

MAYOR AND CABINET			
Report Title	Measures to increase the supply of permanent primary school places: Report on the consultations on proposals to enlarge Rushey Green Primary School and John Stainer Primary School		
Key Decision	Yes	Item No.	
Ward	Catford South, Telegraph Hill		
Contributors	Executive Director for Children and Young People, Executive Director Regeneration & Resources, Head of Law		
Class	Part 1	Date:	December 5 2012

1. Summary

This report sets out the demand for primary places in the Catford, Bellingham & Grove Park, and Brockley, Lewisham & Telegraph Hill Primary Place Planning Localities and the outcomes of the consultations on proposals to enlarge Rushey Green Primary School and John Stainer Primary School as part of the measures to meet this demand

2. Purpose

The report requests the Mayor's permission to publish statutory notices on the proposal to enlarge Rushey Green Primary School from 2 to 3 forms of entry and to enlarge John Stainer Primary School from 1 to 2 forms of entry both with effect from September 2014.

3. Recommendations

That the Mayor agrees to the publication of statutory notices to increase permanently the supply of primary school places from September 2014:

- 3.1. to enlarge Rushey Green Primary School from 2 to 3 forms of entry with effect from September 2014.
- 3.2. to enlarge John Stainer Primary School from 1 to 2 forms of entry with effect from September 2014.

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 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 2011 – 2014 PCP will continue to be governed by the following criteria:
- 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.

School Organisation Requirements

4.7 Proposals to establish additional provision on a permanent basis must comply with the provisions set out in *The Education and Inspections Act 2006 (EIA 2006)* and *The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools)(England) Regulations 2007*. These set out the statutory process for making changes to a school, and statutory guidance on making changes to a maintained school indicates 5 stages to making a prescribed alteration to a maintained school. These are:

- 1) Consultation
- 2) Publication of a Statutory Notice
- 3) Representation period
- 4) Decision making
- 5) Implementation

4.8 There are statutory timescales for stages 2, 3 and 4. Stages 1 and 5 are for local determination.

5. Background

5.1 School expansion

5.1.1 The Mayor and Cabinet have received regular reports detailing the pressure on primary school places and the measures taken to increase supply. The following table summarises the additional places that have been opened since 2008:

Year	Permanent Places opened	Temporary Places opened
2008/09		60 (2FE)
2009/10		255 (8.5FE)
2010/11		555 (18.5 FE)
2011/12		564 (19 FE)
2012/13	180 (6FE)	564 (19FE)

5.1.2 The majority of places have been added as temporary increases (“bulge” classes). The allocation of £12.7m to meet Basic Need in 2011/12 has meant that the authority has been able to launch a programme to increase the supply of places on a permanent basis,

using existing council-owned buildings, developing existing school sites and by taking the opportunity to remove half forms of entry

5.1.3 Projections are reviewed at least annually as the information on live births, applications to schools and the uptake of places across each year becomes available.

5.1.4 The most recent update (August 2012) indicates that the demand for places will remain high and measures continue to be required to increase the supply of places through a mixture of permanent and temporary enlargements tailored to meet the needs of each area. Figures are set out in the following table.

	Reception Places	Reception Demand	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6
2012/13	3332	3906	3603	3531	3241	2988	2886	2736
2013/14	3512	3757	3907	3585	3492	3194	2961	2862
2014/15	3512	3989	3758	3888	3545	3441	3166	2937
2015/16	3512	3994	3990	3740	3844	3494	3410	3139
2016/17	3512	4083	3995	3970	3698	3789	3462	3382

*shading denotes demand in excess of supply of permanent places

5.2 Further Additional Requirement – Borough Wide

	Additional Requirement
2013/14	245 (8.5 forms of entry)
2014/15	477 (16 forms of entry)
2015/16	482 (16 forms of entry)
2016/17	571 (19 forms of entry)

5.2.1 The following table sets out the schools which have opened additional temporary classes.

School	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Primary Place Planning Locality 1 Forest Hill & Sydenham					
Adamsrill		√	√	√	√
Christ Church			√		
Dalmain		√	√	√	Expanded
Eliot Bank					√
Fairlawn			√		
Haseltine					√
Horniman				√	
Kelvin Grove			√	√	Expanded
Kilmorie		√	√	√	Expanded
Perrymount			√		
Rathfern				√	√
St Bartholomew's					√
St Will. of York				√	

Primary Place Planning Locality 2 Lee Green					
Brindishe Lee			√		
John Ball		√		√	
Lee Manor			√		
Primary Place Planning Locality 3 Brockley, Lewisham & Telegraph Hill					
Ashmead			√		√
Beecroft Garden	√				Expanded
Edmund Waller			√		
Gordonbrock				√	Expanded
Holbeach	√	√			
John Stainer		√			√
Lucas Vale				√	
Myatt Garden				√	
St Stephens CE					√
Turnham				√	√
Primary Place Planning Locality 4 Catford, Bellingham & Grove Park					
Athelney			√	√	
Baring			√		
Coopers Lane				√	√
Elfrida					√
Forster Park		√	√		√
Rushey Green			√	√	√
Sandhurst		√	√	√	Expanded
Torridon			√		
Primary Place Planning Locality 5 Deptford and New Cross					
Deptford Prk		√	√		
Grinling Gibbons				√	√
Kender			√	√	Expanded
St Josephs				√	√
Primary Place Planning Locality 6 Downham					
Downderry					√
Good Shepherd				√	
Launcelot			√		
Haberdashers Aske's Knights Temple Grove					Expanded
Rangefield				√	

6. Rushey Green Primary School : Proposal to enlarge Rushey Green Primary School from 2 to 3 forms of entry from 2014

6.1 Additional Requirement – Catford, Bellingham & Grove Park

6.1.1 Primary Place Planning Locality 4 (Catford, Bellingham and Grove Park) shows a continuing increase in the numbers of young children in the population.

Births September 1 st 2000 to August 31 st 2001	592
Births September 1 st 2008 to August 31 st 2009	723
Births September 1 st 2009 to August 31 st 2010	775
Increase 2000/01 to 2009/10	183 (31%)
Increase 2008/09 to 2009/10	52 (7%)

- 6.1.2 It is anticipated that this will translate into the following demand for places in the area:

Reception Year	Permanent Places	Projection	Additional Requirement
2012/13	570	743	173 (8FE)
2013/14	570	677	107 (3.5FE)
2014/15	570	725	155 (5.5FE)
2015/16	570	726	156 (5.5FE)
2016/17	570	739	169 (6FE)

- 6.1.3 In the context of this demand, at the meeting of Mayor & Cabinet held July 11th 2012 the Mayor agreed that there should be a consultation on a proposal to enlarge Rushey Green Primary School from 2 to 3 forms of entry with effect from 2014.

6.2 Rushey Green Primary School

- 6.2.1 Rushey Green Primary School opened in its re-built school in 2009. The school is in a conservation area and the building was designed to reflect this.
- 6.2.2 As a result of exceptional demand for places in the area, the Governing Body agreed that the school should open additional classes in 2010 and 2011.
- 6.2.3 335 applications were received for places at the school in 2012. Initial allocations of places for 2012 meant that the school had a waiting list of over 30 and the “reach” of the school was significantly reduced from 413 to 316 metres. Out of 60 places, 29 were allocated to siblings. After consideration of this demand, the governing body agreed that a further 30 places could be offered in 2012. It requested that earlier work to assess whether the school could be enlarged to 3 forms of entry should be presented to the Mayor and permission sought to commence consultation with the school community.
- 6.2.4 The architects who designed the school have been engaged to work with the Local Authority to develop a design which is consistent with the current building and which can be delivered through modular construction.

6.3 Rushey Green Primary School Consultation Activities

- 6.3.1 At the request of the school, an initial consultation with stakeholders was held on 20th June 2012. In the course of the day, three consultation opportunities (9.00, 3.30 and 6.30) were offered which were open to parents and neighbours. The information leaflet is included at Appendix 1. The events were well attended. Approximately 35 parents and 5 local residents attended across the three events. Although some parents would prefer that the school remained as 2 forms of entry, many others agreed that given the changing population

of the area the school should be enlarged. Neighbours without children at the school were concerned about the impact of more children with more being brought by car. This was reported to the Mayor on July 11th when seeking permission to undertake further consultation.

6.3.2 Following the Mayor's agreement, a consultation was held over a six week period between September 17th and October 26th. A further consultation leaflet (attached at Appendix Two) was drafted and circulated at the beginning of the Autumn term. Consultation events for parents, staff and pupils were held on September 19th.

6.3.3 Parents' Meeting

The meeting for parents was well attended. Many parents, including those whose children had been admitted through the opening of a bulge class accepted that the pressure for school places in the area meant that the school should be considered for expansion. A significant number of parents re-iterated their concerns about the impact on the school if it were enlarged and felt that they did not have either sufficient information or sufficient time to make a considered contribution to the consultation. They felt that the governing body should have offered a separate meeting to discuss the proposal. Arising from this a subsequent meeting was hosted by the school. Five parents attended along with 4 governors 2 assistant heads and the headteacher.

6.3.4 A total of 17 written responses were received from parents and are attached as Appendix Three. Seven supported the proposal, eight were against, one parent was unsure and one parent did not state a preference but raised concerns about being able to access the school since she has a disability.

6.3.4 The following table summarises the issues raised by parents.

Issue	Response
This is an appropriate response from the local authority in the context of the demand for places	Projections and in-year demand for places continue to indicate a need for places in the area. Rushey Green is a popular and successful school and its enlargement will meet local demand.
Will the places serve the neighbourhood?	Places will be allocated in accordance with the Admissions Code. Siblings of children already in the school are allocated a place and in some cases families may have moved from the area since the first child entered the school. Distance from school is the main criterion for entry. The information published annually in the Admissions booklet shows that the distance from school has reduced year on year. In the context of an

	increasing population this indicates that the additional places will serve the neighbourhood.
Resources: concern that there will be sufficient funding as the school becomes larger	Schools receive revenue funding for each pupil admitted, so additional funding will come to Rushey Green as the school enlarges.
Impact on the life of the school: concerns that the school will become more impersonal as it grows in size, with a possible impact on assemblies, managing school performances and school games teams.	There are many examples of successful three form entry schools which manage to ensure that each pupil is recognised and treated as an individual and, to this end, that the school is organised within smaller units as well as a whole. The governing body has started to work on structures and practises to suit the school as it grows
Impact on school standards.	The local authority monitoring of school standards shows that the school has continued to develop and improve over the last 3 years, during the period when it has admitted an additional class each year. It is confident that, with certainty about the future size of the school, this improvement will be sustained.
Concern about apparent unco-ordinated development on the school site	If the enlargement of the school is agreed, the modular classrooms installed in 2010 and 2012 will be removed when the new wing is completed. The area will be landscaped to provide a coherent appearance to the school site.
Loss of playground space and why part of the site was sold off for development.	The school site remains one of the larger sites in Lewisham. The proceeds of the sale contributed to the cost of the new buildings enjoyed by the school.
The Council should build a new school,	Places are needed to serve the locality and there are no vacant sites in the area suitable for a new primary school.
Quality of consultation	The consultation has been conducted fully in accordance with DfE requirements. They recommend that a consultation should be at least 4 weeks and should offer opportunities for the views of all those involved in the life of the school to be heard. Parents, staff, pupils and the

	governing body have all been involved, as have local residents (since the school is in a conservation area.) If the school is enlarged and a building scheme goes ahead there will be further consultation through the Planning application process
Involvement in the development of plans	The plans have been developed through a Design Working Group which is chaired by the Chair of the governing body. The group includes governors who are parents at the school. Designs have been shared with parents and the local community and their comments considered by the Design Working Group.

6.3.5 Pupils Meeting

The proposal was discussed with the School Council and the pupils raised the following issues:

Issue	Response
Congestion in the hall and dining room	The Design Working Group has looked at ways of improving the use of space in the hall. The school can also look at examples of local 3FE schools and how they manage lunchtimes and queuing.
IT provision	The school will receive funding for additional computers /IT as part of equipping the new building.
Playground	The Design Working Group has looked at proposals for a new landscaping of the playground which will get rid of prickly shrubs, put in sufficient shelters and create opportunities for safe active play.
Clubs	The governing body understands how important clubs are. There is no intention to reduce the number of clubs although they may change reflecting the interests of all the children
Will the shape of the new building increase opportunities for bullying	Since hearing of the School Council's concerns, the architect has revised aspects of the building shape to reduce opportunities for bullying to occur in obscured areas.

6.3.6 Staff Meeting

Staff raised many of the same issues as above, but accepted that the Local Authority has a responsibility to provide sufficient school places in the area.

Issue	Response
Parking	Parking provision on the school site is under review and proposals will be submitted as part of a Planning Application.

6.3.7 Governors

The local authority Place Manager and the Senior Project Manager responsible for the building schemes attended a meeting of the school governing body to report back on the consultation and to hear their views. Whilst the governing body would prefer the school to remain at 2 forms of entry, governors understand the demand for places in the area. Rushey Green is a popular local school and has the potential for the site to be developed sympathetically to provide additional school places. Their full response is attached as Appendix Four. In their response they state that they would not be prepared to consider any further enlargement of the school to 4 forms of entry.

6.3.8 Local Residents

Rushey Green Primary School takes part in the annual "Open House" event when people from across London are able to visit examples of outstanding architecture across the capital. The Place Manager attended the event on September 22nd in order to discuss the proposal to enlarge the school with local residents who visited. The adjoining roads were leafleted in advance. About 10 local residents came along to "Open House". All had some concerns about the proposal divided between parking and what they saw as the Council going back on earlier commitments that there would be no future development on the site.

Issue	Response
Parking	The local authority recognises that this is a major issue for people in the area as the roads are also used by commuters and local office workers. Planning policy is aimed at reducing car use and promoting the use of public transport. However teachers have concerns (expressed above) that they need their cars to transport materials for work. This will be an issue that the school is best placed to manage on a daily basis with staff and parents. A new travel plan will be required reflecting the increased size

	of the school will be required as part of a Planning application.
Traffic	This has been discussed with the Road Safety officer. It has been suggested that a series of road safety events should be organised to raise awareness of local traffic conditions and how to ensure safety

6.3.9 The Culverley Green Resident's Association has been kept informed as proposals have developed. A written response from the secretary of the association is attached as Appendix Five. The Resident's Association welcome the proposal as it means that more local people will be able to get a place at the school. It expressed some concern about parking and has asked to be kept informed about aspects of the proposed site development.

Issue	Response
Parking & Traffic	As above
Landscaping	Members of the Residents' Association attended a meeting of the Design Working Group in November to discuss possible landscaping schemes. The LA has undertaken to share future proposals which reflect their comments.

6.3.10 The Local Authority acknowledges the concerns of parents who have chosen Rushey Green as a two form of entry school and are now concerned that it is proposed to enlarge the school. Many families and local residents will also have experienced the recent rebuild of the school. The local authority has expressed its gratitude to the governing body for its careful consideration of all the issues and its committed involvement to the work of the group which has developed the building proposal.

6.3.11 The even balance of written responses in favour of and against the proposal is indicative of the overall views expressed by parents and local residents that, whilst they appreciate the need for additional places in the locality, practical issues needed to be addressed to ensure that the expansion would not lead to a loss of quality of education and to local amenity. Whilst they would prefer that the school remained 2 forms of entry, governors are supportive of a sympathetic design which would retain the character of the current school. The tables above set out the measures proposed to tackle the issues raised by the expansion of a school in an already busy area, and ideas will continue to be developed in partnership with the school and local community.

6.3.12 The demand for places in the area will continue to be high and the Mayor is recommended to agree that the consultation should proceed to the next stage with the publication of a statutory notice for the enlargement of Rushey Green Primary School from 2 to 3 forms of entry.

7 Proposal to enlarge John Stainer Primary School from 1 to 2 forms of entry from 2014

7.1 Additional Requirement – Brockley, Lewisham & Telegraph Hill

7.1.1 Primary Place Planning Locality 3 (Brockley, Lewisham & Telegraph Hill) shows a continuing increase in the numbers of young children in the population.

