



DRAFT

London Borough of Lewisham

Place Planning Strategy 2017-2022 *FOR CONSULTATION*

(V4.3-12-12-16)

Contents

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Context – Population growth and the Council’s role in providing school places
- 3.0 Lewisham Primary Strategy for Change 2008-17
- 4.0 Building Schools for the Future
- 5.0 Lewisham Education Commission Report 2016
- 6.0 New Principles
- 7.0 Forecasting
- 8.0 Primary Demand
- 9.0 Secondary Demand
- 10.0 Early Years Foundation Stage Demand
- 11.0 Special Educational Needs and Disability Demand
- 12.0 Alternative Provision
- 13.0 Post-16
- 14.0 Strategy in Summary
- 15.0 Overseeing the Strategy - Governance
- 16.0 Risks
- 17.0 Finance
- 18.0 Next Steps

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Primary Strategy for Change 2008-17
- Appendix 2 – Tables
- Appendix 3 – Lewisham Education Commission Report
- Appendix 4 – Governance, 6i – Governance Structure,
6ii – CYP Strategic Asset Board Terms of Reference
- Appendix 5 – Free School Presumption
- Appendix 6 – Lewisham Place Planning Localities (PPL) Map

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This (draft) strategy replaces the 'Lewisham Primary Strategy for Change 2008-17', providing guidance and principles by which the local authority can fulfil its statutory duty to ensure the provision of sufficient places for pupils of statutory school age and, within financial constraints, accommodation that is both suitable and in good condition.
- 1.2 Firstly the strategy reviews how the local authority has previously fulfilled its statutory duty, lessons learned and whether the guiding principles are relevant today. Additionally the strategy draws from the recent Education Commission Report (Appendix 3) and the recommendations it made on place planning.
- 1.3 The strategy then goes on to look at the forecasted demand for places and how that interacts more specifically with demand for certain schools. Subsequently the strategy looks at the opportunities that are available to help the Local Authority provide sufficient places.
- 1.4 Finally the strategy outlines the next steps regarding the consultation and approvals process.
- 1.5 In addition it should be noted that once adopted the strategy would become a working document, updated and revised on a yearly basis regarding forecasting, need and how to marry the two. However, the principles and methodology would remain the same.

2.0 Context – Population growth and the council’s role in providing school places

2.1 As of 2016 Lewisham has a total population of circa 297,000 people with an expectation that it will reach over 320,000 by 2026. This expectation of growth has risen since the Lewisham Primary Strategy for Change which in 2008 forecast Lewisham to have a population of only 290,000 by 2026.

2.2 Current Greater London Authority (GLA) forecasting - derived from Office for National Statistics (ONS) data - also suggests that there are currently 95,300 children and young people aged 0-25 in the borough at present. It is anticipated that this population will increase by an average of 1% each year through to 2030 and then grow by 0.5% annually. As a result by 2036 there will be approximately 110,300 more young people aged 0-25 in the borough (15.7% larger than now).

2.3 The council retains the statutory responsibility to ensure that there are sufficient school places available for all Lewisham children and young people who need one. The council has overarching responsibilities for school admissions, coordinating admissions at reception and at secondary transfer, aiming to meet parental preference.

2.4 In addition to securing school places for pupils aged five to 16, the local authority also has the following related statutory responsibilities;

- The council has to make suitable provision to meet the needs of Children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND)
- Early years provision: The council is responsible for childcare sufficiency which overlaps with school provision
- Post 16 education and training where the council takes overall responsibility for sufficiency and suitability of provision.

2.5 While the council has responsibility for providing sufficient school places, it is not for the council to build new community schools. Once the council identifies a need for a new school it may use one of the following two routes to establish it:

1. The free school presumption route (Appendix 5 – Free School Presumption) whereby the council would be responsible for the costs associated with acquiring a site and building the school, and would then invite academy sponsors to put forward their school proposals on a competitive basis. Whilst the council can make recommendations as to whom it would prefer as the sponsor, the decision lies with the Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC) on behalf of the Secretary of State. Alternatively;

2. The council could rely on a free school sponsor to apply to the Department for Education (DfE) to open a new school. In this instance it would be for the Education Funding Agency (EFA) to bear the costs associated with acquiring a site and building the school. The decision would be entirely at the discretion of the Regional Schools Commissioner, but experience elsewhere indicates that council-backed schemes are more likely to succeed.
- 2.6 The council can however permanently or temporarily expand existing maintained schools and work with existing academies to expand.
- 2.7 Generally it is more cost effective to provide permanent places in primary schools. There are times however where site and time constraints mean that this is not possible. There are also occasions where the increase in numbers only applies to one cohort of students. In these circumstances it is better to provide a temporary bulge class, so that we do not create too large a surplus in the system.
- 2.8 Expansion of secondary schools is much more complex and hence expensive. This is partly because specialist facilities (e.g. sport, science, technology) may also need to be provided. Students also need to access these facilities during the building process which makes the prospect of decanting a school far more challenging. Additionally, the scope to expand Lewisham secondary schools is limited as most have been completely rebuilt through the Building Schools for the Future Scheme, and a large proportion are also part of complex and potentially restrictive PFI contracts.
- 2.9 It should be noted that expanding existing schools provides the council greater confidence that provision will be good and that it will be popular. However, the challenges of expansion can also put standards at risk in good schools.
- 2.10 While new schools offer a chance to bring new learning environments and attract high quality providers, the council does not control the provision of free schools, and new and untested providers can be risky.
- 2.11 As an inner London borough there are also considerable challenges in finding sites for new schools. However, moving forwards there is the opportunity that EFA funded 'new' schools will provide the most practicable way to meet some of our place needs, particularly with regards to Secondary and SEND provision.

