

MAYOR AND CABINET		
Report Title	Strategy to deliver Primary Places	
Key Decision	Yes	Item No.
Ward	All	
Contributors	Executive Director CYP, Executive Director Regeneration, Executive Director Resources, Head of Law	
Class	Part 1	24th February 2010

1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report reviews immediate and longer term demand for primary places in Lewisham projected to 2019/20 against current provision and capacity to meet demand. The report considers the implications for the future strategic development of the primary mainstream and primary Special Educational Needs (SEN) school estate, and within this context, considers what the next steps should be to ensure the supply of sufficient primary places at the right time in the right Lewisham localities.
- 1.2 The report goes on to recommend amendments to decisions on the use of capital resources made by the Mayor at the Mayor and Cabinet meeting of 28 May 2008.

2 Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Mayor notes the description of current and projected demand for and supply of primary mainstream and SEN places, and its strategic implications.
- 2.2 That, in the light of feasibility work carried out subsequently, the Mayor agrees to revoke the following decisions made at the Mayor and Cabinet meeting of 28 May 2008, namely:
 - 2.2.1 an expansion of Our Lady & St Philip RC Primary School from 1.5 fe to 2 fe and of St Bartholomew's CE Primary School from 1.5 fe to 2 fe (subject to feasibility);
 - 2.2.2 the following schools to be held in reserve (subject to feasibility) for capital expenditure in relation to feasibility studies on Our Lady & St Philip RC Primary School and St Bartholomew's CE Primary School:
 - An expansion of Dalmain Primary School from 1.5 fe to 2 fe;
 - An expansion of Kilmore Primary School from 1.5 fe to 2 fe;

- 2.3 That the Mayor agrees that the balance of c.£1.5m of Council funding be used to contribute to the capital required to provide additional primary places, including specialist SEN places, for 2010-11 and 2011-12. This represents the difference between the £23.6m approved by the Mayor and the costs of the Gordonbrock and Brockley projects together with the reduction in LCVAP, Diocesan and governing body contributions resulting from approval of recommendation 2.2.1.
- 2.4 That the Mayor agrees that officers should subsequently bring recommendations for future consideration by the Mayor of any major expenditure of capital resources for the provision of primary mainstream and/or SEN places.

3 Policy Context

- 3.1 The Local Authority has a duty to ensure the provision of sufficient places for pupils of statutory age and, within financial constraints, accommodation that is both suitable and in good condition.
- 3.2 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* and, at the same time, contributing to the corporate priority of *ensuring efficiency, effectiveness and equity in the delivery of excellent services to meet the needs of the community*.

4 Background

The Primary Capital Programme and Lewisham's Primary Strategy for Change

- 4.1 At the Mayor and Cabinet meeting of 25 May 2008, the Mayor considered a report on the framework for Lewisham's *Primary Strategy for Change and Primary Capital Programme*. As outlined in that report, all Local Authorities were required to produce a *Primary Strategy for Change* (PSfC) in order to access the first tranche of funding (2009-11) of the government's 14 year *Primary Capital Programme* (PCP).
- 4.2 The Government had announced in 2005 its intention to renew up to half of the primary school estate in England to parallel the *Building Schools for the Future* (BSF) programme for secondary schools. The Government pledged an initial £1,150 million extra resources for this programme from 2008 to 2011, and committed to continue that level of investment for up to 15 years in total, subject to future public spending decisions. After the first pilot year (2008-09) all Local Authorities would be eligible for funding.
- 4.3 In October 2007 the Government gave the details of capital funding for the 2008-11 spending review period, including increased investment in 2008-11

for the PCP to £1,900 million, and from 2011-12 to 2023-24, £500 million a year, subject to public spending decisions.

- 4.4 The PCP's stated aims are to *support the delivery of the Children's plan by:*
- *creating primary schools equipped for 21st century learning, at the heart of the community, with a range of children's services in reach of every family;*
 - *delivering a strategic approach to capital investment - supporting national policy aims, delivering world class standards, access to joined-up services for children and families; and addressing local needs and priorities;*
 - *rebuilding, remodelling or refurbishing at least half of all primary schools, including rebuilding or taking out of use at least 5 per cent of school buildings in the worst physical condition (higher for the most deprived communities);*
 - *focusing resources on deprivation nationally and in every authority; and*
 - *reconfiguring the primary capital stock to account for demographic change.*
- 4.5 The PCP therefore requires a borough-wide strategy to improve the suitability and condition of schools, develop facilities that are more economic to run, and better enable the provision of a range of extended services. All primary schools are eligible, including VA foundation and Trust schools (funding for VA schools at the usual 90% rate) and special schools with primary-age children.
- 4.6 Funding allocation is by formula based on the number of primary pupils and deprivation, with a floor to protect smaller authorities. The expectation is that, for each 3 year tranche of funding, added impact will be made through Local Authorities contributing eligible capital from other government departments and local resources.
- 4.7 The national target is to impact on at least 50% of each Authority's estate, including the replacement of at least 5%. However, along with a number of other Authorities with similar profiles, in acknowledgement of Lewisham's high indices of social deprivation and poor building stock, a condition of our successful bid was the requirement that over the programme period we replace at least 15% of our existing estate most in need of renewal. For Lewisham this means 10/11 schools.
- 4.8 Over its 14 year period, the programme therefore aims to replace or refurbish an Authority's primary estate, rather than to provide for new places (Basic Needs). Indeed for many Authorities it was envisaged that this would involve a reduction in their primary estate in acknowledgement of reduced demand.
- 4.9 However, in its bid Lewisham was prudent in taking account of the pressure on places already evident through its then most recent projections (March 2008). It therefore made one of its criteria for PCP investment in the first tranche of funding *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 articulated 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. “