Births

Births September 1 st 2000 to August 31 st 2001	877
Births September 1 st 2008 to August 31 st 2009	1083
Births September 1 st 2009 to August 31 st 2010	1181
Increase 2000/01 to 2009/10	34%
Increase 2008/09 to 2009/10	9%

7.1.2 On the basis of the 2009 birth data, it is anticipated that this will translate into the following demand for places in the area:

Projected Demand for Reception Places

Reception	Permanent Places	Projection	Additional Requirement
2012/13	756	912	156 (5.5FE)
2013/14	876*	904	28 (1 FE)
2014/15	876*	981	105 (3.5 FE)
2015/16	876*	982	106 (3.5 FE)
2016/17	876*	1007	131 (4.5 FE)

* see 7.2.2 below

Supply

7.2.1 In July, the Mayor agreed the proposal to lower the age of entry to Prendergast Ladywell Fields College, whose site is located in this primary place planning locality. The College will provide 60 places for primary pupils each year from 2013 which are included in the table above.

7.2.2 The Haberdashers' Federation, with the Council's support, has applied to open a 2 form of entry primary school as a Free school on their Pepys Road site. This will serve the northern part of the locality. The Department for Education announced on August 2nd 2012 that it is one

of the successful Free Schools and the school will open in 2013. This provision is included in the table above.

7.2.3 Forecasts suggest that further expansion of up to 4.5 forms of entry is required to meet demand in the area. The recommendation in this report has the potential to contribute 1 permanent form of entry.

7.2.4 In the context of this demand, at the meeting of Mayor & Cabinet held September 12th 2012 the Mayor agreed that there should be a consultation on a proposal to enlarge John Stainer Primary School from 1 to 2 forms of entry with effect from 2014.

John Stainer Primary School:

7.3.1 John Stainer is a one form of entry Primary School. The school has previously admitted two additional "bulge" classes. The first was admitted in 2009 through internal re-modelling and the addition of a small room to replace the music room. Demand for places in 2012 has been very high. The governing body agreed in May 2012 to admit an additional class for entry this September which filled immediately from the school's waiting list.

7.3.2 The governing body has agreed that, in the context of consistently high demand for places and new housing development adjacent to the school, it would be appropriate to consult on a proposal to expand the school from 1 to 2 forms of entry.

7.3.3 The school has been consistently oversubscribed. For entry in 2010/11 the distance of the last child offered was 305 metres. This had reduced to 184 metres for entry in 2011/12. The governing body is concerned that, without expansion, housing developments very close to the school will reduce this distance further. 184 applications were received for places at the school in 2012. Initial allocations of places for 2012 meant that the school had a waiting list of over 30. Out of 30 places, 18 were allocated to siblings

7.3.4 A feasibility study was completed in 2011 as part of a more general appraisal of the options to develop popular and successful schools in the borough. John Stainer is a three storey building dating from c.1905 and was reduced in size approximately 40 years ago. The hall and kitchen at the school date from the 1970s. The kitchen is due for replacement and the school view the hall as unsuitable. A building proposal has been developed which will demolish the hall and kitchen and replace that footprint with a three storey building linking through to the upper floors of the school. This will provide the required additional classrooms, and include a new kitchen and multi-purpose hall. The addition of a lift will ensure that the building is accessible for people with a disability.

7.3.5 The school site is relatively small and outdoor space will require careful management. Whilst parents appreciate that the temporary

enlargements are a response to the local demand for places, they are concerned about the availability of outdoor space. The development of proposals for the site will include a full evaluation of all options to maximise the space available. If a permanent expansion were to be agreed, the building works to support the expansion would not be completed until September 2014. However the school has the ability to admit an additional “bulge” form of entry in September 2013 which does not require any additional capital works.

7.4 John Stainer Consultation Activities

7.4.1 Following the Mayor’s agreement, a period of consultation occurred between September 26th and November 2nd. A consultation leaflet was prepared and distributed. The leaflet is included as Appendix Six. Meetings were held with parents, staff and the school council on October 2nd. The Places Manager attended a subsequent meeting of the Resources Sub Committee of the Governing Body. Governors were circulated with responses received from parents and had these for consideration when preparing their response to the consultation

7.4.2 Parents’ Meeting

The meeting was held by approximately 20 parents. They accepted that there is an increasing demand for school places in the area and that many local families have not been able to secure a place at John Stainer. However, they regretted the need to consider the expansion of the school. Many had chosen John Stainer in preference to a larger school and considered that it would lose its “family” aspect particularly if the small site meant that playtimes would need to be staggered. They urged the Local Authority to look at a range of options for enlarging the site of the school. Subsequently the enlargement proposal was discussed at the PTA meetings of 17th October and 14th November. Parents also convened their own meeting on 28th October.

Parental concerns were repeated in the written responses to the consultation which are included as Appendix Seven. Of the 36 written responses, nine were explicitly supportive of the proposal, and ten against. The remaining seventeen were neither wholly for or against, but raised issues which are summarised and addressed in the table below.

Issue	Response
Appropriateness of response from the local authority in the context of the demand for places.	Projections and in-year demand for places continue to indicate a need for places in the area. John Stainer is a popular and successful school and its enlargement will meet local demand.
The Council should build a new school.	Places are needed to serve the locality and there are no vacant sites in the area suitable for a new primary school.

<p>Concern that the expansion has started without completion of the statutory process.</p>	<p>In response to the demand for places in 2012 and the continuing reduction in the distance for the last offer, governors agreed that the school should offer a “bulge” class in 2012. They also offered to accept a “bulge” class in 2013. This level of increase is allowed without consultation other than the agreement of the governing body. Governors also agreed that there should be a consultation on the enlargement of the school from 1 to 2FE. The buildings which have been installed over the late summer and first part of the Autumn term are to provide the required accommodation for these pupils. A building proposal for an enlarged school is under development but has not been finalised.</p>
<p>Adequacy of the consultation process.</p>	<p>The consultation has been conducted fully in accordance with DfE requirements. They recommend that a consultation should be at least 4 weeks and should offer opportunities for the views of all those involved in the life of the school to be heard. Parents, staff, pupils and the governing body have all been involved. If the school is enlarged and a building scheme goes ahead there will be further consultation through the Planning application process.</p>
<p>Parents drew attention to a number of neighbouring schools whose sites they considered to be larger than John Stainer’s and therefore more suitable for expansion.</p>	<p>Meadowgate is close to John Stainer and some parents asserted that the school was now closed. The number of pupils with a Special Educational Need is increasing. The Mayor agreed on 5th October 2011 that as an interim measure, Meadowgate should become a part of Drumbeat, the local authority’s new school for pupils with an Autistic Spectrum Disorder, and should cater for pupils aged 16 and over. Refurbishment work will be carried out in spring 2013 and Meadowgate’s new role will commence in September 2013. Myatt Garden and Turnham have both admitted additional pupils in</p>

	<p>2011 and 2012. Governing Bodies are aware that the local authority is evaluating the potential of all school sites for expansion. Beecroft Garden has recently been rebuilt and expanded to 2 forms of entry.</p>
<p>Parents suggested a number of adjacent sites which should be considered for acquisition to enlarge the school.</p>	<p>Allotments adjacent to the railway: In addition to the established reluctance of Network Rail to have a concentrated area of children's play next to a railway, the allotments are protected under open space policies so it would not be possible to change these to a school use.</p> <p>Incorporating the triangle of land on the corner of Mantle & St Asaph's Road: Advice from the local authority Planning Department is that moving the wall would appear highly unlikely as it is at a junction and the vision splay is already more restricted than highways would like. A project to move the road as suggested in one response is not viable.</p> <p>Acquisition of a neighbouring Builders Yard. This is in use and changing it to a school site would cause the loss of an employment use (a school is not considered to be an employment use). If the builders yard had been empty for many years and no other viable employment use could be found for the site then it could possibly change to a school use, but solid evidence of marketing the site at a reasonable rent or sale price would need to have been demonstrated. However, this is opportunity is not currently available.</p>
<p>Parents suggested additional facilities which could be used by the school.</p>	<p>The Local Authority and the school appreciate parents' concern that there should be a wide range of sporting opportunities. The proposed venues will be investigated by the school.</p>
<p>Managing the site during the build period.</p>	<p>The School Management Team has stated that if the school were to be enlarged requiring new buildings, they would not wish to decant to an</p>

	alternative building. The local authority has recent experience of developing school sites whilst a school is in occupation, including the nearby Beecroft Gardens. This experience will be applied to schools in the Primary Places programme. The phasing of any building programme must make the safety of all site users a priority. Governors will also need to be satisfied that sufficient facilities are available to enable the school to function effectively
Safety of current exits	This is being considered through the Design Working Group. The current proposals would create an additional entrance which would relieve congestion and further opportunities are being considered.
Maintaining the current level of school clubs.	Clubs are an important part of the life of all schools and contribute to their overall success. The school management team is aware of the need to sustain the variety of activities during any build activities and if the school moves to 2FE.

7.4.3 Staff Meeting

Staff raised concerns about managing the school during the re-development of the site, should the proposal go ahead. They were concerned not to lose the ethos of the school during a period of disruption. They asked detailed questions about the facilities which might be available during this time. The local authority will support the governing body and management of the school in ensuring that there is as little disruption as possible during the development period.

7.4.4 Pupils

The School Council discussed how an increased number of pupils on the site might affect their experience of school. They discussed how they might not know other pupils and then looked at ways to ensure that different year groups worked together to get over this. They were concerned that the playground would be crowded and it was suggested that different year groups could use it at different times. It was explained that the design was being developed to make better use of spaces which were under-used at the moment including landscaping to make them more attractive. The School Council suggested that the football pitch could be multi-purpose and marked out for other games. They liked the idea that if the site were re-developed, toilet provision would be better, on each floor and accessible from the playground and they liked the fact that a lift would be installed for use by teachers or

pupils with a disability. The School Council suggested that the CCTV coverage should be extended to ensure that all these areas were safe.

7.4.5 Governors

The proposal to enlarge John Stainer has been discussed with the governing body. Governors have been concerned about the reducing distances for admission and so agreed to a consultation. They delegated responsibility to the Resources Sub-Committee which includes Parent and Staff Governors. The local authority's Place Manager attended the meeting of Resources Sub-Committee to inform them on the responses to the consultation activities. The governing body has responded positively in support of the proposal to enlarge the school. They feel that it will restore the ability of the school to serve the locality and that it offers valuable opportunities for capital investment on the site.

- 7.4.6 Overall the proposal has the support of the governing body, and whilst the majority of parents who responded to the consultation expressed concerns, those who indicated outright opposition are in a minority, and officers are of the view that, as explained above, the large majority of concerns can be properly addressed. There is considerable demand for places in the locality, and, despite the limitations of the size of the site, the local authority has demonstrated elsewhere that this can be overcome by good design and efficient management of a site to ensure the maximum usage of external play space. The Mayor is therefore recommended to agree that the consultation should proceed to the next stage with the publication of a statutory notice for the enlargement of John Stainer Primary School from 1 to 2 forms of entry.

8. Financial implications

Capital Finance Implications

8.1 Available Capital Resources

- 8.1.1 On completion of the projects for September 2012 primary places, at a cost of £19.3million, there is balance of £29.0million for all future projects delivery. The estimated costs of the September 2013 places delivery is prudently estimated at £24.5million but has yet to be finalised leaving a balance of £4.5m for September 2014 projects when John Stainer and Rushey Green are, if agreed, due for delivery. The estimated costs of September 2014 projects is £20.1million leaving a projected shortfall of £15.6million.
- 8.1.2 The Government is yet to make detailed announcements concerning 2013/14 capital allocations for the basic need grant which funds the primary places projects. The allocations for 2013/14 were expected to be announced in December 2012 but the Government has said that this has now been delayed until late January 2013. The Government has said that the national total will be broadly the same as for 2012/13 at c£800million. In 2012/13 the Lewisham share of that amount was

£12.7million Given the continued increase in Lewisham numbers and that past allocations were moderated then a further allocation of £12million might be a reasonable expectation. On this basis a shortfall would still remain of £3.6million. At this stage it would be possible to close that gap by application of any capital maintenance grant announced in January 2013.

- 8.1.3 A final decision on these proposals, following the statutory phase of consultation, will take place when allocations from central government are known and the precise details of the September 2013 places requirement has been fixed. The Statutory Notices will make it clear that a final decision on the funding for the project at John Stainer can only be made when the outcome of the DfE capital funding round for 2013/14 is announced. Consultation cannot be delayed until the DfE capital funding announcement is made because the complexity of the schemes and their necessary phasing would put at risk delivery for September 2014.

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 borough. 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.
- 9.4 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.

- 9.5 The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 provide 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 changes to the age limit of a school 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.

- 9.6 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.
- 9.7 The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) brings together all previous equality legislation in England, Scotland and Wales. The Act includes a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty), replacing the separate duties relating to race, disability and gender equality. The duty came into force on 6 April 2011. The new duty covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 9.8 In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
 - advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
 - foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- 9.9 As was the case for the original separate duties, the new duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the Mayor, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.
- 9.10 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) issued guidance in January 2011 providing an overview of the new public sector equality duty, including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. The guidance covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance was based on the then draft specific duties so is no longer fully up-to-date, although regard may still be had to it until the revised guide is produced by the EHRC..

- 9.11 The EHRC guidance does not have legal standing, unlike the statutory Code of Practice on the public sector equality duty which was due to be produced by the EHRC under the Act. However, the Government has now stated that no further statutory codes under the Act will be approved. The EHRC has indicated that it will issue the draft code on the PSED as a non statutory code following further review and consultation but, like the guidance, the non statutory code will not have legal standing.
- 9.12 In deciding whether to agree the recommendations in 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 disregarding irrelevancies and having regard to all guidance and advice that he is required to consider.

10 Crime and Disorder Implications

- 10.1 There are no crime and disorder implications.

11 Equalities Implications

- 11.1 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 will be undertaken prior to any final decision by the Mayor.

12 Environmental Implications

- 12.1 Every effort will be made to enhance rather than detract from school environments in the solutions to providing additional primary places.

13 Risk assessment

- 13.1 There are financial risks if insufficient funding is made available to support the delivery of the programme. There are also significant reputational risks to the Council if it does not meet its statutory requirement to ensure sufficient primary school places are made available.

14. Conclusion

The Mayor is recommended to agree to the next stage of consultation on the proposals to enlarge Rushey Green and John Stainer Primary schools, subject to the necessary finance being secured. This is the publication of Statutory Notices. Places in temporary enlargements in both schools since 2009 have been taken up, demonstrating that both schools are popular with local parents and that there is a need for

places. The proposed building schemes will continue to be developed during this next stage. The concerns of parents will be taken into account both in the Design Working Groups and in the work by the Governing Bodies to plan for a potential enlargement.

If there are any queries on this report, please contact Margaret Brightman, Place Manager on extension 48034

Background Papers;
Mayor & Cabinet July 11th 2012
Mayor & Cabinet September 12th 2012

Attachments

Appendix One Rushey Green Consultation leaflet June 20th
Appendix Two Rushey Green Consultation leaflet Autumn 2012
Appendix Three Responses from parents at Rushey Green school
Appendix Four Response from the Governing Body of Rushey Green school
Appendix Five Response from the Culverley Green Residents Association
Appendix Six John Stainer Consultation leaflet Autumn 2012
Appendix Seven Responses from parents at John Stainer school
Appendix Eight Response from John Stainer Governing Body

Possible Developments at Rushey Green Primary School

The Local Authority is in the early stages of assessing whether Rushey Green Primary School can be increased from 2 to 3 forms of entry. Demand for places in Primary schools has increased across London. In Lewisham, the birth rate has increased by 34% over the last decade and as a result the borough will need to provide more permanent places in schools. Rushey Green is a popular school and in 2010 & 2011 the school opened a third Reception class so as not to disappoint parents in the area. The Local Authority is working with the Governing Body to consider enlarging the school permanently to 3 forms of entry. There is a growing demand for places in Catford, so we need to look at how we can contribute to meeting this need. Parents and local residents are very proud of the new school building and any future development on the site will need to integrate with the present building.

The Local Authority have commissioned the architects who designed Rushey Green - PTEa - to look at how classrooms and facilities could be added whilst respecting the original design and the requirements of the conservation area. The school will continue to admit 60 Reception pupils per year. Any permanent enlargement would only take effect after a period of statutory consultation including consultation with Governors, staff, parents and the wider community. A public consultation day at the school is planned for Saturday 22nd September, when we will invite you to provide feedback on the proposals. The below image shows a proposal for a new classroom block to accommodate this extra form of entry.