3.0 Lewisham Primary Strategy for Change 2008-17 (Appendix 1)

- 3.1 The previous place planning strategy set out the rationale for an unprecedented level of Primary School place demand, and an equally large programme of capital expansion. This was based upon ever increasing birth rates with the expectation that by 2017 the number of reception places needed would have risen by over 20% from 3,136 in 2008 to 3,677 in 2017.
- 3.2 Indeed the rate of increase has actually gone beyond these early predictions with numbers peaking in the 2014 Autumn Census at 3,868 (and only falling by 18 from this peak in 2015/16).
- 3.3 As a result over that period there have been a large number of new places provided. Indeed over the last 7 years, there have been 15 permanent primary school expansions (where a school has been able to take a permanent increase to its published admission number – PAN – either through the use of extra space, reconfiguration or extension of the premises), the implementation of 70 bulge classes (where a school has been able to take an additional form of entry as a ‘one-off’ either utilising existing space, being provided with temporary accommodation, a reconfiguration of existing space or small extension), 2 new Primary phases provided within existing secondary schools (whereby secondary schools have become ‘all-through’ schools, i.e. taking pupils aged from 5-16 rather than 11-16) and 1 new Free School. This equates to an increase over that 7 year period of 4,626 places.
- 3.4 Table 1 in Appendix 2 lists the schools with bulge classes and permanent expansions. Bulge classes are highlighted in yellow and permanent expansions in green. It should be noted that in some instances bulge classes have been followed by permanent expansions, so not all bulge classes are available to be recycled. It is important to note that in Lewisham bulge classes are mainly in high quality permanent accommodation not temporary buildings and portakabins.
- 3.5 Throughout this period, the delivery of additional school places has been guided by the key principles that were set out within the Primary Strategy for Change, these are;
- 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 size of school, removing half-form entries, and promoting continuities of education;
 - Enable school extended services for pupils, parents and communities;
 - Optimise the use of the council’s capital resources available for investment.

- 3.6 Throughout this period the local authority has successfully ensured that there have been sufficient places to enable it to meet its statutory duty. However there have been occasions where places could not be provided in the right area and/or at short notice. 'Emergency bulges' (those that are put in at the last minute, have not been advertised and which have been used to help the council meet its statutory duty regardless of preference) have had a negative financial impact on the schools concerned as pupils have over time moved to schools that may be geographically closer to where they live or higher up on their original preference list.
- 3.7 A consequential benefit of the programme is the positive effect on the condition of Lewisham schools, improving the fabric of buildings as well as providing more suitable teaching and learning environments. The council has combined necessary asset management investment with basic need capital to optimise benefits for schools.
- 3.8 The programme of development has also ensured that by September 2018 there will be no more schools with half form entry (that is 1.5 or 2.5) within the borough, with St Winifred's Primary School and Our Lady and St Philip Neri Primary School both undergoing re-development in partnership with the Southwark Archdiocese.
- 3.9 However, alongside these successes it is important to note that at times there has been a perceived large oversupply of places (which can be seen in Table 5 in Appendix 2), whereby there has been an initial oversupply at Offer Day (and indeed at Autumn Census), but which has generally fallen to acceptable limits due to in year admissions. This has proved an additional burden on some schools' finances when classes have not filled up by the Autumn Census date. However it is important for choice and geographic availability that there is a small oversupply of places. 3% is our current target, which is below the DfE expectation of 5%, to allow us to effectively manage in year admissions.
- 3.10 Additionally, the cost of providing additional places has increased substantially during the period, not least as a result of any remaining opportunities being significantly more complex coupled with constrained sites and the impact of older buildings, alongside a London construction bubble that continues to be pushing costs up. The EFA currently has a benchmark of £25,000 per place, which does not take into account any of the issues highlighted, and is indeed a national benchmark.
- 3.11 For example in Lewisham the last 3 expansion projects cost an average of £33,500/place, the 3 prior to that averaged £23,700/place – so an increase of almost £10,000 per place. This trend has also been replicated with bulge classes whereby the last 7 bulge classes averaged £18,100/place, compared

to the 7 prior to that which averaged £10,600/place – an increase of £7,500 per place.

DRAFT

4.0 Building Schools for the Future

4.1 The Building Schools for the Future programme was an initiative by the Labour government to replace, rebuild or renovate every secondary school in England over a 15 – 20 year period.