- 4.10 As a result, the recommendation on Tranche 1 (2009-11) investment to the Mayor at the Mayor and Cabinet meeting of 28 May 2008 reflected the prediction of the most urgent pressures being in PPPL 3 (Brockley, Lewisham, Telegraph Hill) and PPPL 1 (Sydenham/Forest Hill).
- 4.11 Following the PCP guidance, and bearing in mind the significant investment needs of our primary schools, for Tranche 1 officers also recommended a £12.5m increase from other resources to make available a total budget £23.6m, which more than doubled the PCP grant of £11.1m. This increase consisted of Basic Need Supported Capital Borrowing (£9.6m), Extended Services Grant (£0.7m), Schools’ Devolved Formula Capital grant (£0.5m), Diocesan 10% contribution (£0.5m) and LCVAP (£1.2m).
- 4.12 At the meeting of 28 May 2008 the Mayor:
- i) noted the revision of the projections in the Mayor and Cabinet report of 16 January 2008 on the need for primary places in each of the 6 planning localities approved by the Mayor;
 - ii) agreed the framework for the Primary Strategy for Change and its contents at Paragraph 5 of the report;
 - iii) agreed, as part of the Primary Strategy for Change, and subject to feasibility work, the proposals for expenditure of a first tranche of capital funding over the period 2009-11 up to a limit of £23.6 million (including up to £9.6 million of Basic Need Supported Capital) on the following schools:
 - a. A new build (or refurbishment) of Gordonbrock Primary School expanded from 2.5 fe to 3fe;
 - b. A new build of Brockley Primary School expanded from 1fe to 2fe;
 - c. An expansion of Our Lady & St Philip RC Primary School from 1.5 fe to 2 fe and of St Bartholomew’s CE Primary School from 1.5 fe to 2 fe;
 - d. The following schools to be held in reserve (subject to feasibility) for capital expenditure in relation to feasibility studies on Our Lady & St Philip RC Primary School and St Bartholomew’s CE Primary School:
 - i. An expansion of Dalmain Primary School from 1.5 fe to 2 fe;
 - ii. An expansion of Kilmorie Primary School from 1.5 fe to 2 fe;
 - iv) instructed officers to investigate the potential to realise further capital resource through disposal of elements of primary school sites, subject to this not jeopardising the potential for further expansion of pupil numbers;
 - v) delegated to the Executive Director for Children and Young People and to the Executive Director for Resources, in liaison with the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, the responsibility for finalising and submitting the Primary Strategy for Change to the DCSF by 16 June;
 - vi) noted the results of ongoing consultation with stakeholders.
- 4.13 The Mayor also agreed the recommendations made by the Children and Young People’s Select Committee that:
- vii)
 - (a) A thorough risk analysis of the potential sale of assets is carried out before any such action is taken;

- (b) Consider the Primary Strategy for Change and Primary Capital Programme in conjunction with the SEN review to ensure that, in line with the SEN inclusion strategy, consideration of the needs of SEN children is mainstreamed across the Primary Strategy for Change and Primary Capital Programme;
 - (c) Carefully monitor the primary places statistics across the length of the programme to ensure actual need matches projected need, and swiftly review the programme in light of that need;
 - (d) Carefully consider the potential difficulties of the proposal to expand two church schools in the Sydenham/Forest Hill locality;
 - (e) Consider the impact of the programme on the quality of teaching in those schools affected and ensure that clear plans are in place to ensure that high quality teachers are secured and integrated into existing school staff teams, to ensure that the focus on providing a high quality education is maintained when the number of children and teachers rises at a rapid rate.
- 4.14 In providing the framework for the Lewisham PSfC for approval by the Mayor, the report of 25 May 2008 updated projections in the Mayor and Cabinet report of 16 January 2008 on the need for primary places in each of the 6 PPPLs. As requested by the Mayor, planned housing developments which were not yet approved were included in the later report to give a more accurate prediction of the need for places in specific localities.
- 4.15 The 28 May 2008 report also used the updated (March 2008) GLA school roll projections for 2004-2017 which were not available at the time of the January report, and which indicated a significantly higher level of future need for places across Lewisham. The report then went on to set out the criteria for matching need to provision and applied those criteria to describe how capital provision might best be matched to need in each of the 6 Lewisham PPPLs over the period 2009-17.
- 4.16 A review of projected demand for primary places within the PSfC was a condition of PCP grant, together with a description of how that demand would be met. The data and analyses contained in the report of 25 May 2008 provided the basis of the PSfC submitted by the Authority in June 2008. This comprehensive strategy document sets out the Authority's approach to change, its long term plans and its decisions on the expenditure of a first tranche of capital grant within the context of the government's 14 year programme (See Appendix 1).
- 4.17 In November 2008 Lewisham received notification from the DCSF that its PSfC had been unconditionally approved, and its indicative allocation for 2009-10 and 2010-11 of £11.1 million confirmed.
- 4.18 As a result of feasibility work on proposed permanent increases in the other two primary schools approved for expansion, Our Lady and St.Philip Neri and St Bartholomew's, it is recommended that, as neither of these schemes provides value for money against the criteria set out in the Lewisham PSfC they should be discontinued. Estimated costs were c. £4.4m for the St Bartholomew's scheme and £5.3m for Our Lady and St.Philip Neri to produce half a form of entry in each case against indicative budgets of £2.5m. Against

all the criteria used to assess the 15 feasibility studies St. Bartholomew's ranked 9th and Our Lady & St Philip Neri ranked 12th.