For further information please email:-
Margaret.Brightman@lewisham.gov.uk

APPENDIX TWO

Rushey Green Primary School Options for the future

Tell us your views

What is this leaflet about?

In order to meet the huge increase in demand for Reception places, which is predicted to continue to at least the end of the decade, the Local Authority wishes to consult on how it can best increase the supply of permanent primary school places across the borough.

As part of this, we are considering whether existing schools can be enlarged to offer additional places. Rushey Green Primary School has been identified as a possible site and we want to hear your views on a proposal to increase the school's admissions number so that it can admit more children each year.

This leaflet explains:

- why we need to increase the number of primary school places across the borough
- how your school might help meet this demand
- what will happen next after this consultation

It is important to us to gain the views of pupils, parents/carers, governors, school staff, pupils, the local community and other interested parties about this proposal. There is a form at the back of this leaflet for you to fill in and return to share your thoughts. Your feedback will help us to shape possible developments at Rushey Green Primary School.

Completed forms need to be returned by **Friday 26th October 2012**

e-copies of this form are available on the Rushey Green School Website

To return the form:

- Email to: [Rushey GreenPconsultation@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:RusheyGreenPconsultation@lewisham.gov.uk)
- Email to: margaret.brightman@lewisham.gov.uk
- Send to: Margaret Brightman, Pupil Place Manager, 3rd Floor, Laurence House, 1 Catford Road, London, SE6 4RU
- Leave it in the box provided in Rushey Green Primary School reception

You can also call Margaret Brightman on 0208 314 8034 if you have any questions or comments.



The Proposal

The Mayor has asked us to look at the feasibility of expanding Rushey Green Primary School from its current 2 forms of entry to 3 forms of entry. This would mean that from September 2014 the maximum number of children in Reception would rise from 60 to 90. The school has offered 30 additional places each year since 2010 so some year groups are already 3 forms of entry. Eventually all age groups would have a maximum of 90 children and the maximum number of the children in the school, (excluding the Nursery) would grow to 630.

Why do we need additional places in Lewisham primary schools?

The number of births in Lewisham has increased by over 34% since 2000/2001. This has been a consistent trend and means that we need to provide more permanent school places. We know too that major planned housing regeneration schemes will attract new people into the borough and a proportion of them are likely to be families with children. We have expanded many of our schools but we estimate that we still need to add about 510 permanent school places across the borough and these need to be concentrated in the areas where we expect to see population increases.

We will be able to provide many of these places through enlarging existing schools where there is sufficient room on the site to add new classrooms and the other areas that a school needs. This might be through adding new classrooms or by modifying existing buildings.

We will be monitoring our projections very carefully to ensure that - as far as possible - we get the right number of places in the right locations.

We want to be able to educate as many as possible of our young people close to their homes in Lewisham. We also know that with increasing numbers of young people in the population we need to increase the opportunities for many young people with special educational needs to be educated close to home.

Why enlarge this school?

The population in Catford, Bellingham & Grove Park is increasing. There has been a 32% increase over the last decade from 651 births in 1998/99 to 863 in 2009/10. Our projections, which include information on planned housing developments, indicate that there will be a sustained demand for additional places in schools in the area until beyond the end of the decade.

In order to meet local demand, and avoid expecting children to travel long distances, we need to add 135 places (4.5 forms of entry) as permanent expansions in the area as well as some additional temporary expansions to cover the years of peak demand (children entering school from 2013 to 2019). We would like Rushey Green Primary School to offer 30 additional places (1 additional form of entry).

How could the school increase its size?

If the decision is taken to expand Rushey Green, a new wing would be added to the centre of the building on the Culverley Road site. We have commissioned the architects who designed the new school to design a wing which will add the required classrooms and facilities and which will be in the same style as the rest of the building. The modular classrooms installed in 2010 will be removed and the area will be landscaped. We will need to look at how to make the most effective use of the grounds attached to the school to maximise the opportunities for play and for outdoor learning. We can do this through improvements to the playing field on the Penerley Road site which will make it useable throughout the year. We would also put in some additional planting along this side of the site to provide greater privacy for pupils and also to reduce noise for residents of Penerley Road.

Will the education of the children already in the school be compromised?

There is no reason why expansion of the school should compromise the education of children already in the school. The challenge of needing rapidly to expand existing schools has meant that other Councils have looked at whether there is a relationship between school size and school effectiveness.

Lewisham has many successful schools of all sizes and also has effective local networks which spread expertise throughout the borough.

Educational Research repeatedly finds that school leadership, ethos and the quality of teaching and learning are the key factors which influence school effectiveness. The Local Authority is aware of the challenge that it is setting schools being considered for expansion and will tailor the support that it is able to give to ensure that they are not disadvantaged.

What funding will the school receive for the additional pupils?

The Local Authority will meet the costs of the building works required using Basic Need funding received from government and will equip the new classes as they open.

In addition to the set-up costs, the school will be funded for each child who joins the school.

How do I find out more?

There will be a meeting for parents on **Wednesday September 19th 9.00 – 10.30**. If you are unable to attend but have questions please contact Margaret Brightman (Margaret.brightman@lewisham.gov.uk) 0208 314 8034

What will happen next after this consultation?

We will report back to Mayor & Cabinet in November and the Mayor will make a decision on whether to proceed to the next stage of consultation which is the publication of a Statutory Notice. The final decision would be taken in January for inclusion in the Admission arrangements for 2014.

Feedback form

It is important to the local authority and the school to hear your views on this proposal. Please fill in the form below to share your thoughts with us. You can also call Margaret Brightman at Lewisham Council (020 8314 8034) if you have any questions or comments.

To return the form:

- Email to: [Rushey GreenPconsultation@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:RusheyGreenPconsultation@lewisham.gov.uk)

Send to: Margaret Brightman, Pupil Place Manager, 3rd Floor, Laurence House Catford Road, London, SE6 4RU

- Leave it in the box provided in Rushey Green Primary School reception

e-copies of this form are available on the Rushey Green Primary School Website

The deadline for returning the form is October 26th 2012

Your views

Do you support the permanent expansion of the school from 2 to 3 forms of entry? [Please tick one box]

 YES NO UNSURE

Please indicate the reasons for your views

Please could you provide us with some information about yourself overleaf...

Your details

I am representing an organisation in making this response (*please tick and specify*)

Name of organisation:

How would you best describe yourself in relation to this consultation? (*please tick one*)

Parent/carer Governor School staff Pupil Member of local community

Other (*please specify*):.....

Equalities monitoring is the collection of information which helps services ensure that they are providing a fair and inclusive service. The information that is provided on this form will remain strictly confidential in accordance with the Data Protection Act. If you are unhappy about answering a particular question you do not have to.

Are you male or female? Male Female

Please select your age group

Under 18 18-24 25-29 30-34 35-39 40-44
 45-49 50-54 55-59 60-64 65+

To which of these groups do you consider you belong?

- White - British
- White - Irish
- Any other White background, *please state:*
- Mixed - White & Black Caribbean
- Mixed - White & Black African
- Mixed - White & Asian
- Any other Mixed background, *please state:*.....
- Asian or Asian British - Indian
- Asian or Asian British - Pakistani
- Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi
- Any other Asian background, *please state:*.....
- Black or Black British - Caribbean
- Black or Black British - African
- Any other Black background, *please state:*.....
- Chinese
- Other ethnic group, *please state:*.....

Thank you for taking the time to read this leaflet. We look forward to hearing from you.

<p>If you have difficulty understanding this document in English please call the number below.</p>	<p>Sidii aad u hesho macluumaad ku saabsan dokumentigaan fadlan soo wac lambarka hoos ku qoran. Somali</p>
<p>Për të marrë informacion mbi këtë dokument, ju lutemi telefononi numrin e mëposhtëm. Albanian</p>	<p>இப் பத்திரத்திலுள்ள தகவல் தேவையானால் தயவுசெய்து கீழேயுள்ள எண்ணில் தொடர்புகொள்ளவும். Tamil</p>
<p>Pour plus d'informations sur ce document, veuillez appeler le numéro ci-dessous. French</p>	<p>Bu doküman hakkında bilgi için lütfen aşağıdaki numarayı arayınız. Turkish</p>
<p>更多有关本文件的信息，请拨打如下电话。 Mandarin</p>	<p>Để biết thêm thông tin về tài liệu này, quý vị hãy gọi số điện thoại sau. Vietnamese</p>

020 7253 7700

Also call this number for other formats, including Braille, large print, audio tape, BSL or computer disc.
 Email: lewisham@pearllinguistics.com TYPETALK: 18001 020 7253 7700

© Published 2010. Ref: ♻️ recycle

Produced on recycled paper using environmentally friendly print methods. For more information visit www.lewisham.gov.uk

Visit www.lewisham.gov.uk for all the latest news and information about your Council's services and job opportunities

Feedback form

It is important to the local authority and the school to hear your views on this proposal. Please fill in the form below to share your thoughts with us. You can also call Margaret Brightman at Lewisham Council (020 8314 8034) if you have any questions or comments.

To return the form:

- Email to: [Rushey GreenPconsultation@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:RusheyGreenPconsultation@lewisham.gov.uk)

Send to: Margaret Brightman, Pupil Place Manager, 3rd Floor, Laurence House Catford Road, London, SE6 4RU

- Leave it in the box provided in Rushey Green Primary School reception

e-copies of this form are available on the Rushey Green Primary School Website

The deadline for returning the form is October 26th 2012

Your views

Do you support the permanent expansion of the school from 2 to 3 forms of entry? [Please tick one box]

 YES NO UNSURE

Please indicate the reasons for your views

Please could you provide us with some information about yourself overleaf...

Your details

I am representing an organisation in making this response *(please tick and specify)*

Name of organisation:

How would you best describe yourself in relation to this consultation? *(please tick one)*

- Parent/carer Governor School staff Pupil Member of local community
 Other *(please specify)*:.....

Equalities monitoring is the collection of information which helps services ensure that they are providing a fair and inclusive service. The information that is provided on this form will remain strictly confidential in accordance with the Data Protection Act. If you are unhappy about answering a particular question you do not have to.

Are you male or female? Male Female

Please select your age group

- Under 18 18-24 25-29 30-34 35-39 40-44
 45-49 50-54 55-59 60-64 65+

To which of these groups do you consider you belong?

- White - British
 White - Irish
 Any other White background, *please state:*
 Mixed - White & Black Caribbean
 Mixed - White & Black African
 Mixed - White & Asian
 Any other Mixed background, *please state:*.....
 Asian or Asian British - Indian
 Asian or Asian British - Pakistani
 Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi
 Any other Asian background, *please state:*.....
 Black or Black British - Caribbean
 Black or Black British - African
 Any other Black background, *please state:*.....
 Chinese
 Other ethnic group, *please state:*.....

Thank you for taking the time to read this leaflet. We look forward to hearing from you.

<p>If you have difficulty understanding this document in English please call the number below.</p>	<p>Sidii aad u hesho macluumaad ku saabsan dokumentigaan fadlan soo wac lambarka hoos ku qoran. Somali</p>
<p>Për të marrë informacion mbi këtë dokument, ju lutemi telefononi numrin e mëposhtëm. Albanian</p>	<p>இப் பத்திரத்திலுள்ள தகவல் தேவையானால் தயவுசெய்து கீழேயுள்ள எண்ணில் தொடர்புகொள்ளவும். Tamil</p>
<p>Pour plus d'informations sur ce document, veuillez appeler le numéro ci-dessous. French</p>	<p>Bu doküman hakkında bilgi için lütfen aşağıdaki numarayı arayınız. Turkish</p>
<p>更多有关本文件的信息，请拨打如下电话。 Mandarin</p>	<p>Để biết thêm thông tin về tài liệu này, quý vị hãy gọi số điện thoại sau. Vietnamese</p>

020 7253 7700

Also call this number for other formats, including Braille, large print, audio tape, BSL or computer disc.
Email: lewisham@pearllinguistics.com Typetalk: 18001 020 7253 7700

© Published 2010. Ref: Produced on recycled paper using environmentally friendly print methods. For more information visit www.lewisham.gov.uk
Visit www.lewisham.gov.uk for all the latest news and information about your Council's services and job opportunities

APPENDIX THREE: RESPONSES FROM PARENTS AT RUSHEY GREEN

	DESCRIPTION	SCHOOL	RESPONSE	AGE GROUP	SEX	ETHNICITY	COMMENTS
1	Parent	Rushey Green	Y	40-44	F	Other	This would be a great incentive for our children and the Community/Borough. It will give other families in the area more options in terms of "schools" in the area local to home.
2.	Parent	Rushey Green	Y	35-39	F	Chinese	We hope children can have more opportunities to study nearby.
3.	Parent	Rushey Green	Y	35-39	F	Chinese	We hope children can have more opportunities to study nearby.
4.	Parent	Rushey Green	Y	35-39	F	Black or British British - African	I live beside the school and was initially offered a far away place, which would have been inconvenience. I wanted my son to go to a good school nearby. Fortunately a bulge class become available and I accepted it. Rushey Green was initially my first choice and to get to school and from school is walking distance. Other parents I spoke to who were offered a place after the bulge class was made available appreciate that their child got into the 3 rd entry form. Thank you to all involved for considering the bulge class.!! (A grateful parent)
5.	Parent	Rushey Green	Y	18-24 & 40- 44	M & F	Black or British British - Caribbean	Me and Partner feel , local education for local children, travelling long distances can delay and disturb pupils, walking to school is a great start to the day than taking or commuting to school by public transport. Rushey Green School can deliver great education so more allocations needs to be found. I support the expansion
6.	Parent/Carer	Rushey Green	Y	30-34	M	White - British	Though I agree the school needs to expand with the time. I'm very unhappy that it has been detrimental to my child's education the way the new builds have been organised is a joke !!
7.	Parent/Governor	Rushey Green	Y	50-54	F	Black or British British - Caribbean	I am very happy with the expansion as we have a new building, we can make room for children who is bought every minute. I love Rushey Green School and it has made a lot of improvement over the years. I can't wait to see the finish product. It will be amazing.