4.2 Lewisham was one of the first areas in the country to benefit from the BSF programme (a Pathfinder) and as such was able to deliver one of the most ambitious programmes in the country despite the decision to cancel the programme by the coalition government in 2010.

4.3 In total 13 schools in the Borough benefitted from the funding; 9 secondary schools, 3 special schools and 1 further education establishment.

4.4 The 9 secondary schools delivered under the scheme were;

- **Addey & Stanhope School** - Part refurbishment (83%), part new build (17%)
February 2011 – September 2012
- **Bonus Pastor Catholic College** – Full rebuild
December 2010 – September 2012
- **Conisborough College** – Full rebuild
December 2007 – April 2009
- **Deptford Green School** – Full rebuild
August 2010 – September 2012
- **Prendergast Vale** - Part refurbishment (79%), part new build (21%)
December 2010 – September 2012
- **Sedgehill School** – Full rebuild
December 2007 – January 2009
- **Sydenham School** - Part refurbishment (27%), part new build (73%)
May 2013 – December 2016
- **Trinity School** – Full rebuild
April 2009 – January 2011
- **Prendergast Hilly Fields** - Part refurbishment (25%), part new build (75%)
December 2010 – April 2013

4.5 The 3 special schools delivered under the scheme were;

- **Brent Knoll** - Full rebuild
December 2013 – September 2015
- **Drumbeat** - Full rebuild
December 2010 – April 2013
- **Abbey Manor College** - Part refurbishment (5%), part new build (14%)
April 2012 – December 2012

4.6 The 1 further education establishment delivered under the scheme was;

- **Crossways Sixth Form College (now Christ the King)** – Part
refurbishment (3%), part new build (6%)
June 2012 – February 2013

DRAFT

5.0 Lewisham Education Commission Report *(Appendix 3)*

5.1 The Lewisham Education Commission published their report in April 2016 following an 11 week period of enquiry on 5 main areas;

- School organisation, given the national and regional context
- Sustainable, school-led model of improvement for Lewisham
- The best means of providing additional secondary and SEND places in Lewisham and of ensuring existing schools are schools of choice
- Leading edge practice at Key Stages 4 and 5 that could benefit Lewisham
- Improving how Lewisham's system serves the most vulnerable

5.2 With regards to this draft strategy the report made 5 key recommendations;

- Review planning, both for place numbers and the new schools needed
- Develop and consult on a clear 5-year School Place Planning Strategy
- Formalise a cross-borough agreement on secondary places
- Work closely with the EFA
- Support schools who wish to set up Multi Academy Trusts (MATs)

5.3 Bearing this in mind, we have developed 7 key recommendations relating to Lewisham's place planning duties. They are;

1. We must finish what we have started, and learn from our experiences. Over 50 projects are currently still being worked on and must be closed out
2. We need to maximise use of the investment that has already gone into schools therefore we should be recycling bulge classes where projections justify it – unless there is a good reason not to
3. We need to take advantage of free school opportunities – working with potential sponsors and the EFA to secure what Lewisham needs
4. We need to re-evaluate localities and previously considered expansion opportunities alongside demographic change and future growth projections to identify value for money projects as well as a more accurate forecasting model
5. We need to work with the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) team to consider the recent sufficiency review for EYFS and develop a plan for childcare and nursery education
6. We need clear plans for Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) places and Alternative Provision (AP) – providing more of the right kind of places within the borough and reducing the number of placements out of borough
7. We need to develop a better information sharing agreement with other local authorities to share data and information relating to school place planning and continue to work as part of London Councils

5.4 These recommendations inform this strategy

6.0 New principles

- 6.1 The Lewisham of 2017 and beyond is very different to Lewisham in 2008. As mentioned previously population has increased more rapidly than expected, with population growth figures reached over ten years earlier than originally forecast, and no signs of stopping with a further 25,000 people expected to be resident in Lewisham within the next 10 years. In addition the full effect of the financial crisis of 2008 is still being felt across the public sector, the housing crisis has become more acute and the impact of Brexit is still unknown.
- 6.3 In addition to this, the funding landscape looks increasingly uncertain, both in terms of capital funding to further develop places and also revenue so we need to consider how best to utilise our (and others) resources to best effect.
- 6.4 This strategy suggests a set of revised principles upon which future place planning will be based. These are;
1. We aim to provide primary school places according to the level of need within different localities and we will continue to use 'planning areas'. Our aspiration is for children to go to primary school within one mile, but within two miles is reasonable
 2. As far as possible our school expansion proposals will be for schools that are already achieving high standards and if not, have robust school improvement plans in place
 3. We will work with external partners to overcome the financial challenges related to providing additional school places (i.e. Department for Education, Education Funding Agency, Dioceses, Multi Academy Trusts)
 4. We will aim for efficient delivery of education, with consideration of the economies of scale and the viable size for schools and impact on revenue budgets
 5. We will ensure that any proposal for the provision of extra places is scrutinised both in terms of suitability and value for money as well as making best use of existing assets and resources