5. Primary places in Lewisham: general trends in demand and supply implications 2010-2020

- 5.1 As set out in the 28 May 2008 Mayor and Cabinet report and in greater detail in Lewisham's June 2008 Primary Strategy for Change, demand for primary places in Lewisham has been growing significantly from 2008-09. The Reception cohort increased from its low point of 2,776 in 2005-06 to 3,123 in 2008-09 (just below the Borough PAL), and to 3302 in 2009-10 which is 5fe above PAL.
- 5.2 In all PPPLs, Reception places in mainstream schools have been full or nearly full since 2008-09, and pressure is set to continue over succeeding years. From 2008-09, therefore, the more important Lewisham statistics relate to surpluses of (and over-demand for) Reception places, rather than existing overall school surpluses which, where they exist, have already begun to diminish, and will continue rapidly to do so over the next five years.
- 5.3 Lewisham uses three trend line projections for its primary places planning for the whole Borough and for each PPPL: low, a "weighted average", and high, dependent on the percentage conversion rates between known birth rates and assumed Reception admissions, and, for longer projections, on population data.
- 5.4 The latest 2010 birth and GLA data indicate that, at different rates and with some fluctuations, demand will continue to rise above current levels at least until the end of the decade in all six Primary Places Planning Localities (PPPLs) Lewisham uses to plan its supply of places.
- 5.5 Although 2009-10 Reception numbers outstripped even the "high" prediction, applications received as of the end of January 2010 indicate that the "high" prediction for 2010-11 may have forecast overall demand with reasonable accuracy, but that demand per locality may differ from that predicted. The data indicate that the overall gap will widen from 5fe in 2009-10 to around 15fe in 2010-11. Although demand is forecast on the "high" prediction to increase slightly further in 2011-12 to 16.5fe, the gap would reduce to 15fe because of the additional 1.5fe to be delivered in September 2011 at Brockley and Gordonbrock through their new builds.
- 5.6 In 2012-13 the gap is forecast to expand to 600 places on the "weighted average" projection, which after taking account the additional 1.5fe provision in place by that time at Brockley and Gordonbrock, will mean an overall pressure of 18.5 fe (rising to 20.5fe for the "high" projection). After a reduction to 16.5fe in 2013/14, "weighted average" pressure is forecast then to plateau at between 18.5fe and 21fe until at least 2019-20, with the "high" prediction around 1fe higher.
- 5.7 After peaking in 2012-13, demand in most localities should decline and then flatten off, whilst remaining well above current levels. However, in PPPL5

(New Cross and Deptford) the rise from 2013-14 onwards will be very significant, and will not have peaked by 2019-20, reflecting anticipated housing developments. PPPL6 (Downham), which previously was forecast to have flat demand, should have a modest 2fe increase in demand in 2013-14, flattening to an additional 1fe demand for the remainder of the decade.

- 5.8 Given the predictions of rising continued demand for primary places for children with and without Special Educational Needs, the provision of permanent places is a more appropriate response than the incremental provision of “bulge” classes. However, the necessary capital is not currently available to convert any of these into permanent increases in schools’ published admissions limits from 2011-12 onwards, or to invest in other projects in order to help to meet the predicted surge in 2012-13 and the sustained demand for Reception places over the rest of the decade.
- 5.9 Whilst Lewisham received a first tranche of PCP funding of £11.1m for the spending period 2009-11, in the current economic climate, and given the imminence of a general election, there is no surety that the commitment of the current government to PCP funding over the timescale and at the level set out in this report in Paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3 will be sustained from 2011 onwards, or indeed whether the PCP will continue at all.
- 5.10 Lewisham has already committed £9.5m of “supported borrowing” to the first tranche of the PCP, and it is unlikely that it will be able to commit further significant capital which would be required to create additional permanent places.
- 5.11 In this context, it is very regrettable that in November 2009, Lewisham was refused extra funding by the government from its “safety valve” initiative
- 5.12 After intensive lobbying from local government, in July 2009 the government announced that up to £200m would be made available to Local Authorities experiencing unpredicted pressures on primary pupil places. The criteria limited eligibility at that time to those Authorities with more than 15% growth in Reception class numbers between 2008 and 2011, of which Lewisham is one. The funding was made available to be spent on the provision of permanent places, not “bulge” classes, with at least the Reception age group in any projects taking up the extra places created by September 2011.
- 5.13 The original bids for this funding (including Lewisham’s) were submitted to the DCSF in mid-August 2009. Despite the total available grant being subsequently raised to £300m, Lewisham’s bid was rejected in late November 2009 for two linked reasons. Firstly, in making its assessment of an Authority’s need for additional funding, the DCSF included surplus places in any year groups (Years Reception to 6) from September 2008 to September 2011, rather than restricting its calculations to Reception and Years 1 and 2. Lewisham loses out because it currently has a significant number of surplus places in its schools from Year 2 to Year 6, whereas our demand for 2008-09 and 2009-10, and projections to 2011 (and beyond) is mainly for Reception places.