APPENDIX THREE: RESPONSES FROM PARENTS AT RUSHEY GREEN

8.	Parent/Carer	Rushey Green	N	40- 44	F	Turkish/Cypriot	I am deeply concerned of the continuous huts popping up in the playground and building of the new classroom in my children's school on limited playground space. I am concerned that is already over crowded and for playtime, outside accidents will rise as the play area is getting smaller and smaller, but the school is getting bigger, outrageous. There is limited space as it is. I am unhappy that the dinner hall will be over crowded and lunch time when seated for your meal, will be cut short as you will be rushed to accommodate the other changes that need to come in and sit to have there meal. This is totally unfair how this school should continue to make more classrooms. Why doesn't the local authorities spend there money on building a new school, rather than flats, to accommodate all the children in Lewisham and Catford area. Build a new school that's the solution.!
9.	Parent/Carer	Rushey Green	N	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	I am not at all confident that the local authority will provide the necessary funding and support to make the work. The information provided does not fill me with any confidence at all. It is clear for all to see the disruption and disorder created by the current 3 form entry. Eg makeshift classes in places not suitable And it is the children who are suffering from this. PLEASE BUILD NEW SCHOOLS !!! What you are proposing will make things worse!
10.	Parent/Carer	Rushey Green	N	45-49	F	White British	I feel that the children will suffer if additional buildings are allowed on the current site. Since the addition of more classes recently I have noticed a decline in the organisation of the school in general. There will be more children and less room for them to play. A brand new school/schools should be built as this problem is going to increase.
11.	Not specified	Rushey Green	N	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified
12.	Parent/Carer	Rushey Green	N	25- 29	Not specified	Black or British British - Caribbean	I am already not happy with the large numbers in each class. The school already seems overcrowded to me
13.	Parent/Carer	Rushey Green	N	35-39	F	Black or British British - African	Rushey Green school doesn't need 3 forms entry. If all the people that claims to live within Catford actually does. What I am saying is that, most families live as far as Bromley, Deptford, New-Cross, Sydenham

APPENDIX THREE: RESPONSES FROM PARENTS AT RUSHEY GREEN

							etc and still brings children here. That is the reason for the Congestion.
14.	Parent/Carer	Rushey Green	N	65+	F	White British	<p>The school was recently built to accommodate 520 children. It has already lost playground space to accommodate extra children to roll. Surely to add more children will mean losing even more playground space. The dinner hall will be even busier (my son already complains he doesn't have enough time to eat) as more children need to be fitted in.</p> <p>I have had a child in Rushey Green since 1997 and the school was large enough then with 70 nursery children and 2 form entry. I didn't send my children to Rushey Green with the intention that more and more children would be squashed in.</p> <p>If this expansion has a negative effect on my son I shall have no hesitation in enrolling him elsewhere.</p> <p>I was under the impression that the field was donated to the school from the cricket club, and that they had to ensure it was never built on and it sounds like they are going to lose more of it with this expansion.</p>
15.	Parent/Carer	Rushey Green	N	Not specified	F	Not specified	<p>I object to the expansion scheme at Rushey Green Primary School because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The length of the consultation process has been inadequate. We have been given less than four weeks from the first consultation meeting held on 11th Sept to put in our concerns. We have not had enough discussions with our board of governors to talk about the major decisions they are making on behalf of our children and parents. We need to call for the deadline to be put back and more consultation to take place. 2. I question the consultation process itself. Is the process a

APPENDIX THREE: RESPONSES FROM PARENTS AT RUSHEY GREEN

							<p>transparent one? Who sees the outcome of our concerns and will the council even take into consideration our points of view? Parents already feel they have no voice as in the previous meetings parents were told the expansion will go ahead regardless of what parents think, some parents even think the current 'building work' in the playground <u>is</u> the new build.</p> <p>3. Rushey Green School (RGS) went under major construction in 2007 when the new school was built. Years of careful planning went into RGS specifically designing a state of the Art two form entry school taking into account the needs of the children and staff. This took a lot of time, effort and resources. During the planning process the council were given an opportunity to make RGS a three-form entry school, but this did not take place and the school was assured that expansion would not come to RGS. The Council missed this opportunity and now they want to return and cause major disruption after 3 years of completion. This is very short sighted and unacceptable.</p> <p>4. Our children who are currently in Year 5 started their school life coming to a building site lasting for two years, if the plans go ahead , this same year group will be spending their last year of school life on yet another building site. This is wrong to put our children through major disruption on this scale for a second time and as a parent at RGS I do not want this to take place.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

APPENDIX THREE: RESPONSES FROM PARENTS AT RUSHEY GREEN

							<p>5. This school has a history of and is fundamentally a two form entry school. The infrastructure and the running of the school is based on two from entry and already we see the '3 years' of bulge classes impacting on the look and feel of the school. The playground is overcrowded with the current building work for the bulge class, if the planning for the extension is to go ahead, the children will lose valuable space. The plan to put the building in the middle of the new tarmacked space is a terrible idea cutting up the main space of the playground limiting the area for children to play and simply do things such as running. I chose RGS for my children because of its green space and the space it has. The space at RGS is one of the positive aspects of this school, why should we take it away from our children? Already my child has said this term that he doesn't like playtimes anymore because he keeps bumping into the big children.</p> <p>6. I object to replacing the green field with 'Astro turf' as I think it is a bad idea, it is costly and is not safe to run on, what happens if it is wet? What is the risk of the children getting friction burns if they fall? If it not put down properly it will be 'out of action' and the children will have nowhere to play on.</p> <p>7. I object to using the previous architects as they did not get the building right in the first place. They have provided two gates on the Penderly Road entrance where the majority of parents access the school on the Culverly Road side causing major congestion twice a day. You cannot see people come in from the left as you exit the main gate because of the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

APPENDIX THREE: RESPONSES FROM PARENTS AT RUSHEY GREEN

							<p>expansive concrete wall. The Reception area is very small and causes an obstruction most mornings and the design of the footpaths and green field have been a disaster. The landscaped areas in the playground are very poorly laid out, no creativity or thinking in terms of making it 'a fun and creative space' for the children was taken into consideration. Therefore I think it should be opened to other architects to put forward their proposals and for parents to choose.</p> <p>8. As a parent I am very concerned about the future of RGS and the quality of education and care the parents and the children will receive in the coming years. I am already experiencing the intimate atmosphere of Rushey Green School slowly being lost. Just this month alone I have witnessed the impact of the expansion on my children and school life, for instance:</p> <p>School plays and special assemblies, these gatherings mean a lot to the parents and is a good occasion to see the work the school and the children do. The Harvest Festival Assembly took place last week (18th Oct) where the children did a performance showing the masks and bread they made. I had heard about these from my son during the week and was looking forward to seeing it.</p> <p>Over the years I have enjoyed seeing my children in school productions and can now see the impact of an ever increasing number of pupils audience of parents crammed into the hall. This assembly was by far the worst in terms of being able to see. Six forms of children crammed into one-side of the hall sitting on the floor flanked by an audience of parents. Even on the third row I was not able to see, hear the children perform or find my own child in the crowd. All these</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX THREE: RESPONSES FROM PARENTS AT RUSHEY GREEN

							<p>factors culminated into a very disappointing experience for a parent. In our consultation meetings, school plays were brought up as an issue and reassurances had been made from both the head and deputy that future productions, the hall would be opened up and stage managed better. I have yet to see this happen.</p> <p>Another incident took place in regard to my child being sent home with an 'incident report' from the playground. In the report it had said another child had hit my child. When asking my child about this, he said that this had not occurred to him but to one of his classmates. Already we can see the playground assistants are under strain and simply do not know the names of the children even after one year. This is thoroughly disturbing and gives me good reason to doubt the changes.</p> <p>At the same time many parents (reception parents) are having to come back to school several times a week because their child has been knocked down in the playground or that they have injured themselves badly. In the last two years we have seen two children break a limb in our playground. I find this unprecedented.</p> <p>9. Adverse weather conditions</p> <p>Three years into the new build and taking on the bulge classes, this school simply does not know what to do when it rains. It has serious issues of overcrowding and problems of entrance and exits points being obstructed when there is</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX THREE: RESPONSES FROM PARENTS AT RUSHEY GREEN

							<p>heavy rain. Problems stem from whether it is the parents bringing children into school or <u>teachers</u> releasing children at the end of the day. Last Friday on 19th Oct, at 'home time', two teachers decided to stand and release children at the 'middle entrance' and 'give out letters' contrary to the usual protocol of bringing their classes to the playground to parents caused a major obstruction. Parents crowded the entrance to collect children and other classes leaving the building could not get through. It was mayhem. My child, when called was not there and was lost in the crowd. Already the school is not able to cope with the extra pupils, if the expansion takes place here at RGS I seriously doubt the safety levels and the risk factors at this school.</p> <p>10. RGS have an above average of intake for children with specialised needs. What about the specialist teachers and the children who need more care? Is expansion a positive option for these children? In terms of building relationships with other teachers and children, and their education we know that in a small community 'family feel' environment children flourish. How do we know what the impact the expansion will have on the more vulnerable children at RGS? Will they receive the care and environment they need? Again I object for these reasons.</p> <p>11. At present the plans for the new build do not indicate to me that enough care or thought has been put into the planning of the school as a whole. In terms of layout within the school, infants and juniors having separate playgrounds, buildings</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX THREE: RESPONSES FROM PARENTS AT RUSHEY GREEN

							<p>and resources that create an intimate atmosphere for the children, adequate plans for the green field and the new playground areas. Examples of successfully expanded schools have been made through careful planning with the council, schools working with parents, teachers and the community. I do not see any of these happening here at RGS. I have very little faith in the expansion scheme and whether the management of the school have the capacity and the resources to make the scheme a success. They have already handled the planning and the consultation process very badly already. The communication between the head, governing body and the parents has been very poor and it has angered many parents at this school.</p> <p>The expansion will impact of the on our head teacher in terms of time and resources, taking here away from her daily duties to the school and the parents. What resources will the council provide if the expansion scheme was to go ahead? As with major extensions this creates a full time post for an experienced member of staff of three form entry school will be needed to manage and oversee the project. Will the council be providing this?</p>
17.	Parent/Carer	Rushey Green	Unsure	Not specified	F	Not specified	<p>I am writing to you to express my concern regarding the school expansion. I want to bring my concerns to your attention and also request for these to be brought to the attention of Lewisham, Council. I am a disabled parent who has to drop my two kids at Rushey Green. I am at present struggling to drop and pickup my children from school as some parents seem to have no regard and park where ever they like, leaving me to unable to get close enough to school. I have a blue badge, due to limited mobility, so I can legally park on the double yellows but again parents not only park there but also the zigzags (which can be very dangerous when school starts or finishes as they</p>

APPENDIX THREE: RESPONSES FROM PARENTS AT RUSHEY GREEN

							<p>sometimes even do u turns there when busy) I am also worried for the safety of children there as there is no proper crossing.</p> <p>Two years ago I was asked if I was interested in the walking bus service. I did give my interest but have been told that Lewisham Council haven't provided funding yet. I wish I was asked after there was funding on place as I am just waiting and hoping.</p> <p>Therefore I am worried that an increase in numbers visiting the school, without service like the walking bus service, or disabled bays outside school (which the council need to monitor eith cctv otherwise some parents may still park on them with no regard for others) will make it impossible for me to drop off and pick up my children on time.</p> <p>I therefore urge you to forward my concerns to the council in order to make it possible for parents like me to bring their children to school</p>
18.	Parent	Rushey Green	Unsure	n/k	F	n/k	<p>I am very concerned about this proposed expansion. I feel the management and teaching staff cannot cope at the moment with the children that are at school at present. If the school has to expand there will need to be more management staff in place i.e Headteacher for the Infant School and Headteacher for the Junior School. If this is not put in place I feel the school will not be able to provide an adequate education for the children and eventually Rushey Green School will be deemed as a 'failing school'.</p>

APPENDIX THREE: RESPONSES FROM PARENTS AT RUSHEY GREEN

APPENDIX FOUR RUSHEY GREEN GOVERNING BODY

Formal response from the Governing Body to the proposed expansion of Rushey Green Primary School from a two to a three form entry school.

The Governing Body of Rushey Green School would wish to say at the outset that our preference would be to keep the school as 2 form entry as it is currently. However we do understand that there is a need locally for extra primary school places and therefore accept that this means the school will need to expand.

We are in a very privileged position at Rushey Green with our site and our grounds, we do know that we would be able to accommodate the extra children and staff that expansion to 3 form entry would mean. However it is important to note that a large part of our existing play space will be taken by any building extension and it is vital that all other external space on the site is used to ensure that our children continue to have access to the play space that they currently enjoy. This means that the grass field on the Penerley Road side of the site, which is currently unusable for seven months of the year, must be adapted to provide a multi seasonal, multi purpose play space. The loss of play space as well as the increase in numbers is a very serious concern for the whole Rushey Green School community. Many parents have expressed very real worries about the implications of expansion, and as a Governing Body we must take those concerns very seriously. A major part of the school's plan to manage the running of the school post expansion involves being able to use the field all year round to offer play space and sports facilities and without approval to change the field we would have concerns about the viability of our plans.

Rushey Green is a successful and popular school and one that is continuing to improve. All year groups are performing well and those years who currently have 'bulge' classes are equally successful. We have been reassured that expansion should not have an effect on the performance of the school. It is very important to the whole school therefore that the extra staff and children who would come to an expanded school are as well resourced as our current pupils. This means that the school budget must be adjusted to cover not only extra teachers but teaching assistants, mid day meal and playground supervisors, administrative, cleaning and Maintenance staff.

Governors have listened to Parents who want to be reassured that a larger school would not become impersonal, and wanted further information on how the daily life of the school would be managed with a larger intake, for example how school assemblies, performances and sports and games would be organised. The Headteacher and leadership team, with the governors, have already put a great deal of thought into how the school would work to successfully maintain the current ethos and culture of the school with more children on site. Such issues as reorganising times for PE in the outside space, having staggered playtimes and an extra dinner sitting; opening up the existing hall to its full capacity to provide enough space for lunches without affecting the use of the hall for afternoon PE, and staggering assemblies have all been considered. The Senior leadership team will be expanded to include a Head of Year position for each year group this would offer parents a senior point of contact in addition to their class teacher. The head of year will also help with the day to day management of that year.

Parents have been made aware of these changes in a number of ways, including the official consultation meetings, at a meeting with Governors requested and lead by parents, through letters directly to parents and in the weekly Rushey Green Paper. Staff are continuing to reassure parents. Our coffee mornings are a popular event for parents and staff are happy to discuss their concerns and have them addressed by the Senior Leadership team. Governors agreed that a letter be sent to all parents to address some of the key concerns raised, possibly incorporating quotes from the children. The letter emphasised that standards had not been affected by the previous expansion in 3 year groups through bulge classes, and that the school had now moved up in the local authority's categories. We will aim to reassure parents that the family atmosphere of the school would not be affected, and the school's successes, for example in sports awards and the ICT Mark, would not be affected. The letter stressed that the culture and ethos of the school is not related to the size, and will not change as a result of the expansion; furthermore, if the local authority felt that the expansion would be detrimental to the school in any way, it would not be going ahead.

Governors have listed to the views of the School Council and about their concerns that the design of the new building would have more secluded corners with a greater potential for bullying when children were out of sight of playground supervisors. The children had asked how this would be resolved. The School Council has made some very helpful suggestions about facilities which might be needed in the playground, such as shelters against the rain for the increased number of children. All of these are being looked at with the Expansion Committee and Architects, for example, when designing the toilets where children could gather out of sight as well as out in the playground and ensuring that the school retains the shaded seating areas. We aim to ensure that the issues raised by the children will be addressed in the landscaping plans for the redesigned site.

The effect of the proposed expansion of the school on traffic and parking in the immediate vicinity of the school is a major concern both for the whole school community and for our neighbours. Concern has been expressed by staff about the impact of travelling to work and in particular about the difficulty of parking in the area and restricted number staff car park spaces. Governors are concerned that the possibility of staff having nowhere to park could lead to problems in retaining or recruiting staff. A traffic impact survey has been completed, which has shown that traffic in the area is already at saturation point, and whilst it is a requirement of the application for a green travel plan to be prepared, which would encourage cycling to school, car sharing and use of public transport, it has been pointed out that initiatives such as these were not necessarily practical for teachers, who regularly had to carry large and heavy loads, and staff already tried to share cars where possible.

Governors, Parents & staff are also concerned about the management of parking and traffic during drop off & pick up times. Ten local residents attended the open house session at the school and concerns were raised around parking and the Council having reneged on their commitment that there would be no further development on the school site. It seems clear that the residents do understand that this commitment was given before the huge growth in demand for school places had become apparent, and it appears to have been accepted that the expansion is necessary, although the additional parking was raised as a significant area of concern, both in terms of extra staff parking and an increase in the number of parents dropping off and collecting their children. In addition, it has been pointed out that many staff from Laurence House already currently park in Penerley and Culverley Roads, and the roads were at saturation point. Governors are aware that this is an extremely difficult issue to manage, and recognise that the problem of car parking is common to most schools. Some

residents showed interest in investigating the possibility of a residents' parking scheme which they felt might help to overcome the problems of inconsiderate parking. Concern has also been expressed about the heavy traffic making deliveries to Phoebe's Garden Centre in Penerley Road, and the increased potential for accidents with the anticipated additional traffic as a result of the expansion. The Headteacher agreed that this is a valid concern, and there will inevitably be more traffic, double parking, and congestion, which would make the area more dangerous; however, evidence suggests that most deliveries to Phoebe's take place in the early morning between 7-7.30 a.m. It has been suggested that the timing of deliveries could be discussed with the Garden Centre and the support of Council officers may be helpful in facilitating such a discussion. The Headteacher is planning to run some parent workshops on the positive impact of walking to school, and work with children on staying safe while getting to & from school. We hope that this will help and encourage some parents make the change from car to walking.

Governors have sought an assurance that the school would not be asked to expand beyond three form entry in the future. We have been told that no school in Lewisham was larger than three form entry, and the local authority was of the opinion that a four form entry was too large for a primary school. It was therefore highly unlikely that Mayor and Cabinet would agree to a further expansion. Foundations on the site would not support a higher structure than the present buildings, and any further construction would therefore impinge on the remaining play space to an unacceptable degree. Governors are adamant that they would not support expansion to a four form entry school should they be approached in the future.