7.0 Forecasting

- 7.1 Current forecasting is informed by two sources. Firstly Lewisham utilises the GLA School Roll Projections service (as do 30 other London boroughs), however due to historic issues regarding accuracy, and the subsequent need for emergency bulge class provision to meet demand, Lewisham has used a more refined 'Lewisham' model to improve accuracy.
- 7.2 Since 2009 the GLA School Roll Projections have become more accurate (indeed in 2015 only two boroughs were underestimated in terms of places needed) and Lewisham should continue to work with both sets of data and undertake sensitivity analysis, given the high cost of getting it wrong.
- 7.3 Both sets of projections are informed both by centrally held demographic data, including the Office of National Statistics (ONS) census data, fertility rates and birth rates together with locally held information such as migration patterns and planned housing growth.
- 7.4 The methodology also takes account of "survival ratios" which are the percentage of children who historically move into the following academic year in an area. This is particularly important in Lewisham where we are a net importer of students at primary school but a net exporter of students at secondary.
- 7.5 Both sets of forecasts are now a very good indicator of place need, but they remain statistical models which should be seen as a valuable tool rather than a definitive position. There are a number of factors which can lead to the forecasts being revised up or down.
- 7.6 Birth rates, migration patterns and the impact of local regeneration projects can change significantly in a short period of time. Projections for Reception numbers in Lewisham had been revised significantly downwards from 2013 (after nearly a decade of sustained growth), however birth rates subsequently started to rise again so were revised up again from 2014. However another dip in birth rates has resulted in figures being revised down again in the 2016 forecasting.
- 7.7 Secondary projections are more secure as they largely take account of children already in the system. However, the "survival ratios" are a particularly important factor in Lewisham as we are currently a net exporter of secondary pupils. This may change as pressures on secondary places grow in neighbouring boroughs and Lewisham schools improve, therefore leading to an increase in demand beyond that in the current projections. We also aim to make all our secondary schools more popular and schools of choice.
- 7.8 An analysis of the past 5 years of forecasting data shows that the mean average of multiple years of forecasting data can be broadly relied upon to

ensure sufficient places. Indeed, taking this one step further it would be prudent to utilise this average figure provided that it is made up of at least three years of forecasting and at least three years out (prior) from the time of need so as to ensure the ability to commission suitable places.

- 7.9 An interrogation exercise on this can be seen in Table 2 in Appendix 2, which shows the number of primary reception places broken down by primary place planning locality (PPL) alongside the actual reception role taken at the summer census, set against the mean average of the forecasting data sets, the maximal and minimal forecasting figures and the forecasting 3 years out (prior) to the actual. (Appendix 6 features a map of the PPL areas)
- 7.10 What this shows is that the forecasting mean average is indeed a suitably accurate measure, showing that over the past 5 years the forecasting mean average has always been within 2.5% of the summer census figures. Given that we would make an allowance for a 3% average oversupply of places, then this margin of error should be deemed tolerable.
- 7.11 Specifically the table shows both places and forecasting measured against summer census figures, so where it is highlighted green there are spare places, and where highlighted red there would be insufficient places. In all instances however you can see that the variance under places (compared to census) in the first column of figures is always green thanks to that spare capacity.

8.0 Primary Demand

8.1 The primary places forecasts suggest that over the next 4 years we should expect an overall fall in demand due to the recent dip in birth rate.

Year	Number of data sets	Mean Average Forecast	Forecast + 3% spare capacity	Current Expected PAN (with no bulges used)	Expected gap to be filled by bulge classes	Bulge classes required
2017/18	4	3895	4012	3855 ¹	157	5-6
2018/19	3	3884	4001	3900 ²	101	3-4
2019/20	2	3897	4013	3900 ³	Up to 113	Up to 4
2020/21	1	3776	3889	3900 ³	0	0

¹ Expansion of Sir Francis Drake by 30 places and St Winifred's by 15 places

² Expansion of Ashmead by 30 places and Our Lady and St Philip Neri by 15 places

³ There are an additional 210 places to come from approved free schools but we do not currently know when these will occur

8.2 However, GLA population projections suggest that birth rate is starting to creep up again across the capital and that the wider population will increase by approximately 1.25% per year in coming years. Based on that information we can make rough forecasts for growth over the following 5 year period, as seen in the table below (again not taking into account of additional 210 places from approved free schools).

Year	GLA Population Projection Forecast	Forecast + 3% spare capacity	Current expected PAN (with no bulges used)	Expected gap in places
2021/22	3823	3,938	3900	38
2022/23	3871	3,987	3900	87
2023/24	3919	4,037	3900	137
2024/25	3968	4,087	3900	187
2025/26	4018	4,139	3900	239

8.3 Given that there is currently a 'Published Admissions Number' for reception year totalling 3810 plus the expansions of Sir Francis Drake (30 places), St Winifred's (15 places) and Our Lady and St Philip Neri (15 places) plus the proposed expansion of Ashmead (30 places) and the pre-approved Harris Lewisham Free School (90 places tabled for 2019) and Citizen Free School (120 places) it would appear that for the foreseeable future we should be able to meet the anticipated need through effective recycling of bulge classes where required alongside the provision of two new free schools. However, it should be noted that the decision making on free schools is not with the council but with the DfE (devolved from the Secretary of State), so that relying on that provision has an element of risk.

