change its use to unfenced civic space would require SoS approval. The EFA has a class consent in relation to Section 77 for Priority School Building Programme (PSBP) schemes, and has confirmed that both the preferred option in the Feasibility Study for Sir Francis Drake and Galliford Try's current proposal as outlined to the Design Review Panel would be eligible for the PSBP class consent.

6.4.2.10 Timeline for construction, landscaping and highways improvements

Governors wish to obtain a realistic timetable from the EFA so that they can plan around the key events. Officers advise that this can only be confirmed once the planning application has been determined. However indicative timelines are being prepared and distributed to the school and the LA. Officers will continue to support the school through this process.

6.4.2.11 Engagement Process

The engagement process which is an integral part of the Priority School Building design programme, is extremely compressed, comprising 6 weekly meetings to arrive at the main elements of the design. The school and the local authority committed considerable resources to ensure that the final design was tailored as far as possible to meet the needs of the school within the constraints of the design brief. Both agreed that the timescale was not optimal and put particular strain on school and governor resources.

7. Proposed additional expenditure by Lewisham

- 7.1 The following elements of indicative expenditure are proposed up to a maximum of £200K:

Item	Indicative cost £
2x Reception Canopies	
Road Safety Measures (tbc)	
Strengthened foundations –part of building (tbc)	
Playground and other enhancements (tbc)	
TOTAL:	200K

8 Complaint

- 8.1 A complaint about the proposal to enlarge Sir Francis Drake was received 23 September. The complaint covered the following issues:
We found 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.

Complaints and objections about the initial consultation by parents[in February/March 2014] raised via emails to the Mayor and all responded to by Chris Threlfall. Chris Threlfall did not advise that there was a formal process for complaints and so it was inferred that it was his decision was his alone.

Local Evelyn Ward councillors and MP Joan Ruddock tried to help parents but Chris Threlfall was the one person who was dealing with this so effectively a stone wall. Public Notice was issued and 357 objections Mayor agreed to the proposal for Lewisham's first "Austerity" school to be built.

The DFE referred us to the Ombudsman who has told us there is a formal council process for complaints and to contact Barry Quirke.

- 8.2 The Council's complaints procedure can be viewed at the following link:
<http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/Complaints-and-feedback/Pages/complaints-procedure.aspx>
This complaint was dealt with as a Stage 1 complaint where a response is prepared by a service manager. A response was sent October 6th.
- 8.3 On October 16th, the complainant lodged a request for the complaint to be dealt with under Stage 2. A Head of Service or Executive Director must respond by November 12th.

9 Financial implications

- 9.1 In the period 2008/09 to 2016/17 the Government has made available £114.95m Basic need grant available. In addition the Council has secured other grants of £18.65m and identified £4.3m of Section 106 monies to support the programme. This makes the total resources available over the period £137.9m. Against these resources the value of works estimated to be necessary are £157.25m to September 2016: this leaves an estimated shortfall of £19.3m. In the period to September 2019

additional works of £55m are estimated currently which includes £50m to meet secondary places demand equivalent to two secondary schools.

9.2 Capital Financial Implications

- 9.2.1 The costs for the construction of Sir Francis Drake were intended to be met through the government's Priority Schools Building Programme. However, it is now clear that, as a condition of the scheme, the EFA will not pick up the additional costs resulting from planning permission requirements. These costs are likely to relate to highways requirements and have been estimated at £50k as set out within paragraph 7.1 above. The governing body has raised concerns about some elements of the design and facilities provided by the EFA as part of the build and omissions from the scope. The local authority has agreed to meet the cost of a limited number of these concerns, as set out in paragraph 7.1. The costs of these, along with planning permission requirements, are estimated to be in the region of £200k and these are allowed for in the overall assessment of costs for the places programme as described in paragraph 9.1 above.
- 9.2.2 Although the LA had hoped to secure a rebuilt and expanded school at no cost, the contribution likely to be made will be a small proportion of the costs and could not be otherwise achieved with the resources available currently to the Council. The construction of a new build, two form entry school would be between £4.5 and 6m depending upon design, site conditions, procurement and the need for demolition and/or decant. The Council will therefore secure a very significant asset in return for its investment of up to £200k.
- 9.2.3 The construction works will provide an additional 30 places in September 2016 rising to a total of 210 additional places over the next 7 years.