- 5.14 The second factor relates to the presumed use of an Authority's existing capital resources to meet its statutory duty to provide sufficient primary places. In short, the DCSF thinks the Authority has received enough money in the 2008-11 spend period to meet its additional demand for Reception places from its Basic Need, New Deal for Schools and the Schools Access initiative funding. The Council disputes this. Against £15.75m presumed by the DCSF to be available to meet Lewisham's additional pressure on primary places, Lewisham has in fact spent or committed £17m through supported borrowing.
- 5.15 Committed spend includes a £9.6m contribution (supported borrowing) to our PCP for the rebuild of Gordonbrock and Brockley Primary Schools, which generate an extra 1.5 forms of entry. In addition, almost £2m is supporting the development of our Primary SEN Resource Bases. Lastly, £4.6m is committed to keeping our schools repaired and maintained, without which expenditure we would be in danger of closing existing schools.
- 5.16 The assumptions from the DCSF seem to be that:
- The LA should have already got rid of surplus places, which would have involved us in closing schools and would place us now in a far worse position to meet our pressures on primary places which are projected to continue into the next decade.
 - We should stop our current primary rebuild commitments and switch funding to schemes that would produce more primary places. This would mean halting the rebuilding of Brockley and Gordonbrock which are due to be delivered for September 2011, and leave us with even more repair bills and the threat of closure because of their dilapidation.
 - To meet our huge Reception demand we should reorganise our schools with surplus places in Key Stage 2 into classes with up to 3 or 4 age groups in any one class. As an example, this would mean that in a school with four KS2 classes each with 24 children (96 children and a surplus of 24 places), they might be organised into two classes of 32 Years 3-5 children, and one class of 32 Years 4-6 children. To have this age range in any one class is educationally challenging and would be rejected by parents and governing bodies alike.
- 5.17 Intensive lobbying has so far not resulted in any remediation of this inequitable treatment of Lewisham, and the LA must assume in its planning that it will not receive "Safety Valve" grant.
- 5.18 Officers will continue to plan, as now, on a locality basis, to deliver the required number of places for 2010-11 and succeeding years, cutting our cloth according to available resources. The immediate priorities are to:
- prioritise the delivery of temporary "bulge" accommodation for 2010-11 and 2011-12;
 - explore the potential for releasing some existing space in schools by increasing the number of mixed age classes;
 - if and when sufficient finance is available, deliver permanent increases in PAL on existing school sites for delivery from 2011-12, and, in order to do so, consider incremental approaches to building projects;

- investigate possible new school sites for delivery from 2011-12 onwards
 - negotiate other sites including co-locations for delivery from 2011-12 onwards as opportunity and finance permit, working with Council and non-Council partners.
- 5.19 Despite the potential downsides, the LA will explore the feasibility of undertaking even a limited number of projects to release space in schools by increasing the number of mixed age classes containing children from no more than 2 year groups if this does not compromise educational standards and can demonstrate value for money.

6. Primary places demand and supply issues: 2007- 08 to 2011-12

Pre-2008-09

- 6.1 Historically Lewisham has had surplus places in many of its mainstream schools. Lewisham's PSfC reports that:

“Our early 2008 analysis of GLA projections for Lewisham had indicated that in 2016 there would be an overall shortage in the Borough of only 74 places or 2%. Previous experience has been that GLA figures significantly overestimate demand in Lewisham. This suggested that, at most, action might be required to increase or reduce the number of places in particular planning localities to address variation in demand across the Borough, and to improve the suitability and the condition of the primary schools estate.”

- 6.2 As reported to the Mayor on 28 May 2008 and in the June 2008 *Primary Strategy for Change*, significant investment had been completed or committed before early 2008 to improve Lewisham's primary estate. Because surplus places were at that time predicted to continue at least until 2016, (itself an increase on earlier predictions), this investment was intended to improve the conditions, suitability and standards of our existing schools, not to increase capacity.
- 6.3 In terms of mainstream investment, the new, all-age St. Matthew Academy, which opened in 2007, therefore retained the 2 forms of entry of its predecessor primary school. Childeric and Ashmead Primary Schools also retained their 2 and 1 forms of entry respectively when they opened in brand new accommodation in 2008. Planning for the incorporation of Monson Primary School into Haberdashers' Aske's Hatcham College began in 2006, and the proposal could not have been achieved in 2008 if it had been proposed to increase the 2 forms of entry. Investment in the refurbishment of the primary section, begun in 2009 and to be completed in 2010, was a result of DCSF investment in the extension of the Academy, and would not have been available for other LA schemes. In the case of Tidemill's rebuild, planning began in 2006 as an integral part of the Giffin Street redevelopment, with a planning application early 2008.
- 6.4 In addition, in the particular context of the need to deliver required secondary places on a constrained site, when it opens in 2011 our all-age mainstream school, Prendergast-Vale College was planned to reduce to 1fe the current 2fe entry of its predecessor primary school Lewisham Bridge.

2008-09

- 6.5 As reported in the Mayor and Cabinet report of 28th May 2008, the 2008 release of GLA data bucked the previous trend by predicting a significant rise in primary places demand for the 2008-09 school year. The June 2008 PSfC stated:

“The latest GLA demographic projections, dated 11 March 2008, show a very different picture of significantly increasing places demand in Lewisham. They also indicate that these forecasts may be more accurate than previously, based on a comparison of the 2008 GLA prediction compared to the January 2008 PLASC figures, which shows the GLA prediction to be below the actual number on roll.”

- 6.6 Increases in birth and fertility rates were the biggest determinants of the change in forecasts. As expressed in the PSfC:

“This change in forecast is predicated on increase in the 2005/06 birth rate (now factored into the GLA forecasts) which has been rising since 2001/02, and an increase in natural fertility rates which ONS began to factor into projections during 2006/07 (the highest fertility rate since 1980). The new GLA forecasts assume that this increased birth rate will continue, and, as a result, the Lewisham projections for the age 4 cohort between 2010 and 2017 are approximately 300 places higher each year than the previous version. Depending upon pressure in surrounding boroughs and the private sector, it is possible that more than 80% of these extra learners would seek places in Lewisham schools. This would have a 240 place impact (8fe) greater than the previous GLA school roll projections. This suggests a very substantial increase in the requirement for pupil places in Lewisham which could only be met by permanent provision rather than, for example, demountable classrooms and temporary changes to school Pupil Admission Limits (PAL).”

- 6.7 The PSfC reported that pressure would be felt in each of our 6 Primary Places Planning Localities (PPPLs).