8.4 At Place Planning Locality (PPL) level the forecasts continue to vary dramatically, mainly as a result of the lack of correlation between where people live and where they apply for schools. Indeed it is acknowledged by the GLA that to have a greater chance of accuracy forecasting at PPL level

then boroughs need to consider fewer PPL areas. Lewisham currently has 6 PPLs, of varying sizes both in terms of geography and number of schools, which have been in place since before the inception of the Lewisham Primary Strategy for Change in 2008.

- 8.5 Moving forwards it is suggested that we revise down from 6 PPLs to 3 or 4 areas. This would result in better forecasting accuracy on a local level as well as providing more flexibility to be able to provide supply within PPL areas. This would ensure an acknowledgement of distinct areas of the borough while enabling a better acceptance of pupil flow.
- 8.6 In the interim we will consider the impact of school popularity upon place demand and the impact that it has on forecasting (which is derived from post code data).
- 8.7 Table 3 in Appendix 2 shows the number of places available in each school and PPL alongside the number of 'on-time' first preference applications. Those figures highlighted red are where first preference applications outstrip the number of places available in a school. Those emboldened figures that are highlighted red show where first preference demand outstrips supply in a PPL (and in green shows where there is sufficient supply). Furthermore, those schools that are highlighted in grey are those that over the past 6 years have had first preference applications that outstrip supply on at least 5 occasions (the suggestion here is that they are long-standing popular schools that should be considered as opportunities for extra places where possible and as required)
- 8.8 Interpreting Table 3 we can see that there are areas of particularly high demand in PPL 1, 2 and 5, namely Forest Hill & Sydenham (PPL1), Blackheath & Lee Green (PPL2) and New Cross & Evelyn (PPL5). Clearly in PPL1 and PPL5 there is a growing demand for places and in PPL2 there appears to be a high demand for a certain set of schools.
- 8.9 One of the options for ensuring sufficient places is recycling bulge classes to meet more localised demand, given the expected levelling off of forecast growth in the short term. It is sensible to consider how this can be done in a fair and transparent manner. The council has therefore already reached out to schools that currently have bulge classes that are available for recycling in either 2017 or 2018, describing a process by which we would look to rank them in an order of preference in relation to need and other factors (Table 4 in Appendix 2 shows in what years bulges are first available to be recycled, and in which PPL they reside)
- 8.10 The council is aware that schools are able to decide to recycle bulges themselves (this is a governing body decision) so long as they inform the council in sufficient time so that it is able to fulfil its admissions responsibility.

Given that schools are struggling financially, it is likely that a number of schools that are confident of filling the places will want to do this to maximise income and economies of scale. Others that have found it more difficult to fill the places may not wish to take a bulge again in the future.

- 8.11 Once the council is aware of who already intends to recycle their bulge, and if there is still a need for additional places then criteria (outlined below) will be used to rank the other bulges available. This list will be shared with schools so that they can consider it in their decision making process as well.
- 8.12 The agreed criteria used to rank available bulge classes is as follows (in order of priority) –
- 1. Need** - The forecast demand in that area suggests that additional places are required
 - 2. Willingness** - Whether the school wish to have their bulge recycled or not
 - 3. Oversubscribed** - Whether the school is currently oversubscribed on 1st preference applications
 - 4. School is 1 form of entry** - Whether a smaller school's financial viability is greatly impaired by the economies of scale associated within an additional class
 - 5. Suitability of accommodation** - How suitable is the environment - Is it a temporary building? Is it of adequate size?
 - 6. Ofsted** - Schools that have a current inspection outcome of outstanding would be preferred
 - 7. Local Authority School Classification** - Schools that are classified as green by the LA would be preferred
- 8.13 Moving forwards the council will consult with the School Place Planning and Admissions Forum (see Governance Structure - Appendix 4) in relation to the ranking of bulge classes and how we work with schools to manage supply.
- 8.14 It is worth noting that each year there have been a number of spare places across the Borough that are able to be used for in year admissions (a margin of spare capacity). In year admissions and the general churn of pupil turnover/mobility can be quite high. In autumn 2016 to date the number of in year applications has gone up by 25% compared to the same period in 2015.
- 8.15 Overall as can be seen by the tables above, whilst recycling bulge classes is an appropriate solution over the next few years given the fluctuating demand, longer term we need to consider additional permanent places.