Some governors have expressed the view that this has not felt like a consultation exercise but has been more an opportunity for the local authority to inform stakeholders what was happening, and there is a sense of this being a foregone conclusion. This view is clearly echoed by some parents. However, it has been suggested that the consultation is focussed around how the expansion should take place rather than whether it should go ahead, and that the local authority was consulting to understand the concerns of stakeholders so that these could be managed more effectively. The comments we have made illustrate the work the school has done to address the concerns which have been raised within the school community and beyond and indicate our willingness to ensure that an expansion of Rushey Green will not affect our aims for the culture and ethos of the school and its academic rigour.

In conclusion, Governors are in agreement that the proposed expansion should go ahead.

Annie Roper

Chair of Governors - Rushey Green School

on behalf of the Governing Body of the school

22nd October 2012

APPENDIX FIVE CULVERLEY GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Culverley Green Residents Association

I understand that you are anxious to ascertain the position of the Culverley Green Residents Association regarding the proposal to expand Rushey Green Primary School to three form entry.

We fully understand the need to expand the school and indeed welcome it especially if it means that our members could then get their children into the school. This is the school that residents view as their local community school and one that is moreover within easier walking distance than the ones that some of our members have been currently offered.

Parking is as I am sure you understand an issue. This expansion would hopefully mean that more children from the immediate locality would then be able to be offered places. They then would be able to walk safely and quickly to school with their parents negating the need to cross busy main roads etc.

The Association would like Option B to be the design as this incorporates all the school's needs in one attached building doing away with the temporary classrooms. The play- ground space that this would release would of course go some way in alleviating the loss of play - ground space caused by the new building.

I do however need to point out that there is a certain amount of anxiety about the landscaping of the ground on the Penerley Road side and do ask that you keep us informed about your plans for that area and ask for our comments.

APPENDIX FIVE
John Stainer Primary School
Options for the future
Tell us your views

What is this leaflet about?

In order to meet the huge increase in demand for Reception places, which is predicted to continue to at least the end of the decade, the Local Authority wishes to consult on how it can best increase the supply of permanent primary school places across the borough.

As part of this, we are considering whether existing schools can be enlarged to offer additional places. John Stainer Primary School has been identified as a possible site and we want to hear your views on a proposal to increase the school's admissions number so that it can admit more children each year.

This leaflet explains:

- why we need to increase the number of primary school places across the borough
- how your school might help meet this demand
- what will happen next after this consultation

It is important to us to gain the views of pupils, parents/carers, governors, school staff, pupils, the local community and other interested parties about this proposal. There is a form at the back of this leaflet for you to fill in and return to share your thoughts. Your feedback will help us to shape possible developments at John Stainer Primary School.

Completed forms need to be returned by **Monday 5th November 2012**

e-copies of this form are available on the John Stainer School Website

To return the form:

- Email to: JohnStainerPconsultation@lewisham.gov.uk
- Email to: margaret.brightman@lewisham.gov.uk
- Send to: Margaret Brightman, Pupil Place Manager, 3rd Floor, Laurence House, Catford Road, London, SE6 4RU 1
- Leave it in the box provided in John Stainer Primary School reception

You can also call Margaret Brightman on 0208 314 8034 if you have any questions or comments.



The Proposal

The Mayor has asked us to look at the feasibility of expanding John Stainer Primary School from its current 1 form of entry to 2 forms of entry. This would mean that from September 2014 the maximum number of children in Reception would rise from 30 to 60. The school offered 30 additional places in 2009 and in 2012 so some year groups are already 2 forms of entry. Eventually all age groups would have a maximum of 60 children and the maximum number of the children in the school, (excluding the Nursery) would grow to 420.

Why do we need additional places in Lewisham primary schools?

The number of births in Lewisham has increased by over 34% since 2000/2001. This has been a consistent trend and means that we need to provide more permanent school places. We know too that major planned housing regeneration schemes will attract new people into the borough and a proportion of them are likely to be families with children. We have expanded many of our schools but we estimate that we still need to add about 510 permanent school places across the borough and these need to be concentrated in the areas where we expect to see population increases.

We will be able to provide many of these places through enlarging existing schools where there is sufficient room on the site to add new classrooms and the other areas that a school needs. This might be through adding new classrooms or by modifying existing buildings.

We will be monitoring our projections very carefully to ensure that - as far as possible - we get the right number of places in the right locations.

We want to be able to educate as many as possible of our young people close to their homes in Lewisham. We also know that with increasing numbers of young people in the population we need to increase the opportunities for many young people with special educational needs to be educated close to home.

Why enlarge this school?

The population in Brockley, Lewisham & Telegraph Hill is increasing. Since 2000/01 there has been a 35% increase in births - from 877 births in 2000/01 to 1,181 in 2009/10. Our projections, which include information on planned housing developments, indicate that there will be a sustained demand for additional places in schools in the area until beyond the end of the decade.

In order to meet local demand, and avoid expecting children to travel long distances, we need to add 131 places (4.5 forms of entry) as permanent expansions in the area as well as some additional temporary expansions to cover the years of peak demand (children entering school from 2013 to 2019). We would like John Stainer Primary School to offer 30 additional places (1 additional form of entry).

How could the school increase its size?

If the decision is taken to expand John Stainer, we would demolish the hall and kitchen and replace that footprint with a three storey building linking through to the upper floors of the school. This will provide the required additional classrooms and include a new kitchen and multi-purpose hall. The new building would include a lift which would make the school fully accessible for people with limited mobility. The school site is relatively small and outdoor space will require careful management. The development of proposals for the site will include a full evaluation of all options to maximise the space available.

Will the education of the children already in the school be compromised?

There is no reason why expansion of the school should compromise the education of children already in the school. The challenge of needing rapidly to expand existing schools has meant that other Councils have looked at whether there is a relationship between school size and school effectiveness.

Lewisham has many successful schools of all sizes and also has effective local networks which spread expertise throughout the borough.

Educational Research repeatedly finds that school leadership, ethos and the quality of teaching and learning are the key factors which influence school effectiveness. The Local Authority is aware of the challenge that it is setting schools being considered for expansion and will tailor the support that it is able to give to ensure that they are not disadvantaged.

What funding will the school receive for the additional pupils?

The Local Authority will meet the costs of the building works required using Basic Need funding received from government and will equip the new classes as they open.

In addition to the set-up costs, the school will be funded for each child who joins the school.

How do I find out more?

There will be a meeting for parents on **Tuesday 2nd October 9.00**. If you are unable to attend but have questions please contact Margaret Brightman (Margaret.brightman@lewisham.gov.uk) 0208 314 8034

What will happen next after this consultation?

We will report back to Mayor & Cabinet in December and the Mayor will make a decision on whether to proceed to the next stage of consultation which is the publication of a Statutory

Notice. The final decision would be taken in January for inclusion in the Admission arrangements for 2014.

Feedback form

It is important to the local authority and the school to hear your views on this proposal. Please fill in the form below to share your thoughts with us. You can also call Margaret Brightman at Lewisham Council (020 8314 8034) if you have any questions or comments.

To return the form:

- Email to: John.StainerP.consultation@lewisham.gov.uk

Send to: Margaret Brightman, Pupil Place Manager, 3rd Floor, Laurence House Catford Road, London, SE6 4RU

- Leave it in the box provided in John Stainer Primary School reception

e-copies of this form are available on the John Stainer Primary School Website

The deadline for returning the form is November 5th 2012

Your views

Do you support the permanent expansion of the school from 1 to 2 forms of entry? [Please tick one box]

YES

NO

UNSURE

Please indicate the reasons for your views

Please could you provide us with some information about yourself overleaf...

Your details

I am representing an organisation in making this response (*please tick and specify*)

Name of organisation:

How would you best describe yourself in relation to this consultation? (*please tick one*)

Parent/carer Governor School staff Pupil Member of local community

Other (*please specify*):.....

Equalities monitoring is the collection of information which helps services ensure that they are providing a fair and inclusive service. The information that is provided on this form will remain strictly confidential in accordance with the Data Protection Act. If you are unhappy about answering a particular question you do not have to.

Are you male or female? Male Female

Please select your age group

Under 18 18-24 25-29 30-34 35-39 40-44
 45-49 50-54 55-59 60-64 65+

To which of these groups do you consider you belong?

- White - British
- White - Irish
- Any other White background, *please state*:
- Mixed - White & Black Caribbean
- Mixed - White & Black African
- Mixed - White & Asian
- Any other Mixed background, *please state*:.....
- Asian or Asian British - Indian
- Asian or Asian British - Pakistani
- Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi
- Any other Asian background, *please state*:.....
- Black or Black British - Caribbean
- Black or Black British - African
- Any other Black background, *please state*:.....
- Chinese
- Other ethnic group, *please state*:.....

Thank you for taking the time to read this leaflet. We look forward to hearing from you.

<p>If you have difficulty understanding this document in English please call the number below.</p>	<p>Sidii aad u hesho macluumaad ku saabsan dokumentigaan fadlan soo wac lambarka hoos ku qoran. Somali</p>
<p>Për të marrë informacion mbi këtë dokument, ju lutemi telefononi numrin e mëposhtëm. Albanian</p>	<p>இப் பத்திரத்திலுள்ள தகவல் தேவையானால் தயவுசெய்து கீழேயுள்ள எண்ணில் தொடர்புகொள்ளவும். Tamil</p>
<p>Pour plus d'informations sur ce document, veuillez appeler le numéro ci-dessous. French</p>	<p>Bu doküman hakkında bilgi için lütfen aşağıdaki numarayı arayınız. Turkish</p>
<p>更多有关本文件的信息，请拨打如下电话。 Mandarin</p>	<p>Để biết thêm thông tin về tài liệu này, quý vị hãy gọi số điện thoại sau. Vietnamese</p>

020 7253 7700 Also call this number for other formats, including Braille, large print, audio tape, BSL or computer disc.
 Email: lewisham@pearllinguistics.com Ttypetalk: 18001 020 7253 7700

© Published 2010. Ref: Produced on recycled paper using environmentally friendly print methods. For more information visit www.lewisham.gov.uk Visit www.lewisham.gov.uk for all the latest news and information about your Council's services and job opportunities



APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

	DESCRIPTION	SCHOOL	RESPONSE	AGE GROUP	SEX	ETHNICITY	COMMENTS
1.	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Yes	30-34	F	Turkish	I think it would be benefit the school and the local community bigger space would be good.
2.	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Yes	45-49	M	Turkish	I feel the school has the capacity to expand. Many years ago the school has an annexes and a juniors. I have always felt the knocking down of the juniors was a mistake.
3.	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Yes	25-29	F	White - British	I feel the school has the capacity to expand. Many years ago the school has an annexes and a juniors. I have always felt the knocking down of the juniors was a mistake.
4.	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Yes	40-44	F	White - British	
5.	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Yes	35-39	F	White - British	
6.	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Yes	40-44	F	White - British	I lived 214 metres from John Stainer and did not get a place at the school until they decided to do a 2 form entry and being on the waiting list my son got a place. I was grateful for this decision for a 2 form entry, so to extend John Stainer would be a good thing considering many people who applied now will get a chance to get their first choice primary school.
7.	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Yes	35-39	F	Vietnamese	There should be 2 classes for each year if there is a high demand of children each year. So there's a chance of all children get places in the school. There should be at least two teachers in each class for each year i.e. main teacher and student teacher.
8.	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Yes	45-49	F	Chinese	There are obviously more children who need schools around here. We have been in a situation when we couldn't get a school so we know how difficult it is and we don't wish other people to experience what we had
9	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Yes	30-34	F	White-British	I can see the benefits of new buildings and recognise that the school has to be part of the effort to offer more places in Lewisham. I am concerned about <u>space</u> (esp. outside) but am reasonably confident

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							that these issues can be overcome with good planning
10	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	No	30-34	F	N/K	Too many pupils in too little space. Why not building new schools? Sorry, I don't see the advantage for existing pupils. And why are we getting this survey when things seem to be already decided.
11	Parent	John Stainer	No	N/K	M	N/K	<p>Several points.</p> <p>I presume the extra class will result in all classes through the school with every year being doubled, over time, resulting in about 180 extra pupils in the school. Thinking of the playground area that is a lot of extra bodies for such a small amenity space.</p> <p>Whilst the level of expertise and organisation can be very successful there are schools that are overwhelmed by the sheer amount of deprived young people that live in the area. I do not know if that is the case now in the catchment area for JS, but I believe it once was the case.</p> <p>I believe the development will affect the young people as a result of compromising their play experience, for the duration of the build. This will ultimately impact on their studies and quality of learning.</p> <p>I believe John Stainer is on the right track in terms of excellence, but in terms of the future, to expand and cram in extra pupils might as a result of a past failure to adequately anticipate the educational needs in Lewisham could result in the undoing of all the good work that is at present happening in the school.</p>
12.	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	No	35-39	F	White - Irish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Stainer has one of the smallest playgrounds and since the spare land was sold off previously now has not enough space for play. • The entrance to school is impossibly hard to get smoothly in & out of already with numbers of students currently • The ethos and atmosphere of the small school will be radically changed if staggered playtimes & lunches become needed to accommodate for the children. Currently older children all know all younger children & are able to take them under their wing. This will no longer be possible.

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

13	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	No	35-39	F	White - British	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I think that smaller schools (like 1 form entry) allow for a more caring, family – type environment for children aged 3-11. It is good to have some 1-form entry schools in the borough and to preserve them.] 2. I think the site is too small as it is and is not suitable for such a large increase. 3. I would prefer a new primary school to be built in the area to accommodate the rising numbers. Thank you !
14.	Parent	John Stainer	No	45- 49	F	White - British	The school playground is not large enough as it is to accommodate the children – without extra “play” area it will be dangerously, unpleasantly crowded if expansion is allowed. It is nice that all the children know each other& the ‘smallness’ of the school – we feel. Is one of the factors that contributes to the lovely and special atmosphere of John Stainer – It will become crowded and impersonal. Lewisham should build and staff another school.
15.	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	No	35- 39	F	Any other white-German	I am not convinced that the school grounds will be adequate for outdoor activities for 420 children.
16.	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	No	25 – 29	F	Mixed - White & Black African	The playground is small as it is the school ?
17.	Not specified	John Stainer	No	60-64	M	White - British	The school is not big for expansion
18	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	No	35-39	M	Any other white-Background	<p>The school is too small to make it bigger. The education of the kids will be comprised and so the standard. The council should create new school not disroid the good one –</p> <p>I am against the extension of the new school because also the building site will; the education and safety of the pupils- no playground for 420 kids. The school is just copying with the new classroom for 2013 – Cannot cope any more than that.</p>
19	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	No	40-44	Not specified	White - British	The playground is already not large enough for the additional forms from 2009/12. There is not enough space for parents collecting children, playtime and events in the hall (such as Christmas shows etc) A new form means up to 60 new people(set of parents)would want

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							to attend events. A huge hall would be required. The school already feels too crowded.
20	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Unsure	Not specified	F	Not specified	<p>.I feel strongly that I am being asked to support a proposal that I have had very little information about, from my point of view it seems as if decisions have already been made and that the consultation process is merely a nod in the direction of having sought feedback. As a working single parent who has many commitments during the week it is very difficult to attend meetings during or after school. I would like therefore for much more detailed and comprehensive information sent to me via email or letter regarding the proposals and their exact impact both during the work and after their completion should the expansion go ahead.</p> <p>I will try to be brief, my main concerns then are as follows;</p> <p>As someone who has worked for as a teacher in the primary school system I am very much in favour of small/one form entry schools. One of the main reasons along side its nurturing ethos and emphasis on all round achievement, that I choose John Stainer school was for it's size. I moved my son from another local school at which he was overwhelmed and struggling. I watched his transformation within 2 weeks of his arriving at John Stainer, he felt safe, secure and is now, confident and doing well academically. I realise that there are huge pressures on Lewisham re school places but am concerned that the borough will end up with no one form entry schools.</p> <p>I accept that if an expansion was handled in a careful way with an absolute commitment to hold on to the small school caring and family like atmosphere which John Stainer currently has, what makes the school so special could possibly be retained however I am not convinced that there is the space to be able to do this.</p>