“There is an increase over time in the demand for places, but at different rates. If no action were taken on the supply side, this would result in a 13% overall surplus of places in 2007 moving to a 15% shortage by 2017. Whereas current surpluses across the 6 Lewisham places planning areas vary between 7% and 21%, by 2017 there are shortages predicted to vary between 9% and 23%.”

- 6.8 In the short-term reality, by December 2008 over 450 late applications had outstripped the GLA Borough forecasts of a surge, and almost filled all our surplus Reception places across the Borough.

- 6.9 To respond to the demands of two PPLs in particular, this required the emergency creation of 60 extra places for the January 2009 Reception intake at Brockley and Holbeach Primary Schools (30 each). This provision took up pressure on places particularly from PPPL 3 (Brockley/ Lewisham/Telegraph Hill, PPPL 2 (Lee Green) and, to some extent, PPPL1 (Sydenham/Forest Hill).

2009-10

- 6.10 Lewisham’s spring 2009 “weighted average” projection based on GLA data, forecast that 15 extra places would be needed above the Borough published admissions limit (PAL), with a “high” forecast of demand for 116 extra

Reception places. The Authority planned prudently for a safety margin of 49 places above the “high” projection, 165 additional places in total.

- 6.11 However, by the time that applications were closed at the end of January 2009, demand for Reception places in 5 of the 6 PPPLs already outstripped the high figure and, with late applications by October 2009 subsequently significantly overtook even the safety margin.
- 6.12 As a result, in order to take further late applications into account, a total additional 255 “bulge” places over the Borough’s 2009-10 PAL have been created for 2009-10. This equates to 8.5 forms of entry (fe), which has met the pressures of the January 2010 Reception intake with a margin for any further late admissions. In relation to actual numbers of places taken up for 2010 as of January 2010, the margin of 3.2% places currently available is well within the 5% recommended by the government to allow for mobility in schools and localities.
- 6.13 The 255 extra “bulge” places have been created at 10 schools:

PPPL		No. Places	FE	Schools
1	Sydenham/ Forest Hill	60	2	Dalmain (15), Kilmorie (15), Adamsrill* (30)
2	Lee Green	30	1	John Ball (30)
3	Lewisham/Brockley/ Telegraph Hill	90	3	Brockley (30), Holbeach (30), John Stainer (30)
4	Catford/Bellingham/ Grove Park	45	1.5	Sandhurst (15) Forster Park* (30)
5	Deptford/New Cross	30	1	Deptford Park* (30)
6	Downham	0	0	
TOTAL		255	8.5	* late supply

- 6.14 As of the end of January 2010, of the 90 (3fe) places supplied to meet late demand at Adamsrill, Forster Park and Deptford Pak, 52 (2fe) had been taken up, and 15 offers rejected (0.5fe).

2010-11

- 6.15 Using the same 2009-10 PAL baseline, Lewisham’s predicted 2010-11 “low” demand was for 116 places (4fe). Our “weighted average” projection was a demand for 361 extra places (12fe). Our “high” forecast demand was for 454 (15fe), almost double the number of extra places delivered in 2009-10.
- 6.16 As of the end of January 2010 cut-off date, 3699 First Preference applications had been received on time for the 3156 Reception places available. This compares with 3446 applications received by this date last year, a difference of 543. Late in-borough applications in 2009-10 numbered 420. If late applications are factored in for 2010-11 at the same level, and an expected applications to acceptances “conversion” rate of 88% applied, this should result in an additional Borough-wide demand of 15-16fe, which is in line with the “high” prediction. If the uneven demand across localities is taken into account this could rise to 17 fe, as illustrated in the table below.

6.17 The extra demand per locality is as follows:

PPPL		2010-11 fe demand above Locality PAL
1	Sydenham/ Forest Hill	6.5
2	Lee Green	5.5
3	Lewisham/Brockley/ Telegraph Hill	2
4	Catford/Bellingham/ Grove Park	3
5	Deptford/New Cross	1
6	Downham	-1
TOTAL		17*

* Taking into account aggregated demand per locality.

- 6.18 Negotiations are therefore underway with governing bodies for the required number of additional Reception classes in each PPPL and will be finalised by the end of February 2010.
- 6.19 Permanently increasing a school's capacity by one form of entry entails creating 7 additional classrooms and also enhancing and extending the school's infrastructure and general facilities. There is a minimum timescale of two years to deliver such refurbishment schemes. It was therefore never envisaged that, should the required capital be available, refurbishments or, indeed new builds could be delivered before 2011-12. As a consequence any increases for 2010-11 will continue, as per previous years, to be "bulge" classes, that is one-off increases in the Reception intakes.
- 6.20 Meeting demand through the provision of "bulge" classes becomes more difficult over time. In all but one of the ten schools which have contributed to meeting additional demand in 2008-09 and 2009-10 (two of them, Holbeach and Brockley, in each of these years) internal remodelling and reorganisation of the existing accommodation has enabled the increases in Reception places. This option becomes increasingly difficult as the majority of these schools are not amenable to further remodelling of this kind, and many of the remaining 55 mainstream Primaries do not offer the same option.
- 6.21 It is likely, therefore, that for 2010-11, in the context of severe constraints on available capital, additional demand will be met mainly through the release of classrooms through more mixed age teaching in Key Stage 2 where numbers allow, as well as the provision of demountable classrooms. Whilst these are of a high standard, and have a good lifespan, their siting will usually decrease the amount of playground space available to a school in the context of increased pupil numbers. Many Lewisham primary schools do not have outside space which meets minimum recommendations for inner-city schools. Further curtailment of play space is therefore less than ideal.