- 8.16 Current forecasting suggests that we need to consider plans for an additional 4FE by 2022, and plans should also be considered for a further 4FE by 2025, in addition to the current expansions of Sir Francis Drake, St Winifred's and Our Lady and St Philip Neri, along with the planned expansion of Ashmead. Beyond these four expansions, given the difficulty in expanding existing schools further due to complex sites and lack of space, we need to consider the use of free schools to provide these additional places.
- 8.17 There is currently one all-through free school approved by the DfE but without an identified site – the Citizen School which would contribute 4FE. There is also one 3FE primary school that has been approved by the DfE, again no site is identified. The provision of either school would contribute to meeting the shortfall of places and both would (over the life of this strategy) create a small surplus. However to meet the demand beyond 2022 an additional school would still be required.
- 8.18 It should be noted that there is risk associated with relying on the provision of free schools as these are out of the council's control; however they are realistically the only option to meet such anticipated high demand. The council will need to work effectively with the EFA and DfE along with associated sponsors to help ensure the provision is achieved.

9.0 Secondary Demand

9.1 Lewisham is currently a net exporter of secondary age pupils. As a result accurately projecting demand for secondary school pupil places is not as straightforward as it should be given that we know what numbers are coming through from primary schools. Indeed cross-borough flows at the age of transfer complicate the picture considerably. Over a quarter of pupils currently go out of the borough for their secondary education. The corresponding figure for the primary sector is 10 per cent. There are only three other London boroughs – Croydon, Greenwich and Ealing – that have a net export of more pupils than Lewisham.

Table – Import and export of pupils at Year 7 in 2015

Total imports from all LAs to Lewisham	Total pupil imports from all LAs as % of all pupils going to schools in Lewisham	Total exports to all LAs from Lewisham	Total pupil exports from Lewisham to all LAs as % of all pupils living in Lewisham	Net export
1890	14.6%	3923	26.2%	2033

9.2 Additionally, London Councils data also shows to which borough our secondary pupils are going. This highlights the need to work closely with other London boroughs to ensure that we can make the best predictions about the future level of export and therefore demand for Lewisham secondary places. Indeed the picture could change dramatically if schools in other boroughs become harder to access coupled with Lewisham schools improving.

Table - Imports and Exports of pupils to Lewisham neighbours

	Exports to Lewisham	Imports from Lewisham	Net export from Lewisham
Southwark	799	986	187
Greenwich	470	781	311
Bromley	359	1125	766
Lambeth	78	130	52
Croydon	70	278	208
TOTAL	1776	3300	1524

9.3 Currently Lewisham has a PAN of 2667 for Year 7. This means that we are currently running a surplus of spaces, mainly within Deptford Green, Prendergast Ladywell Fields and Sedgell.

9.4 However, it is anticipated that even without a change on net export ratios that the Lewisham secondary system will begin to come under pressure over the

coming years. Current forecasting suggests that from 2018 onwards we will require additional secondary places beyond what is being planned (Addey and Stanhope 2FE expansion).

Table – Secondary Forecasts

Year	Avg Forecast	PAN	Surplus/Deficit	FE equivalent	Action
2016/17	2520	2667	147	4.9	
2017/18	2641	2692	51	1.7	Bonus Pastor Expansion (1FE)
2018/19	2808	2752	-56	-1.9	Proposed Addey and Stanhope Expansion (2FE)
2019/20	2895	2752	-143	-4.8	
2020/21	2949	2752	-197	-6.6	
2021/22	3012	2752	-260	-8.7	
2022/23	3074	2752	-322	-10.7	

- 9.5 This shows a total shortfall of more than 10FE by 2022. There is currently one all-through free school approved by the DfE but without an identified site – the Citizen School which would contribute 4FE. There is also a bid for a free school being considered by the DfE for a Church of England 8FE school, again no site is identified. The provision of either school would contribute to meeting the shortfall of places and both would create a small surplus.
- 9.6 It should be noted that there is risk associated with relying on the provision of free schools as these are out of the council’s control; however they are realistically the only option to meet such anticipated high demand. The council will need to work effectively with the EFA and DfE along with associated sponsors to help ensure the provision is achieved.

10.0 Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) Demand

10.1 In the spring of 2016 Lewisham commissioned a Childcare Sufficiency Statement to look at demand for childcare and early years provision given the rising population and the changing landscape of EYFS policy and funding. The council has a statutory duty to ensure sufficient provision and will be reporting a new Early Years and Childcare Strategy to CYP Select Committee in early 2017.

10.2 An executive summary and key actions of which can be found below.

Executive Summary

10.3 The Childcare Sufficiency Statement identifies a changing population where key growth wards for children aged 0-4 years in Lewisham are concentrated in Children's Centre Service Area (CCSA) 1 (Evelyn and New Cross wards particularly) and the wards of Lewisham Central and Blackheath in CCSA 2. By contrast, all wards in CCSAs 3 and 4 are predicted to see reducing numbers of children aged 0-4 years across 2015- 2019 (except Rushey Green in CCSA 3 which will remain broadly the same). Evelyn, New Cross and Lewisham Central wards need to have more provision for eligible 2 year olds reflecting their relative deprivation. These wards are where the affordability of childcare is most significant and where there is least ability to pay.