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							<p>My main concern then is logistical. The school, having sold off part of it's grounds, is very small. The suggestion to double the number of children on the site is very worrying;- reduced play space per child within the playground, staggered lunchtimes, increased traffic outside of the school at beginning and end of the day, loss of much loved after school clubs, especially from my sons point of view 'football club' and again as a working single parent possible loss of brilliant after school provision until 5.30 would for me personally be hugely difficult and is already causing me some anxiety ie none of this has been clarified so as to allay fears.</p> <p>Should the expansion go ahead, I am concerned about the noise, dust, and pollution the staff and children will be exposed to and general disruption to the all children's learning during the works. I have had previous experience of working in a school undergoing building works which were supposed to have been carefully thought out so to have caused 'minimal disturbance'.</p> <p>I have been invited to outline my concerns, which I feel I have done briefly in the above, I don't have the solutions but am looking forward to being included in an open and clear discussion about the future of a valuable community resource so that many others can benefit from it in years to come but not at the expense of my son's experience of John Stainer at the time he has left there.</p>
21	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Unsure	Not specified	M	Not specified	<p>We have one child at John Stainer school (in year 2) and another who will be applying there to start in September 2013, so this proposal will affect our children hugely over the next 7 years.</p> <p>We feel that John Stainer is currently a really good school, and although we are theoretically in support of the idea of the school increasing in size (and recognise the need across the borough for more class places), we have a number of concerns specific to this</p>

						<p>case. It is very hard to be specific when we have seen no plans, but at the initial (and I must say, very poorly publicised) meeting with yourself and Sue, I got a fairly good idea of the general plans and that makes my position on the support for the project 'Unsure'. My concerns are principally as follows:</p> <p>1) Size of school site: The main concern that we have is that the site is too small to accommodate a two form entry school. The new building will obviously mean that there are enough classrooms, and we welcome some of the additional benefits that the new building will hopefully bring – DCT / Art rooms, outdoor learning on roof, storage, better kitchen and hall. But the outdoor play space at the school is already very much lacking, and the pick up and drop offs are already becoming incredibly crowded. The addition of an additional bulge reception class in September 2012 has already meant that these crucial times of day have become much less pleasant and more stressful than they were last year. Additional classes of children will also inevitably mean additional cars doing drop-offs which will add to the bustle and confusion. I have not been in the corridors and stairwells when the kids are going in for lessons, but I can only imagine the same will apply here.</p> <p>More significant for me however, is the playground space, which is already very crowded at break time. We have heard reports that certain activities (such as ballgames) are frequently not permitted in the playground already due to overcrowding. When this was raised at the initial meeting at the school, the answer was that staggered playtimes would be introduced. However, many parents have concerns about this destroying the ethos of the school (many agree that the interaction between kids from all the year-groups is one of the really special things about John Stainer) and about disruption to those in classes. In addition to this, many parents already feel that the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>school needs more outdoor sports facilities, rather than the same facilities being shared by (nearly) twice as many pupils.</p> <p>2) Disruption during build: While it is obviously great in many ways that the children do not have to be relocated during the build of the school, we and other parents we have spoken to have quite serious concerns about what will happen during the course of the build (scheduled for two terms, but realistically likely to encompass a whole academic year). The loss of the hall and the basketball pitch which is used for football club is the most obvious loss, but just fitting all the kids that are there now (plus an extra class for next year's bulge reception) into much less space is, I believe, going to make the school a very claustrophobic environment for the children. The problems mentioned above (drop off / collection overcrowding, and crowded playgrounds) will be very extreme from Sept 2013 to the end of the build (supposedly 2 terms but realistically likely to be 3 at least) and I think some serious thought needs to go into solutions to these issues.</p> <p>I am also concerned that other parents who will come to view the school during this time and indeed parents with children at the school will either not apply to it or even remove their kids on the basis that the outdoor space is inadequate, and the quality of the school will suffer as a result.</p> <p>There are a number of after school clubs, most notably the football club but also gardening and others that take place in the hall, which are very important to my son and to many other children at the school and we are very keen that these should not simply disappear for a whole year. Can they be relocated?</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

							<p>3) Insufficient consultation with parents:</p> <p>One of the many things we like about John Stainer School is the energy and diverse expertise of the parents. Coming from all different walks of life, there are many parents I have spoken not only take a keen interest in the school, but who in their professional lives are architects, interior designers, planning experts, fundraisers... And I feel that many of them (and others like myself who are not expert in those fields, but who perhaps have other skills that could be helpful) could really assist in developing plans for the school, including proposing solutions for some of the problems outlined above. I feel that the school would be wasting an opportunity not to be more open in outlining its plans and offering them up for discussion. At the moment it feels hard to find out what is going on, and I am certain that many parents do not even know this consultation is happening.</p> <p>A few possible ideas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One parent mentioned incorporating the grass verge on the corner of Mantle Road / St Asaph Road into the playground in order to gain a reasonably large amount of extra space. • I tried last week to find out what happening to the site of Meadowcroft School a very short walk away (on Revelon Road) as I had heard a rumour it was closing down. My enquiries led me to discover that it has been taken over by Drumbeat, but that they will be vacating the premises from April 2013, after which another Primary school called Trinity School will take it over. I can find out absolutely nothing about this new school. Can John Stainer agree to share some of the land (e.g. At the very least for football club in the 2013-14 year when the building is taking place, or even better on a permanent basis). If this school is not moving there, can the site be acquired to turn John Stainer in to an even bigger
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							<p>school over two sites?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I contacted the council last summer as a piece of land close to the railway line (and close to the school) was up for auction at a very cheap price (£20k). It didn't sell and there were some issues surrounding use of the land which was partly used for allotments, but I feel it perhaps hasn't been investigated sufficiently. • Putting aside a decent pot of money on an ongoing basis for hiring out of another space for sports events. • Acquisition of Hartcrown Land (one parent thought this might be possible) to turn into a dedicated outdoor playspace for use by the nursery / reception? • Use of Telegraph Hill park tennis courts for football club / perhaps a tennis club? • Can a second level of playground space be built above the existing basketball pitch? One parent thought this was a possibility? <p>Once again, we really like John Stainer School and feel it has many things to recommend it, but we are keen for it not to go downhill, but rather to improve. I'm sure the potential is there, but there are also many pitfalls that need to be addressed. I think we and many other parents would be very keen to see more detailed plans.</p>
22	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Unsure	Not specified	F	Not specified	<p>In principle I am in favour of the expansion of John Stainer school from one to two-form entry, as I believe it is an excellent school which could well serve an even wider community. It has a committed and dynamic Headteacher, talented teachers and a happy, welcoming atmosphere. However, in physical terms, John Stainer is a small school that occupies a small patch of land; I speak to many local parents with nursery age children, and have heard many times that the amount of playground space is the main barrier to them selecting the school for</p>

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							<p>their children and this is with the current one-form entry.</p> <p>Therefore, if the extension is to go ahead, all options for a larger, better playground space and facilities for playing sport outdoors should be thoroughly investigated. Would it be possible to obtain any additional land to expand the school's footprint, or to acquire or gain access to a playing field that the school could permanently use? For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could John Stainer's current playground be enlarged by the acquisition of the patch of land currently occupied by Hartcrown Ltd (the yard adjacent to the building currently used as the after-school club)? 2. Is there any land attached to Meadowgate school on Revelon Road that could be partitioned off for John Stainer perhaps to create a playing field, or even a new nursery on a separate site? What is going to happen to the Meadowgate school site when its current Special School relocates? 3. Some parents have raised with the council the possibility of acquiring all or part of the patch of land next to the railway track that was recently put up for auction (and not sold) to use as a playing field. Might this be a possibility? <p>John Stainer has an enthusiastic and committed group of parents taking a keen interest in the way the school is developing. We would all be very grateful for the opportunity to see and comment on the plans for the new layout of the school site and the new building.</p>
23	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Unsure	Not specified	F	Not specified	<p>My son is a pupil in year 3 at John Stainer Community School. I am extremely worried about the planned expansion of the school. The play ground is already too small to accommodate the existing number</p>

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

						<p>of pupils</p> <p>- without adding a double form entry. How will the school run comfortably whilst the work is being done? I feel that the small school ethos will be lost and pupils will no longer form valuable relationships across the school year groups. The playground has become dangerous already due to the space limitations caused by the building disruption - if a double entry is to be squeezed in then I feel there is a health and safety issue. The children have already been banned from playing all ball games in the playground - this is unfair and as the Mother of four boys I know that if young children do not "run off" their energy at playtime then behaviour will deteriorate in the classroom.</p> <p>The proposed new school hall will be too small to fit in the amount of pupils in a two form entry and also all the parents - we have up until now really all enjoyed and benefited from collective assembly meetings and also concerts and plays - to split the school for such events would be a great loss.</p> <p>As parents we have not been properly consulted about the proposed expansion - we have not had access to any plans and building work has begun before the deadline for objections (5th November) has passed.</p> <p>Residents living close to the school do not seem to have been informed and notice of the meeting held was buried at the back of the feedback form - it was not clear if the meeting was at 9am or 9pm!! As a parent I have been very involved in helping out at the school and I feel as the name suggests "John Stainer COMMUNITY School" the school should be "our" school - that we - pupils, teachers and parents - should all be consulted and involved in plans for the future of the school. It is quite clear that this is not happening. In fact I'm pretty sure that consultation protocol may have been broken.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							As parents we have no idea what the building work will involve or how the school will finally look - our worries seem to fall on deaf ears and we also have no idea what the school may gain. If there is a shortage of primary school places in Lewisham then really new schools should be built, staffed and supported - it is obviously cheaper to try and squeeze more children into John Stainer - but this will be to the detriment of the existing pupils.
24	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Unsure	Not specified	F	Not specified	<p>In principle I am not wholeheartedly against the school being expanded and I appreciate that renovation would make school more accessible to some disabled pupils. However, like many parents I would like to see plans for the development to make an informed decision.</p> <p><u>My concerns</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overcrowding of play space, which is already small compared to other schools in the area, the knock on effect of the 'temporary' portakabins is already being felt. Reduced space will affect the children negatively and could cause behavioural problems/ bullying. • Staggered playtimes as an answer to the above will cause disruption to those in the classrooms and effectively create an infant/ junior division, something children and parents are keen to maintain is the connection the children have between all year groups and not just on the occasional RE day. The older children benefit from learning to support and nurture the younger children, to be positive role models, the younger children benefit from having older children to keep an eye on them, to make sure they are settling in and if they need help

							<p>or support. The small school ethos will be lost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrance/ exit will be a health and safety issue. This is already an issue at drop off/ pick up time with such a small gate and tight pavement area. It causes tension between parents trying to get out for work and parents rushing in to get kids to school on time. Additional entrance/ exits will have to be provided which could make it difficult to keep all children safely in the playground. There is already an issue with parking all around the school and at these times with double the amount of cars trying to park and children trying to cross the road it will create a potentially dangerous situation. • During the build there will be a loss of space that is currently used for after school clubs; the basketball court, the hall, gardening space. Football club will be lost for the duration which is the only true sport the children can take part in on a regular basis. For a lot of children who are not academic taking part in a sport can really boost their confidence. Particularly for boys, without this outlet of energy, behaviour will be negatively affected. Regular PE classes will no longer have the hall space when the weather is bad. The suggestion of PE classes in one of the portakabins was mentioned in the council meeting - this sounds like it would be very noisy and disruptive for those in the surrounding portakabins. • The 'consultation process' seems to have started after the works to extend the school have already begun. If the expansion doesn't go ahead what will happen to the portakabins and the additional classes already taken on? It seems that the decision has been made with very little information provided to the parents/ community. The lack of
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>communication has caused confusion and anxiety amongst parents. It is a community school but it doesn't feel like a community venture. The meeting organised by the council was badly advertised and not backed up by the school newsletter as well as a general feeling that it has all already been decided so what's the point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That this is the wrong school with too limited a footprint and that there are more suitable sites. Please see attached maps looking at the available sq meterage for other local primary schools in comparison. <p><u>What we want:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More information - we would like to see the plans even if these are just outline at this stage - if we are in a consultation period we would like to know what we are being consulted on, we would like to know what stage the process is at, we would like to see how the school will benefit financially from agreeing to this expansion, we would like to know how the transition/ build period will be managed without negatively affecting the children, we would like to know how the leadership will maintain a nurturing environment for pupils, especially the more vulnerable. <p><u>Our suggestion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Football club/after school clubs to be continued for the duration of the build period, the council to make suitable provisions for this off site. Possibly lease part of Meadowgate school for the duration of the build for additional sports space. There seems to be some confusion as to who will be using
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>this school space from April 2013. Could it be available in whole or part for John Stainer to utilise on a short term or even long term basis?</p> <p>Find outdoor space off site that can be used for extra play space/ PE/ sports space, as above re. Meadowgate, communicate with Haberdasher Aske to discuss the leasing of a section of their extensive playing fields - big society and all that - pursue this and other ideas via Boris Johnson, Hugh Robertson (Minister of State, Dept. for Culture Media and Sport).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pursue the land across the road that runs alongside the railway - what are Network Rail's reasons to object? Lewisham council has not that long ago built an adventure playground beside the railway in Ladywell, Ladywell playground has the railway running alongside it, private gardens back onto the railway. The land in question could be used in such a way that there was a non ball strip closest to the line, a planting/ gardening area along here, fencing and netting can be used, non ball sports - running, hurdles, long jump, high jump, assault course etc etc.. <p><u>Other ideas :</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate the planted verge outside the school at the junction of Mantle Rd and St Asaph Road and reroute the pavement, this would be relatively inexpensive to do but would give a relatively large additional play area, equivalent to the current play structure area.
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create an additional storey above the basketball court transforming the current court into an all weather sports area with a raised play space above - we are going to submit a sketch proposal for this. • Lease the neighbouring builder's yard for the duration of the build for additional play/ sports/ PE area with a view to buying this land for the school, alternatively this could form the playground for the nursery with the current after school club becoming the nursery and the existing nursery playground being brought back into the main play space. The after school club can be re-sited in the existing nursery class room.
25	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Unsure	Not specified	F	Not specified	<p>I am writing to have my concerns and suggestions noted and responded to regarding the proposed expansion of John Stainer Community Primary from a one form (plus currently 2 bulge years) to a two form school.</p> <p>Firstly I would like to say the 'consultation process' seems to have started after the works to expand John Stainer have already begun. If the expansion doesn't get the go ahead what will happen to the portakabins and the additional classes already taken on? Are we to forever have half the playground taken up by these? It seems that the decision has been made with very little information provided to the parents/ community. The meeting organised by the council was badly advertised and not backed up by the school newsletter. There is a general feeling that it has all already been decided.</p> <p>I would like to see more information. Plans, even if just outline at this stage, to see the positive side of the build, the size of the new hall, the classroom layout, the mezzanine play area, it would help to know what</p>

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

						<p>we are being consulted on. Knowledge is key and could actually help clear up any misconceptions. We would like to know what stage the process is at. We would like a clear plan of how the build will be managed to minimise disruption to the children. It is not enough to just be told that it WILL be managed to keep disruption minimal - we want to know HOW that is going to be achieved.</p> <p>Concerns:</p> <p>Overcrowded play space. This is already small compared to other schools in the area. I have made a comparison of the sq meterage of John Stainer against other 2 form schools - please see the attached plans. I think these illustrate how, if this expansion is to go ahead, the school needs to be allocated additional space for play and sports. The knock on effect of the 'temporary' portakabins is already being felt. There is concern this will effect the children negatively and could cause behavioural problems/bullying.</p> <p>The answer currently being given to this issue is staggered playtimes. There already is some staggering that goes on so to increase this will playtime have to be reduced to avoid disruption to those back in class? The beauty of this school is the small size and everyone knowing each other. Both children and parents are keen to maintain the connection between all year groups and not just on the occasional RE day. The older children are able to support and nurture the younger children, this gives them a feeling of responsibility, the younger children benefit from having someone to turn to if they need help or support.</p> <p>The entrance/ exit will be a health and safety issue. It is already an issue with such a small gate and reception classes lining up just inside the gate. Additional entrance/ exit will be needed with a larger school</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>and this in itself causes problems with keeping everyone safely in the playground. There is already an issue with car parking around the school, with double the amount of children it could create a potentially dangerous situation. Has anyone from the council been to John Stainer at drop off time? I think an unannounced visit would be helpful.</p> <p>The loss of space during the build will mean the loss of the football club, the hall for after school clubs, gardening space as well as creating a smaller and smaller general play area. Football club is the only true sport the children get to do on a regular basis. For many children, particularly boys, who may not be academic this can be a way to really boost their confidence. Without this outlet of energy behaviour is inevitably going to be negatively affected. PE classes will no longer have the hall space, there was a suggestion to use one of the portakabins for PE - would this not be incredibly noisy and disruptive to the other portakabin classes?</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <p>1) Football club to be continued for the duration of the build. The council to make suitable provisions for this off site even if this involves a minibus. Possibly lease part of Meadowgate school as this is within easy walking distance. If an additional adult was required to accompany the children as well as Russell, the football coach, a rota of parents could easily be managed. Meadowgate school has a very large site with a big play area. Could this also be used as PE/ after school space? There seems to be some confusion over the future of Meadowgate. One of the parents from JS contacted the council and was told it would be used after 2013 and then he contacted the people who were apparently going to use it and was told no they won't be using it after April 2013. If there is an opportunity for John Stainer to acquire part of the school on a permanent basis this could be the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