2011-12

- 6.22 Using the same 2009-10 PAL baseline, Lewisham’s predicted 2011-12 “weighted average” projection is a demand for 401 extra places (13.5fe). Our “high” forecast demand is for 494 places (16.5fe).
- 6.23 These projections are as follows per locality:

PPPL		Low		Weighted Average		High	
		No.	FE	No.	FE	No.	FE
1	Sydenham/ Forest Hill	67	2	105	3.5	125	4
2	Lee Green	27	1	66	2	76	2.5
3	Lewisham/Brockley/ Telegraph Hill	54	2	110	3.5	134	4.5
4	Catford/Bellingham/ Grove Park	41	1.5	87	3	100	3.5
5	Deptford/New Cross	10	0.5	52	1.5	67	2
6	Downham	-42	0	-19	0	-8	0
TOTAL		157	7*	401	13.5	494	16.5

* Taking into account aggregated demand per locality.

- 6.24 For September 2011 the PCP is scheduled to deliver an additional 45 permanent Reception places (1.5 fe) above 2009-10 PAL from the Brockley and Gordonbrock projects, both in PPPL3. The rise in Brockley School’s PAL from 1fe to 2fe, and Gordonbrock’s PAL from 2.5fe to 3fe means that the overall Borough-wide PAL will be 3199. This reduces the “weighted average” forecast to 12fe and the “high” forecast to 15fe.
- 6.25 Since the approval of the PCP and PSfC by the Mayor on 28 May 2008, officers have undertaken feasibility work for permanent increases in their PAL in 13 primary schools (including Dalmain and Kilmorie, the two reserves on the PCP) to determine whether their permanent expansion for 2011-12 and beyond can provide value for money. In addition, feasibility work at Our Lady & St.Philip Neri and at St Bartholomew’s was carried out as a condition of their approval as PCP funded schools.

6.26 Feasibility work undertaken for permanent increases in PAL.

PPPL		No. Places	FE Increase	Schools
1	Sydenham/ Forest Hill	180 - 210	5 – 7	Dalmain (15-45), Kelvin Grove (30), Kilmorie (15-45), Adamsrill (30), Christchurch (30), <i>OL&SPN (15)*</i> , <i>St Bartholomews (15)*</i>
2	Lee Green	30	1	Lee Manor (30)
3	Lewisham/Brockley/ Telegraph Hill	60	2	Edmund Waller (30), Holbeach (30)
4	Catford/Bellingham/ Grove Park	75	2.5	Coopers Lane (30), Forster Park* (30), Sandhurst I & J (15)
5	Deptford/New Cross	60	2	Deptford Park (30), Kender (30)
TOTAL	Downham	375-435	12.5 -14.5	* Proposed refurbishments through the PCP

6.27 The feasibility studies on the 15 schools were analysed and ranked. All were assessed to have solutions, some more complex and difficult than others, but all, at high cost. At the present time none of these schemes is affordable, and officers will look to other solutions to meet demand over the next three years as outlined in Paragraph 5.18 above.

7. SEN Primary places in Lewisham: demand and supply

SEN demand

- 7.1 The Mayor and Cabinet report of 3rd October 2007, *Strengthening Specialist Provision for Children with Special Educational Needs*, which pre-dated the forecasts of significant pressures on overall demand for primary places, identified that the number of primary children with high level needs in the Borough would increase by 37 children from 316 in 2006/7 to 353 by 2015. This was a projection which took into account that, in accordance with Lewisham local authority policy, all new statements issued would be for children with higher level needs. This policy has been in place for approximately five years.
- 7.2 The Mayor and Cabinet report of 28 May 2008 *Primary Strategy for Change and Primary Capital Programme* focussed on overall demand for primary places, and the supply of places in mainstream primary schools. However, a proportion of increased demand is necessarily for places for children with SEN. The SEN figures are further increased as a result of a rise in prevalence of ASD diagnosis within the population, as outlined in Paragraph 7.7 below.
- 7.3 DCSF data from 2008 identified that 3% of all Lewisham students had statements of Special Educational Needs, down from 3.2% in 2006. By the end of the academic year 2008/09 the actual number of children between the ages of 4 and 10 with a statement of SEN totalled 536, some 85 children

more than had been estimated for that academic year¹ by the 2007 report *Strengthening Specialist Provision for Children with Special Educational Needs*.

7.4 More recent reviews of demand incorporate information from Health colleagues. This data is in the process of further updating. The latest available information indicates that by 2010-11 there could be 614 children with statements of SEN rather than the 387 estimated in 2007. As indicated in the table below, by 2015/16 this is predicted to increase to 826 4–10 year olds, compared with the previous estimate of 353 3–11 year olds.

7.5 Primary aged children with statements of SEN 2008-09 to 2019-20 (2008/9 are actual figures as at 29 May 2009).

	2008/9	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20
ASD	237	268	297	324	355	386	418	448	458	461	463	463
BESD	45	40	42	43	45	47	48	50	51	51	51	51
HI	15	20	21	22	22	23	24	25	25	26	26	26
MLD	38	40	42	43	45	47	48	50	51	51	51	51
MSI	7	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3
PD	22	20	21	22	22	23	24	25	25	26	26	26
PMLD	13	20	21	22	22	23	24	25	25	26	26	26
SLCN	100	101	104	108	112	116	121	124	127	128	129	129
SLD	29	40	42	43	45	47	48	50	51	51	51	51
SPLD	23	20	21	22	22	23	24	25	25	26	26	26
VI	7	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3
TOTALS	536	574	614	651	695	740	785	826	844	851	855	855

ASD demand

7.6 A growing proportion of the demand for SEN primary places is due to the higher rate of Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) diagnosis. Current information from Public Health in Lewisham indicates that the rate of ASD diagnosis in under 5s is 1.8% of that population compared with the 2007 SEN review estimates of 1.2%.