10.4 With government plans for an extended early education entitlement for eligible children aged 3 and 4 years from September 2017, Rushey Green, Lewisham Central, Forest Hill, Evelyn, New Cross and Perry Vale wards will have greater total numbers of children eligible for these places. This points to greater requirements in these wards for more flexible early education and childcare to meet the needs of working families. In the surveys undertaken parents were very positive about the introduction of the extended entitlement, although few parents with young children had heard of this entitlement. Primary objectives for parents in relation to the extended entitlement were found to be to:

- a. Limit the amount of settings that children attend.
- b. Access the extended entitlement during school holiday periods and after 3pm.
- c. Have any setting make available additional hours if required for purchase; and ideally existing settings their children attend will offer the extended entitlement.
- d. For parents with children that are attending school, they want any younger children to have access to the extended entitlement at the school nursery.

10.5 This will impact the existing market. Most parents report that they will move children so that they benefit as much as possible from access to their early

education entitlement in a single setting. This is likely to affect school nurseries and pre-schools/play groups the most; and will benefit those early years settings which make available more flexible provision.

- 10.6 There are likely to be enough places to meet the anticipated demand for the extended early education entitlement in Lewisham. This is because there are already plans for expanded supply and many existing early years settings have low to medium levels of occupancy (57% occupancy for childminders and 73% occupancy for PVI settings). More places will be available for funded entitlements, if necessary, in settings that rate at least 'satisfactory'/'requires improvement' or better from September 2017. However, key to ensuring maximum take-up are (1) more flexibility in provision to better meet the needs of working families and (2) where families can access the extended entitlement in a single setting.
- 10.7 Overall, 86% of children aged 3 and 4 years take up funded early education, with 85% doing so in good or outstanding quality settings as at January 2016. It is less so for children aged 2 years where 62% accessed their funded early education entitlement and a little over 13 in every 20 do so in good or outstanding quality settings. Improving quality of settings and take-up by children of their early education entitlements are key priorities for Lewisham. Early years settings are especially keen for additional support to improve quality, and particularly so from: (a) the Early Years Quality and Sufficiency Team; (b) more relevant and affordable professional development and; (c) networking and collaborative learning opportunities.
- 10.8 A key gap relates to childcare and early education for children with additional needs/disabilities. Parents of children with additional needs/ disabilities are less likely satisfied with their childcare. Settings already receive some form support in meeting the needs of children with additional needs but they want more. Priorities include building the skills and confidence of staff to work with children with additional needs/ disabilities and ensuring access to targeted early intervention support for children prior to any agreed Education, Health and Care Plan.
- 10.9 Parents have choice about types of childcare and early education although this varies between wards and CCSAs. More than half of children attend private, voluntary and independent (PVI) settings, about 3 in 10 attend school/independent schools and 13% attend childminders. The faster growing Evelyn, New Cross, Lewisham Central and Blackheath wards have the least childminder provision in Lewisham. Most childcare and early education provision is available Monday to Friday between 8am and 6pm, with more than half of PVI settings not open during holiday periods. Families and early years settings identify that a key gap is having a single comprehensive

directory of childcare provision which provides information about all childcare and early education options in Lewisham. The existing FIS Directory needs to be updated and also needs to set out the new minimum standards.

10.10 Three out of four early years settings do not plan to change their hours of operation in the coming 18 months. However, 1 in 4 settings intend to offer more early education places and more flexibility. This will help those 1 in 3 parents that are not satisfied with the availability of childcare when and where they need it.

10.11 Four out of five parents rate their childcare arrangements as meeting their needs, with the affordability of childcare being their main concern, with 1 in 3 parents reporting they are dissatisfied/very dissatisfied with affordability. The cost of delivering early education is the main concern of early years settings. Lewisham families pay a little less than the London average for children aged 2, 3 and 4 years, but are likely to pay more for children aged under 2 years. Lewisham Council hourly rates for funded early education are consistent with the average hourly rate charged to fee paying parents with children aged 2 years and between 8- 14% less than the average hourly rate charged to fee paying parents with children aged 3 and 4 years. Approximately 5% of PVI settings and 15% of all childminders report that they plan to increase fees by more than £10 per week for local families in the next 12-18 months.

10.12 Early years settings are concerned about the likely funding rate for 3 and 4 year places when the extended entitlement is introduced; and while 35% of settings (mainly day nurseries and pre-schools/playgroups) indicate they definitely plan to make available extended provision, 1 in 5 definitely plan not to. For those undecided settings (close to 2 in 5), they indicate requirements for more information including most particularly the level of funding.

10.13 **Key priorities for childcare market development in Lewisham**

1. In helping families and the local early years childcare market prepare for the introduction for the extended entitlement and address parent priorities for childcare that meets their needs, we need to:
 - a. Encourage more flexible provision and opportunities for children to access early education and childcare in a single setting.
 - Especially longer opening hours and childcare availability during school holidays (this includes for parents stretching early education entitlements across more than 38 weeks). This includes targeting PVI settings and school nurseries and especially those in faster growing wards in Children's Centre Service Areas (CCSA) 1 and 2 i.e. Evelyn, New Cross, Lewisham Central, Blackheath and Brockley

wards (as well as Sydenham ward in CCSA 4) where more than 9 in 10 early education places are available from PVI settings and school nurseries.