						<p>answer to resolve the space issue.</p> <p>2) Look into other outdoor space off site that can be used for extra space/ PE/ sports space. Haberdashers have a huge playing field, part of which - a triangular section at the southern end - seems not to be used. I am not sure if this is part of it or belongs to someone else but it could be accessed through Pincott Place and could become a John Stainer playing field. Speak to Haberdashers - big society, Olympic legacy and all that!</p> <p>3) There is also the land that I contacted the Mayor of Lewisham and Margaret Brightman about back in June. This is across the road from the school and currently the lease is for sale however it has allotments on it and it runs alongside the railway. Margaret told me Network Rail has said they would object to any application we made to us it as a school playing field. What would be there objection? Not that long ago a children's adventure playground was built beside Ladywell railway. The width of the land in question would allow a very wide non ball strip closest to the railway. There are also plenty of sports and activities the children can do without using balls.</p> <p>4) The planted verge at the junction of Mantle Rd and St Asaph Rd could be incorporated into the school playground and the pavement rerouted. This would be relatively inexpensive but give a good addition of space, equivalent to the current play structure.</p> <p>5) Create an additional storey using a lightweight frame construction above the existing basketball court transforming the current space into an all weather sport area with a raised play space above to link in with the proposed mezzanine play area. \</p> <p>6) Buy the neighbouring builder's yard, move the nursery into the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							<p>existing after school house and give the nursery the builders yard as their dedicated play area with a separate entrance, thereby reducing some of the morning congestion. The main playground increases in size as the existing nursery play area is brought back into this space - again reducing morning/ evening congestion as this bottle neck will have been removed. The after school club can then be re-sited to the existing nursery room with direct access onto the playground.</p> <p>I have attached plans to illustrate my points. I look forward to hearing from you.</p>
26	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Unsure	Not specified	F	Not specified	<p>I write with regards to the proposed expansion of John Stainer Primary School. Whilst I acknowledge the need to create extra school places in the borough, I have reservations as to whether the footprint of the school's playground has the necessary space to facilitate this expansion. I love the idea of a brand new school, I am hoping will bring back the music room, include art facilities which are important parts of a children's education, however equally as important are areas for the children to play and run at break times and need the space for them to be able to do so.</p> <p>The decisions made today will shape the lives of us all in the future, so it is vital that all avenues are explored to come to the right decision for the good of the community.</p> <p>I would like raise the following points:</p> <p>* Is there a health and safety document to report the safety of each child in the square footage of the school with the proposed two form entry (minus portacabin and space required for building works). Children need space to run and play at breaks so they are then able to rejoin the classroom with a fresh mind for education. You are offering staggered playtimes as a solution which eliminates the benefits of</p>

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

						<p>interaction amongst children of junior/senior ages, something which is vital for children to learn from their peers and may be disruptive for children that are in classes.</p> <p>* How do you plan to facilitate the sports programme whilst the build is taking place, then longterm for the extra forms. I am deeply concerned that the current hall and basketball court will be removed during the build, therefore I would like to know what measures you are taking to provide space to facilitate sport in both the short during the build and then longterm with the extra classes.</p> <p>* Drop off/pick up; this is currently very congested and difficult to get through with current children & parents. At the moment there is one door that we all use to enter /exit. I would like to know how you plan to tackle this issue.</p> <p>* We have not seen any proposed plans both from the perspective of a parent of the school and also a local resident. Are these able to be made public?</p> <p>* How do plan to facilitate assembly for the whole school, which I think is very important to bring together all years, for end of year concerts, or other seasonal activities celebrated such as dress up days, festivals, world book day and so on that the school do so well.</p> <p>Ideas/ solutions;</p> <p>* can the current street layout be modified to increase the size of the playground; include the triangular greenery just outside the school. * can land be acquired to increase the playground such as the builders yard next to the school. The current afterchool club could double up as the nursery and by acquiring this land you could have a separate</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							<p>entrance to the school for afterschool pick up.</p> <p>* Can you secure space next to the tennis courts at Telegraph Hill top park to facilitate sport for the school? Haberdashers have a vast outdoor space - are they able to share this?</p> <p>* Meadowgate school, please kindly confirm if this school is continuing and if it has been explored as an option to be used as either JS Junior or Senior school and incorporate a special needs division? Alternatively, can John Stainer use their playing space for PE during the build?</p> <p>* when drawing up the plans, the new hall can include the current basketball court with sides that can be open/closed so have dual purpose for sport/assembly? The basketball court could then be used as an all weather sport space and possibly also build on top of this space too?</p> <p>* I believe there has been discussion as to including a roof area for the children to play. Has there been discussion as to what activities the children will do in this space, and its safety. Are you going to include table football tables, or the garden club could have space to grow things there or create other ways to stimulate the children as the space will not be big enough to run around.</p> <p>* could you include a climbing wall somewhere as a permanent fixture the staff can be trained on and the children then learn as part of PE?</p> <p>* a parent spent time exploring the allotments as an area the school could acquire for a possible sports area; is this still an option?</p> <p>One last point of consideration for the future, I would like to know what plans you have in place to facilitate all increase of children in the area at Secondary School level.</p> <p>Please can you advise if you are planning to meet again to further discuss this expansion of John Stainer.</p>
27	Parent/Carer	John	Unsure	Not	M	Not specified	I'm writing in regards to the planned expansion of John Stainer School

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

		Stainer		specified		<p>in Brockley. On first look, this is not an obvious choice as the school has a very small footprint. However as it seems to be going ahead I would appreciate some considerations for outdoor space and ensuring that little is sacrificed to this end.</p> <p>I have 2 children there currently and do hope that my daughter will eventually attend there too. But the school is going to change and this of course raises concerns that I'd like to have addressed.</p> <p>My main concerns are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The lack of any coherent communication of the proposed plans, and the consultation process. 2) The implications of the building work on my childrens' experience at John Stainer - and the actual reality of the expansion. What this will mean to the school, the safety, the access, the playing area, the atmosphere, the "small community school ethos" and personality of what I consider to be a great school which I'm always happy to support and nurture. 3) The footprint of John Stainer compared to other schools in the borough, is very small school so to double the intake without any significant expansion in the playground and sports area is a worry. Ideas from a roof terrace playground, to buying land near the railway have been suggested. <p>So, what I'd like to see happen is:</p> <p>A) A stronger line of communication. My family is part of a small school that has a great reputation and we're called upon to be part of it which is something we're happy to do. But in this instance, it seems like the communication has been very one way and we're being told the bare minimum.</p> <p>This is causing resentment and ill-feeling which I really think needs to be addressed. The consultation process feels very sparse and</p>
--	--	---------	--	-----------	--	--

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							<p>perfunctory. With builders already taking over a sizeable chunk of the playground it also feels like we still have very little information about what is happening and also when!</p> <p>B) If our child's lives at school are to be disrupted for up to a year, then what does this actually mean? What happens to after-school clubs, to the playground, to the classrooms, who goes in Porta-cabin classrooms. These all seem like very basic questions that I would have assumed would have been laid out and communicated to what are clearly concerned parents.</p> <p>The eventual expansion of the school will of course mean more children in a reduced space - which currently has pretty poor access at dropping off and pick up times - as well as more crowded playgrounds, apparently limited access to school assemblies for parents. The health and safety of all this is of course a major concern and I know I'm not alone in not knowing what the reality will be when this work is both happening and completed.</p> <p>I hope you can appreciate my concerns - I know I'm not alone in feeling like this. But again my children are very happy at this school, and we feel very lucky to have a school like this. We know that there is a growing need for more school places so appreciate the need for the expansion, just not at the cost of all the great things we already have.</p> <p>Thank you for your understanding. We look forward to what might be an exciting journey ahead and creating an even better school than the one we have.</p>
28	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Unsure	Not specified	M	Not specified	<p>I am writing to you to voice my utmost concerns in relation to the proposed redevelopment works at John Stainer Community School.</p> <p>I am aware of the consultation deadline of 5th November 2012 and I</p>

						<p>would appreciate that my response to this consultation will be logged and responded to. I have listed below my concerns as a parent and resident.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overcrowding of play space, which is already small compared to other schools in the area, the knock on effect of the 'temporary' portakabins is already being felt. Reduced space will affect the children negatively and could cause behavioural problems/ bullying. My children boy yr 2 & girl yr 1 already dislike playtimes due to limited space. No ball games are allowed for my son so he doesn't enjoy playtime as much and asked me when I spoke about the proposed plans 'how will we be able to play together if another 100 children join our school, there's not enough space to play at the moment and when there was I enjoyed playing with everyone'. My daughter has encountered several accidents causing her distress as she has hurt her head due to a bang of heads with another child, twice she has cut her knees and tights due to being pushed by another child running/playing. This will be a major concern factor overcrowding overall. How will the redevelopment help in this situation? • It has been suggested by the school staggered playtimes as an answer to the above. This causes great concern this will cause disruption to those in the classrooms and effectively create an infant/ junior division, something children and parents are keen to maintain. My son and daughter both enjoy playing with older children as well as the younger children, something I feel is very important for a child to learn and improve communication and social skills. All the children benefit from interacting with each other between all year groups. The older children benefit from learning to
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>support and nurture the younger children, to be positive role models, the younger children benefit from having older children to keep an eye on them, to make sure they are settling in and if they need help or support. The small school ethos will be lost if the staggered playtimes are put in place temporary or permanent. All due to overcrowding. How will the redevelopment help this situation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Entrance and exit will be a health and safety issue. This is already an issue at drop off/ pick up time with such a small gate and tight pavement area. It causes tension between parents trying to get out for work and parents rushing in to get kids to school on time. Additional entrance/ exits will have to be provided which could make it difficult to keep all children safely in the playground. There is already an issue with parking all around the school and at these times with double the amount of cars trying to park and children trying to cross the road it will create a potentially dangerous situation. What is the school travel plan for our school and surrounding roads at the moment? Is there a new proposed plan for a new school travel plan if this redevelopment goes ahead? If so what is it? • The 'consultation process' seems to have started after the works to extend the school have already begun. How is this possible? <p>I must say as a parent and resident I had little and no communication regarding this proposal. I had a little from a parent whom asked me 'what my thoughts were regarding the proposed redevelopment as it would affect me?', to which I was amazed and cross I hadn't received any information from both the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							<p>school, whom I have spoken to and tried to assure me 'there was a letter' in my children's bag. I check both their bags 3 times a week as they get homework 3 times a week. I can assure you I never received one thing?!</p> <p>I was very surprised however that I, nor my fellow residents did not receive any information from yourself (the council) regarding this proposed redevelopment plans. Surely as residents especially I, should have received some information to allow our opinion as this would affect us and our community? I only found out as a parent with 2 children at John Stainer. It seems that decisions have been made with very little information provided to the parents and the community. The lack of communication has caused confusion and anxiety amongst parents. It is a community school but it doesn't feel like a community venture. Apparently there was a meeting organised by the council to which was badly advertised and not backed up by the school newsletter, only parents that went to PTA found out about this. Why was that?</p> <p>If plans go ahead, my other concerns are:</p> <p>Where will the children eat lunch? The school has suggested classrooms; this is a health and safety issue.</p> <p>How will children receive a hot meal? Where will this be cooked?</p> <p>What will happen to the after school clubs?</p> <p>Where will they have PE lessons?</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							<p>Where will assemblies be held?</p> <p>As a parent/ resident within very close proximity of the proposed redevelopment site in question I am requesting as part of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, all information to be disclosed:</p> <p>I received a copy of the proposed and actual plans of the redevelopment site.</p> <p>How much is this redevelopment going to cost?</p> <p>How long are these works expected to start and the end date?</p> <p>How will all plans affect my property which is attached to the adjoining school playground where the redevelopment is planned for?</p> <p>How much disruption of noise levels and in general will my family encounter?</p> <p>Thank you in advance for taking time to read this. I would appreciate that my response to this consultation will be logged and responded to.</p>
29	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Unsure	Not specified	F	Not specified	<p>I am writing to express my concern regarding the planned expansion of John Stainer school.</p> <p>In particular I am very worried about the lack of outdoor space. As it is there is barely the room required for the school in its current form.</p> <p>I would ask the council to think hard to find imaginative solutions to this problem. Staggering playtimes is disruptive to children still at work and not good enough.</p>

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							<p>Either more space must be acquired or the plans abandoned. Our children must have the freedom to run around.</p> <p>Why have no plans been submitted to parents? Why has a temporary classroom gone up with no explanation (never mind consultation). The lack of information from the council is notable.</p>
30	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Unsure	Not specified	F	Not specified	<p>I am writing to offer my input as a parent who currently has a child at John Stainer with a second starting in Sept 2013. Whilst I and many parents recognise the need for extra places and who are not opposed to the expansion of the school, I do have some simple concerns that I wish to raise. I have listed them in bullet form below.</p> <p>I would also like to highlight some aspects of the consultation process so far that will only serve to cause bad feelings towards something that in essence should be a positive exercise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The email address that was supplied for feedback does not work • The consultation meeting was vaguely worded and seemingly buried within a similarly vague document that was inconsistently distributed. • The consultation meeting time was 9:30am when most parents are at work, why was there not a meeting set at the same time as the PTA as this is obviously scheduled to include as many working parents as possible. • When the parents requested a room at the school in which communicate to parents that could not attend the first meeting or were not informed, to collate our feedback to the planning we were told that it was not possible due to the expense of paying the caretaker (who lives on site)

							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no plans for us to be consulted on. <p><u>Feedback to planning proposal:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at present the outside space is over crowded. This will not be remedied by 'staggering' playtimes as it will cause a huge uproar as many parents (and academic studies) favour the mixing of years at playtime. It will also be incredibly disruptive to the children when they can hear the classes exiting the building and then playing underneath their window. • how much of an increase in the schools budget is proposed as if there is not enough money at present to facilitate the opening of a classroom for half an hour then when the number of children (and parents doubles) there will be many shortfalls that come with any expansion. • There are no plans! We have had no offer of any visual plans, this seems odd considering that whatever has been decided is strong enough to has resulted in our toilet block being demolished and prefabs being bought in. You cannot have a consultations if you will not produce plans on which to consult • what are the benefits to the school? We have only heard of the benefits to Lewisham. Our children attend this school, what happens each day is important to us and this has not once been addressed. • obviously it is impossible to double the amount of children without reflecting this in the outside space and yet no mention of expansion has been discussed. • the road scene outside the school is currently a dangerous situation which is the sole responsibility of two crossing ladies who have near misses every week. Double the volume of children and this will result in a very serious road traffic accident involving a child.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • why when we have the smallest footprint in the area are we being expanded? <p><u>Possible solutions to the expansion of outside space that is required;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside the school wall there is the potential to expand by absorbing the grass verge and rerouting the existing path around the edge. • Over the road outside the row of shops there is another large verge that if the road was moved 20 feet to the right could double the outside space. • There is a lot of land along the railway directly opposite the school, which could become a playing field that would not require bussing the children to. It is currently up for sale and is used as allotments owned by Lewisham. • There is Medowgate school that is closing down at the end of 2013, it is one street away, has no plans for use, is owned by Lewisham and could hold more that is currently being proposed in the current plan. • There is a builders yard on the opposite side to the caretakers house that has no structures on and borders the playground that could be incorporated into the playground <p>I hope that I and the other parents will have the opportunity to meet and be involved with what I hope is the continuing discussion as at present it feels like the decisions have been made and that we are being ignored (craning in two massive prefabs that are phase one of the plan that was mentions the previous week and before any plans have been made public is an outrageous way to behave and one that suggests that planning will not offer any problems and likewise the parents). Time will tell. You cannot expect that parents and children will accept that doubling the number of children will be anything other</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							<p>than a short sighted disaster if you do not double the outside space. There is currently a great school. That has been forget for and worked hard at to arrive at something that is anything but a typical inner city school. Water down this at your peril as the current proposal without expanding the outside space will destroy this and impact negatively of what is a very exiting area of Lewisham and one that will bring much needed revenue to the council.</p>
31	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Unsure	Not specified	F	Not specified	<p>Further to a brief parent consultation and parents holding a separate meeting to discuss the proposed expansion of John Stainer School I would like to let you know my concerns, as per request for feedback, and offer some ideas on what to consider if this expansion goes ahead.</p> <p><u>Concerns:</u> It feels very tokenistic and disrespectful to offer a consultation process after the works to extend the school have already begun. It seems that the decision has been made with very little information provided to the parents/ community. The lack of communication has caused confusion and anxiety amongst many parents. We keep being told it is a community school but it doesn't feel like one, particularly this expansion venture. The meeting organised by the council was badly advertised and not backed up by the school newsletter as well as a general feeling that it has all already been decided so what's the point.</p> <p>Generally parents are sympathetic to the need for more places for children though they are particularly concerned with how this will impact on children's play as the outside space is very small (Lewisham having previously sold off a considerable portion of this school's land to property developers) so a smaller playground is now expected to accommodate twice as many children. Reduced space will affect the</p>