7.7 This increased Under 5s ASD pressure is having a subsequent impact on Reception demand. The total number of primary age children with ASD rose from an estimated 149 in the 2007 report to an actual figure of 237 by June 2009. This represents a rise from 33% of the total number of 3–11 year olds with statements to 44% of 4–10 year olds with statements.

SEN supply

7.8 The 2007 SEN report aimed to deliver 114 specialist places for this primary age group via Resource Bases in mainstream primary schools. This would have therefore catered for 32% of the report's projected higher level needs SEN population with a statement. 181 pupils or 51% were to be educated in special schools. A total of 83% of pupils with statements would therefore be educated within specialist provision, with the remaining 17% of this group educated in a mainstream setting.

¹ Page 33, *Strengthening Specialist Provision for Children with Special Educational Needs*, 3rd October 2007

7.9 Three resource bases in mainstream primary schools, at Coopers Lane, Kilmorie and Rushey Green, had already opened by 2007. Based on the figures in the 2007 report it was planned to open resource bases at:

- Perrymount – 16 places for Complex Physical and Medical Needs
- Tidemill – 16 places for SLCN
- John Ball – 16 places for children with ASD
- Forster Park – 16 places for children with SLCN

7.10 Perrymount and Tidemill have subsequently opened resource bases as planned. However specialist facilities are no longer planned to be delivered at John Ball, Holbeach and Forster Park. Instead an ASD resource base currently in development at Athelney Primary School is scheduled to open in September 2010. An alternative SLCN resource base and a second alternative ASD resource base are currently in the process of being identified. These additions would bring the programme up to the supply level identified in 2007.

7.11 The configuration of resources bases currently available or under negotiation is set out below:

School	No. of Places	Specialism
Coopers Lane	12	Hearing Impairment
Rushey Green	12	Hearing impairment oral/aural
Perrymount	16	Complex Physical & Medical Needs
Tidemill	16	Speech, Language & Communication Needs
Kilmorie	10	Learning Difficulty & Disability
Athelney	16	Autism Spectrum Disorder
Another Primary	16	Autism Spectrum Disorder
Another Primary	16	Speech, Language & Communication Needs
TOTAL	114	

7.12 As shown in the table at Paragraph 7.6 above, the forecast of 826 primary age children with a statement by 2015-16 is swollen by a substantial rise in the rate of incidence of ASD to 1.8% of the primary age population. This is 473 children more than in the original 2007 report. Specialist provision delivered at the 2007 level will accommodate 35% of the projected number of primary aged children with a statement of SEN. To deliver to the 83% level of specialist places, the programme would need to develop 685 specialist places. This is 390 more places than indicated in the 2007 report.

7.13 If this additional need were to be provided through Resource Bases, that would equate to up to 24 more primary SEN resource bases if each base were to support 16 children. In total 32 SEN resource bases would be

required at the primary level, 29 of which would be developed via the Strengthening SEN programme.

- 7.14 If this strategy were taken forward in full, the capital costs of these resource bases would be significant if pursued as independent projects. Revenue resourcing would need to be met from the Schools Dedicated Support Grant.
- 7.15 Officers will review the feasibility work already undertaken on the possible siting of additional Resource Bases, and will evaluate how best to support the increased demand for SEN primary places.

Special Schools

- 7.16 In 2007 it was proposed that once sufficient resource bases had been developed to address demand, the primary provision at Brent Knoll would be phased out and the school would be redeveloped as a secondary and 16+ provision. However short term responses to demand have meant that primary provision at the school has expanded from necessity. There are currently 55 primary children within Brent Knoll. This includes 8 children who were accommodated through an increase in capacity created in September 2009. It is planned that capacity for a further 10 places will be developed by Easter 2010.
- 7.17 Special schools with primary age pupils have been in receipt of considerable, recent capital investment, or have planned development proposed as part of the 2007 Lewisham Special Schools review. This comprises state-of-the art SLD provision at Watergate School, completed in 2004, a brand new SLD school at Greenvale completed in 2009 using Grouped Schools PFI funding, and the refurbishment of New Woodlands EBD School in 2009 through Lewisham and BSF funding. A new all-age ASD school is currently being planned and delivered through BSF due for completion in 2012-13. The new ASD school will provide for 120 pupils with a statement identifying ASD as their most significant need. The intention is to provide 54 primary places, 56 secondary places and 10 post-16 places.
- 7.18 No further capital investment in increasing provision is planned. In 2007 it was recognized that there was no provision in the capital programme for the £1.9m which had been identified as required. However since that date £1.9m has been secured from the Lewisham Modernisation allocation for this programme of work. The capital costs for the development of the primary phase of the new ASD school are funded through the BSF programme as part of the whole school's development.

8. Financial Implications

- 8.1 The total funding envelope for the Primary capital Programme was agreed by the Mayor on 28 May 2009. The funding assumed that the programme for the period 2008 – 11 would provide for the rebuilding of two schools and the refurbishment of two others which were both voluntary aided. The total funding envelope agreed was £23.6m.

- 8.2 This report recommends that the refurbishment of the two voluntary aided schools should not progress on value for money grounds. As a consequence the Primary Capital Programme can make claim neither to the funds of the Locally Coordinated Voluntary Aided Programme (LCVAP) nor the expected contributions from the dioceses and the two governing bodies. The consequence is that the funding envelope available is reduced. The impact on the funding envelope is set out below.