9.3 Revenue Financial Implications

- 9.3.1 The revenue costs of running the fully expanded accommodation will be funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant with no burden falling on the General Fund resources of the Council.

10 **Legal Implications**

- 10.1 The Human Rights Act 1998 safeguards the rights of children in the Borough to educational provision, which the Council is empowered to provide in accordance with its duties under domestic legislation.
- 10.2 Section 14 of the Education Act 1996 obliges each local authority to ensure that there are sufficient primary and secondary schools available for its area i.e. the London Borough of Lewisham, although there is no requirement that those places should be exclusively in the borough. The Authority is not itself obliged to provide all the schools required, but to secure that they are available.
- 10.3 In exercising its responsibilities under section 14 of the Education Act 1996 a local authority must do so with a view to securing diversity in the provision of schools and increasing opportunities for parental choice.
- 10.4 The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It 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.

- 10.5 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.
- 10.6 The 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.
- 10.7 The Equality and Human Rights Commission has recently issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled “Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code of Practice”. The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at:
<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/equality-act-codes-of-practice-and-technical-guidance/>
- 10.8 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:
1. The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
 2. Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
 3. Engagement and the equality duty
 4. Equality objectives and the equality duty
 5. Equality information and the equality duty
- 10.9 The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at:
<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/guidance-on-the-equality-duty/>
- 10.10 In deciding whether to agree the recommendations of this report, the Mayor must be satisfied that to do so is a reasonable exercise of his discretion on a consideration of all relevant matters and disregarding irrelevancies and having regard to all Guidance that he is statutorily required to consider.

11 Crime and Disorder Implications

- 11.1 There are no crime and disorder implications.

12 Equalities Implications

- 12.1 This report supports the delivery of the Council's Equalities programme by ensuring that all children whose parents /carers require a place in a Lewisham school will be able to access one. An Equalities Analysis Assessment has been undertaken and was attached as Appendix 8 in the report to the Mayor June 25th 2014.

13 Environmental Implications

- 13.1 The development aims to achieve BREEAM "Excellent" but, taking into account value for money considerations, is likely to achieve BREAAM "Very Good".

14 Risk assessment

- 14.1 There are significant reputational risks to the Council if it does not meet its statutory requirement to ensure sufficient primary school places are made available. If the EFA is unable to deliver this scheme the LA will need to fund a similar development placing more pressure on capital budgets.

15 Conclusion

- 15.1 This report and background papers demonstrate that there has been a thorough scrutiny of the EFA proposals for the re-development of Sir Francis Drake Primary as a 2 form of entry school. The building offered meets standards equivalent to buildings delivered through the LA's programme funded by Basic Need. The additional costs to the LA are judged by the LA to be reasonable and affordable. Governors should not incur higher running costs as a result of construction methods. In common with many other schools in Lewisham the school managers may need to review aspects of school management such as staggering playtimes. New practises can evolve as the school fills gradually from 2016.
- 15.2 The Mayor is therefore recommended to agree to the enlargement of Sir Francis Drake Primary School from 1 to 2 forms of entry with effect from September 2016.

Background Documents

Mayor & Cabinet June 25th 2014

<http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=139&MId=3282&Ver=4>

Mayor & Cabinet April 9th 2014

<http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s28377/Permanent%20Primary%20Places%20Holbeach%20John%20Ball%20Coopers%20Lane%20and%20Sir%20Francis%20Drake.pdf>

Children and Young People Select Committee January 2014

<http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s26896/06PrimaryAndSecondarySchoolPlacesPlanning29012014.pdf>

Mayor & Cabinet January 15th 2014

<http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s26528/Permanent%20Primary%20School%20places.pdf>

Guidance on school organisation changes

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/278422/School_Organisation_Guidance_2014_-_Annex_B.pdf

If there are any queries arising from this report, please contact
Margaret Brightman, Place Manager, ext 48034

i