						<p>children negatively and could cause behavioural problems/ bullying. The suggested staggered playtimes as a solution will cause disruption to those in classrooms and will not maintain the much appreciated ethos of the school where the mixing of ages mean older children form relationships with younger children, both age groups hugely benefiting.</p> <p>The entrance/exit already causes tension between parents trying to get out for work. Also additional cars parking around the school and extra children trying to cross the road will create a potentially dangerous situation.</p> <p>During the build there will be a loss of space that is currently used for after school clubs; the basketball court, the hall, gardening space. Football club will be lost for the duration which is the only true sport the children can take part in on a regular basis. For a lot of children who are not academic taking part in a sport can really boost their confidence. Particularly for boys, without this outlet of energy, behaviour will be negatively affected. Regular PE classes will no longer have the hall space when the weather is bad.</p> <p>The nearby Brockley school has just be rebuilt. Why was it not rebuilt with the extra places needed in mind? The size of the land they have is much bigger in comparison to John Stainer. This seems shockingly short sighted.</p> <p><u>Suggestions:</u></p> <p>- It is crucial to formally apply to acquire the land across the road that runs alongside the railway. Lewisham council has not that long ago built an adventure playground beside the railway in Ladywell, Ladywell playground has the railway running alongside it and many private gardens back onto the railway. The land in question could be used in such a way that there was a non ball strip closest to the line, a planting/ gardening area along here, fencing and netting can be used,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

						<p>non ball sports - running, hurdles, long jump, high jump, assault course etc.</p> <p>- Lease the neighbouring builder's yard for the duration of the build for additional play/ sports/ PE area with a view to buying this land for the school, alternatively this could form the playground for the nursery with the current after school club becoming the nursery and the existing nursery playground being brought back into the main play space. The after school club can be re-sited in the existing nursery class room. Parents can start various fundraising ventures to help with this.</p> <p>- Create an additional storey above the football court transforming the current court into an all weather sports area with a raised play space above. There are several parents who are architects who can and will assist with sketches/plans.</p> <p>- Find outdoor space off site that can be used for extra play space/ PE/ sports space, and factor in any additional staff costs this may entail. it could be that regular volunteers are used on set times each week to help with this.</p> <p>- Football club/after school clubs to be continued for the duration of the build period, the council to make suitable provisions for this off site. Possibly lease part of Meadowgate school for the duration of the build for additional sports space. There seems to be some confusion as to who will be using this school space from April 2013. Could it be available in whole or part for John Stainer to utilise on a short term or even long term basis?</p> <p>- Incorporate the planted verge outside the school at the junction of Mantle Rd and St Asaph Road and reroute the pavement, this would be relatively inexpensive to do but would give a relatively large</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							<p>additional play area, equivalent to the current play structure area.</p> <p>Finally parents need more information - we would like to see the plans even if these are just outline at this stage - if we are in a consultation period we would like to know what we are being consulted on, we would like to know what stage the process is at, we would like to see how the school will benefit financially from agreeing to this expansion, we would like to know how the transition/ build period will be managed without negatively affecting the children, we would like to know how the leadership will maintain a nurturing environment for pupils, especially the more vulnerable.</p>
32	Parents/Carers	John Stainer	Unsure	Not specified	M/F	Not specified	<p>We as a family are greatly concerned about the planned expansion of John Stainer School. We believe that John Stainer is currently a great school for our son who is in year 3. We perceive the school as a great place for learning which is inclusive and supportive. We appreciate that our son's learning, strengths and skills have been fully developed.</p> <p>As a small school we have serious concerns that the planned expansion will detrimentally affect the learning experience of the children.</p> <p>Our concerns are as follows: Our son is particularly concerned about the lack of space in the playground for the outside activities (rounders, football, etc). For example, he had a bump on his knee two weeks ago because of other children playing in an already confined space. Similarly, it is not clear where PE is going to take place, which is one of the most important parts of the curriculum, in our view. The congestion at the entrance and exit is always a problem. In addition, we are too scared to cross the road nearby the school due to the number of cars parking to transport the children to and from school. Clearly, these problems will only increase during the build and</p>

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							<p>the proposed enlargement of the number of children.</p> <p>It appears that the work has already started without the proper consultation process. We know that many other families are greatly concerned about how these changes have been informed, enforced and arranged without clearly explaining how these will affect our children's education.</p> <p>In our view, John Stainer does not appear to have the physical structure and facilities to cope with this planned expansion. For example, close to the area, there is a whole education building (with enough playground space) which is not currently used (Meadowgate school).</p>
33	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Unsure	Not specified	F	Not specified	<p>My daughter is in reception class at John Stainer school in Brockley. I am aware that there is work going on to accommodate the increase in numbers at the school. I have a few questions and concerns.</p> <p>The decision has been made to increase the school from a one form entry, to a two form entry but I am uncertain about the considerations if any that have been made to deal with the problem of lack of space in the playground as a consequence.</p> <p>Having children that feel safe and can move happily in the playground is of paramount importance to my child's happiness at school. Not to mention the essential requirement for the health of children to exercise and run off steam outside.</p> <p>I wonder if you were aware of the amount of space available to students in the playground? Could you please explain your reasoning and legal obligations in terms of space in the playground. There is</p>

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							<p>certainly a limit to the amount of students this small space can accommodate.</p> <p>I can offer a couple of suggestions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Perhaps the caretakers building could be better served as playground space. -the verge of grass outside the school could be included as part if the playground, build the wall around it. -There is a builders yard next door to the school which could be compulsorily purchased. - there is vacant land near the railway lines opposite the school. <p>I also find the small entrance to the school hugely impractical at present and only wonder how the school will cope in subsequent years.</p> <p>Please let me know how you intend to address these very significant problems.</p>
34	Parents/Carers	John Stainer	Unsure	Not specified	M/F	Not specified	<p>We would be grateful if you could take our views into account as part of the consultation exercise regarding the future of John Stainer Primary School.</p> <p>SUMMARY</p> <p>1. We are shocked that the decision to expand the school appears to have been taken <i>prior</i> to the consultation process – works are already under way at the school.</p>

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

						<p>2. This consultation has not provided parents with adequate information. In particular no detailed plans relating to proposed works have been shown to parents.</p> <p>3. If the proposed expansion goes ahead we strongly recommend that the council finds additional land to increase the available outdoor play space, which is already small compared to other schools in the area.</p> <p>4. The proposal to stagger playtimes in order to prevent overcrowding in the outdoor spaces will have a negative effect on the existing, excellent, relationships between older and younger pupils.</p> <p>5. The entrance/exit to the school (main gate) is already too small and if the proposed expansion goes ahead this will need to be widened to accommodate increased numbers.</p> <p>6. We are concerned by the inevitable loss of outdoor space during the build process. The portakabins already installed have already significantly reduced the play space and prevented some after-school clubs from operating.</p> <p>7. We cannot understand why this has been chosen for expansion when there are other schools with larger footprints in the Borough that would more easily be able to accommodate an expansion of this kind. The council has offered inadequate evidence to support its choice.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>REQUESTS & SUGGESTIONS</p> <p>1. The council should urgently provide parents with access to plans so that we are able to have some input, as part of the consultation process.</p> <p>2. We would like urgent clarification as to whether the council intends to act on parents' views and recommendations. We request precise information to clarify what stage this process has actually reached. Has a decision already been taken to go ahead with the expansion? If not, why are the building works already under way?</p> <p>3. Can the council find alternative venues nearby for football and other after school clubs so that these can be continued during the build period? Perhaps it's possible to lease part of Meadowgate School for the duration. Could there be a more permanent use of that school's site in future, to provide more space for John Stainer if the expansion goes ahead?</p> <p>4. Can the council acquire the land across the road that runs along the railway? We are aware that Lewisham council recently built an adventure playground beside the railway in Ladywell, so there is a precedent for this kind of use.</p> <p>5. Can the council incorporate the planted verge outside the school at the junction of Mantle Rd and St Asaph Road and reroute the pavement? This would be relatively inexpensive to do but would create significant additional play area, equivalent in size to the current play</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							<p>structure area.</p> <p>6. Can the council lease the neighbouring builder's yard for the duration of the build as an additional play / sport area, with a view to buying this land subsequently for the school? We urge the council to do so in any event (whether or not the expansion goes ahead) since the school's footprint is already small, as noted above.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing the outcome of the consultation and thank you for your attention to the above.</p>
35	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Unsure	Not specified	F	Not specified	<p>With regards to the JS expansion we have very little information (or even a plan to look at) and are being asked to support the expansion without knowing if our concerns or suggestions have been explored or incorporated into the planning.</p> <p>There are many implications arising from an expansion of John Stainer and it is hard to thoroughly evaluate the proposal without a detailed plan, so much of the discussion was based around the impact of doubling the the schools intake and possible solutions.</p> <p>The council should in addition to putting together an enduring build proposal should be looking to acquire additional outside space for the school.</p> <p><u>Our concerns:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overcrowding of play space, which is already small compared to other schools in the area, the knock on effect of the 'temporary' portakabins is already being felt. Reduced space will affect the children negatively and could cause

							<p>behavioural problems/ bullying.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staggered playtimes as an answer to the above will cause disruption to those in the classrooms and effectively create an infant/ junior division, something children and parents are keen to maintain is the connection the children have between all year groups and not just on the occasional RE day. The older children benefit from learning to support and nurture the younger children, to be positive role models, the younger children benefit from having older children to keep an eye on them, to make sure they are settling in and if they need help or support. The small school ethos will be lost. • Entrance/ exit will be a health and safety issue. This is already an issue at drop off/ pick up time with such a small gate and tight pavement area. It causes tension between parents trying to get out for work and parents rushing in to get kids to school on time. Additional entrance/ exits will have to be provided which could make it difficult to keep all children safely in the playground. There is already an issue with parking all around the school and at these times with double the amount of cars trying to park and children trying to cross the road it will create a potentially dangerous situation. • During the build there will be a loss of space that is currently used for after school clubs; the basketball court, the hall, gardening space. Football club will be lost for the duration which is the only true sport the children can take part in on a regular basis. For a lot of children who are not academic taking part in a sport can really boost their confidence. Particularly for boys, without this outlet of energy, behaviour will be negatively affected. Regular PE classes will no longer
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>have the hall space when the weather is bad. The suggestion of PE classes in one of the portakabins was mentioned in the council meeting - this sounds like it would be very noisy and disruptive for those in the surrounding portakabins.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 'consultation process' seems to have started after the works to extend the school have already begun. If the expansion doesn't go ahead what will happen to the portakabins and the additional classes already taken on? It seems that the decision has been made with very little information provided to the parents/ community. The lack of communication has caused confusion and anxiety amongst parents. It is a community school but it doesn't feel like a community venture. The meeting organised by the council was badly advertised and not backed up by the school newsletter as well as a general feeling that it has all already been decided so what's the point. <p><u>What we want:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More information - we would like to see the plans even if these are just outline at this stage - if we are in a consultation period we would like to know what we are being consulted on, we would like to know what stage the process is at, we would like to see how the school will benefit financially from agreeing to this expansion, we would like to know how the transition/ build period will be managed without negatively affecting the children, we would like to know how the leadership will maintain a nurturing environment for pupils, especially the more vulnerable.
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

							<p><u>Our suggestion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Football club/after school clubs to be continued for the duration of the build period, the council to make suitable provisions for this off site. Possibly lease part of Meadowgate school for the duration of the build for additional sports space. There seems to be some confusion as to who will be using this school space from April 2013. Could it be available in whole or part for John Stainer to utilise on a short term or even long term basis? <p>Find outdoor space off site that can be used for extra play space/ PE/ sports space, as above re. Meadowgate, communicate with Haberdasher Aske to discuss the leasing of a section of their extensive playing fields - big society and all that - pursue this and other ideas via Boris Johnson, Hugh Robertson (Minister of State, Dept. for Culture Media and Sport).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pursue the land across the road that runs alongside the railway - what are Network Rail's reasons to object? Lewisham council has not that long ago built an adventure playground beside the railway in Ladywell, Ladywell playground has the railway running alongside it, private gardens back onto the railway. The land in question could be used in such a way that there was a non ball strip closest to the line, a planting/ gardening area along here, fencing and netting can be used, non ball sports - running, hurdles, long jump, high jump, assault course etc etc.. <p><u>Other ideas :</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate the planted verge outside the school at the junction of Mantle Rd and St Asaph Road and reroute the pavement, this would be relatively inexpensive to do but would give a relatively large additional play area, equivalent to the current play structure area. • Create an additional storey above the basketball court transforming the current court into an all weather sports area with a raised play space above - we are going to submit a sketch proposal for this. • Lease the neighbouring builder's yard for the duration of the build for additional play/ sports/ PE area with a view to buying this land for the school, alternatively this could form the playground for the nursery with the current after school club becoming the nursery and the existing nursery playground being brought back into the main play space. The after school club can be re-sited in the existing nursery class room.
36	Parent/Carer	John Stainer	Unsure	Not specified	F	Not specified	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the plans for expansion at my children's school. We chose the school as it was small and deliberately avoided the bigger (double form entry schools) in the area. In a school of its current size, the children know each others names and there is much interplay and friendships between them.</p> <p>With the last two extra classes, there is no space in the hall for assemblies, discos, fetes etc. There is no room in the playground to play and its extremely crowded when trying to collect your child at the end of the day. The footprint of the school is much smaller than all others in the area and cannot accommodate the children that are there already.</p>

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

						<p>It seems as if the expansion is happening without our comments being given consideration. We have very little information and have seen no plans for the works. There surely must be a plan for acquiring additional space for the school as part of the expansion. Even simply getting around the building with extra children on site is problematic at this stage.</p> <p>The main points that concern us as parents are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The overcrowding of play space. 2 Staggered playtimes as an answer to the above will cause disruption to those in the classrooms and effectively create an infant/ junior division. 3 Entrance/ exit will be a health and safety issue. There is already a problem with the one small gate entrance and parking around the school. 4 During the build there will be a loss of space that is currently used for after school clubs and for PE. Where will these take place? 5 Will it be safe for children around the build? Already there have been cars and vans parked in the playground taking up more space and children playing around them. This is not safe. 6 It feels like the consultation process has started after the works have begun. We already have portakabins that take up a huge area and temporary (freezing cold) toilets. What happens if the expansion doesn't go ahead? will these remain? 7 Many parents are unaware if what is going on and many feel that
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

APPENDIX SEVEN JOHN STAINER PRIMARY SCHOOL

							<p>they don't have a say as the work has begun. The first term of this year has already been very disruptive with works that surely could have been completed over the summer.</p> <p>We would like more information. What are the plans? What stage is the process at? What are we consulting on? How will the expansion benefit the school? Its already Outstanding and pupils are happy. How will the build be managed?</p> <p>How can the school possibly retain its small school ethos?</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