	Original £m	Revised £m
PCP Grant	11.1	11.10
Extended Services Grant	0.7	0.70
Schools DFC	0.5	0.20
Diocesan contribution 10%	0.5	0.00
LCVAP	1.2	0.00
Basic Need Supported Capital	9.6	9.60
Total	23.6	21.60

- 8.3 The Mayor has agreed commitments against the available funding in respect of Gordonbrock and Brockley primary schools these total £20.1m. This leaves an uncommitted sum within the PCP funding envelope of £1.5m.
- 8.4 During the period 2008–11 the Government has made available a sum of £6.5m capital allocation for modernisation purposes. This has been allocated to delivery of primary resource bases and planned renewals within the primary school estate to avoid schools closures.
- 8.5 The balance of the modernisation resources are committed to planned maintenance and plant renewal of the schools' estate to avoid school closures. The type of works being undertaken are boiler replacements, window replacement projects, electrical rewiring projects, roof replacements and school perimeter renewals (walls and fences). The delivery of the planned programme of works will be challenging to complete within the resources available.
- 8.6 In 2009/10 financial year the capital costs of the bulge reception classes has been met from resources within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). The DSG maintains a budget provision for unplanned minor works in schools and it has proved possible to meet the costs from this budget provision for the current financial year. If the PCP funding envelope proved insufficient for 2010/11 bulge reception class needs then it would be possible to review the availability of funds allocated for school maintenance purposes within the DSG.
- 8.7 The provision of the additional classes will require project management support. The resources available within the Estates management Unit and the PCP programme management team have been reviewed and the work can be accommodated with some adjustment within the estates team to deal with this.
- 8.8 The PCP funding envelope was dependant upon the use of supported capital. The original decision by the Mayor indicated that the revenue cost falling upon the Council to undertake this borrowing was £630k. The

adjustments to the funding envelope in paragraph 8.2 above do not impact on the amount of supported borrowing required. The change in interest rates will however decrease the impact on the revenue budget of the Council.

- 8.9 The establishment of bulge reception classes has revenue consequences for the DSG. When each class is established the pupils taking the places are not in the census used by the Government to fund the Lewisham DSG until the following year. For each additional and temporary class there is a provision within the DSG to make an additional payment to the school in addition to its annual delegated budget allocation. The amounts allocated in 2009/10 total £456k and have been met from provisions made within the DSG.
- 8.10 In 2010/11 the equivalent cost of the additional 361 places is estimated at £654k. In setting the budget for the DSG in 2010/11 this estimated requirement will be taken into account. No costs will fall upon the General Fund in this respect.
- 8.11 In terms of the demands for 2011/12 and beyond there are no clear indications from central government as to the level of capital resources that will be made available to support this pressure. The current economic climate would suggest that the capital allocations provided in 2008–11 are unlikely to be matched in the next three year funding period. Once government intentions are more clear, most likely in the latter part of 2010 the funding of further temporary and, if possible, permanent classes will need to be considered.

9 Legal Implications

- 9.1 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.
- 9.2 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 area. The Authority is not itself obliged to provide all the schools required, but to secure that they are available.
- 9.3 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.

The Education and Inspections Act 2006 places requirements on Authorities to make their significant strategic decisions concerning the number and variety of school places in their localities against two overriding criteria:

- to secure schools likely to maximise student potential and achievement;
- to secure diversity and choice in the range of school places on offer.

Section 19 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 provides that where a local authority or the governing body of a maintained school proposes to make a prescribed alteration to a maintained school and it is permitted to make that alteration, it must publish proposals.

- 9.4 The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 provides that proposed enlargements of school premises which would increase the capacity of the school by more than 30 pupils and by 25% or 200 pupils (whichever is the lesser), or where there is a proposed increase in the number of pupils in any relevant age group by 27 or more, are prescribed alterations which means that statutory proposals have to be published, and there must be a period of four weeks for representations before a decision is made. This does not apply to temporary enlargements where it is anticipated that the enlargement will be in place for less than 3 years, or a rise in the number anticipated to last only one year.
- 9.5 The Council, before making any decision regarding the expansion of a school, must ensure that capital funding is in place, interested parties have been consulted, the statutory notice is published and there has been a four week period for representation.
- 9.6 Section 315 Education Act 2006 requires local authorities to keep their arrangements for special educational needs provision under review. In making decisions about SEN provision, the Council will need to comply with a number of statutory duties such as the need to have regard to the general principle set out in Section 9 Education and Inspections Act 2006 that children are educated in accordance with their parents' wishes so far as that is compatible with the provision of efficient education and the avoidance of unreasonable public expenditure. The Council will also have to have regard to its duties under the Disability Discrimination Act 1995.
- 9.7 However, this report requests officers to revert to the Mayor and Cabinet with a further report following feasibility work on proposals for capital expenditure on additional primary and/or SEN provision Full legal implications associated with those proposals will be set out in that further report.

10 Crime and Disorder Implications

- 10.1 There are no crime and disorder implications.

11 Equalities Implications

- 11.1 In addition to the implications for children without SEN, the report provides an update on the strategy to improve access to specialist provision for vulnerable groups, including primary age children with autism who currently have less access to appropriate local educational provision.

12 Environmental Implications

- 12.1 The impact on school environments of the solutions to providing additional primary places will be dictated by finance.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Appendix 1	Lewisham's <i>Primary Strategy for Change 2008-17</i> June 2008
Appendix 2	Mayor and Cabinet report on the framework for Lewisham's <i>Primary Strategy for Change and Primary Capital Programme</i> 28 May 2008
Appendix 3	Mayor and Cabinet report <i>Strengthening Specialist Provision for Children with Special Educational Needs</i> 3 rd Part 1 October 2007

If there are any queries on this report, please contact Chris Threlfall on extension 49971.