- Through supporting innovative collaborations between early years settings such as schools and childminders to offer longer opening hours and childcare availability during school holidays.
 - Efforts to improve the low occupancy rates for many childminders as well as encouraging greater supply of childminders in the fast growing wards of Evelyn, New Cross, Lewisham Central, Blackheath and Brockley.
- b. In order to deliver on the Childcare Act 2006 section 12 duty, the Family Information Service (FIS) must build a more comprehensive, up to date directory of childcare and early education services for families across Lewisham. This includes setting out the minimum standards that parents can expect of childcare provision. This will also assist future sufficiency planning, better inform parents about their childcare options and help early years settings with their business planning and marketing.
- c. The council should work with early years settings to agree a refreshed provider agreement. This offers scope to set out the roles and responsibilities of early years settings that offer funded early education and the council (particularly the Early Years Quality and Sufficiency Team and the Family Information Service).
- In clarifying partner roles and responsibilities, the newly formed Early Years Quality and Sufficiency Team has the opportunity to establish a clear plan for taking childcare forward. This includes setting out the Team's focus and scope of their support for early years settings quality improvement, sufficiency and networking/ collaboration. This includes in supporting the roll out of the extended entitlement in September 2017.
2. We need to work with early years settings and families with children with additional needs/disabilities to improve the accessibility of childcare and early education. This includes clarifying the available targeted early interventions for children that do not have an EHC Plan and the available advice, guidance and resources for early years staff to confidently manage children's behaviour and other needs, as well as making early years information and advice for parents of children with additional needs/disabilities more integrated.

3. Multiagency practitioners who work with families with children aged 0-4 must be encouraged to continue raising awareness of early education entitlements and the benefits of these entitlements for families they interact with; together with providing practical help to families to take up these entitlements.
 - a. This includes especially families eligible to the funded entitlement for children aged 2 years. A continuing focus on building the quality of funded early education for children aged 2 years is also a priority. This is especially so for settings in CCSA 1 (Evelyn and New Cross wards most particularly).
 - b. The Early Years Quality and Sufficiency Team and FIS should partner with Employment, Skills and Adult Education leads to ensure families they are supporting to return to work know about the early education entitlements and can help parents with taking these up.

DRAFT

11.0 Special Education Needs and Disability (SEND) Demand

11.1 In the summer of 2016 Lewisham commissioned a SEND placement planning review to look at the rising population and the likely impact that would have on SEND provision needed within the borough. The key findings of which are outlined below.

11.2 Key findings

1. The number of children with Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) in Lewisham is currently 1,847. The net growth in children with EHCPs in the years to 2020/21 is likely to be 100-110 per year before levelling off to grow in line with growth rates for the population of children and young people aged 3-25 years.
2. The growth in incidence of SEND, together with improved data on the open cases for Children with Complex Needs Service (CWCN) shows that the use of out of borough provision is driven by limited local capacity, particularly severe cases of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) and Behavioural, Emotional and Social Disorders (BESD). For pupils with complex needs, local schools, Watergate and Greenvale particularly so, are equipped to meet the needs of children and young people with the most severe learning difficulties and complex behavioural, emotional and social difficulties. But this special school capacity is full and not sufficient to meet demand.
3. The shortfall in special school places in Lewisham is greater than had been forecast in 2014 and will widen further. There are currently 495 children and young people accessing LBL maintained special school provision from September 2016-March 2017; while 194 are placed in out of borough independent, maintained or non-maintained specialist provision (on basis of 75% full time equivalent, this is 146 full time places) i.e. there are approximately 641 children and young people (FTE) with a special school place.
4. The likely levels of special school full time places required in 2017 is in the range 641 to 652, with increases of 9-11 per year expected to 2021/2022 and thereafter the increase is less than 10 per year. From 2025/26 the growth is only 5-6 per year. This equates to an additional 70 additional children and young people requiring a place at a special school by 2024. This would increase the demand for out of borough placements from 146 to 216, if there was no additional capacity within Lewisham special schools.
5. This highlights the need for a new special school for secondary school age young people. The only route to providing a new special school is

the free school route. This could be achieved by an existing special school in Lewisham establishing the free school and/or the council partnering with a free school provider that possibly in partnership with an existing mainstream secondary school to help contribute to the inclusion of the children and young people and deliver economies of scale. Such schools have been delivered elsewhere in London.

DRAFT

12.0 Alternative Provision (AP)

12.1 Between October 2015 and April 2016, the London Borough of Lewisham Children and Young People Directorate collaborated with key stakeholders to undertake a review of the existing strategy, structures and systems for Alternative Provision at all Key Stages. The aim of the review was to evaluate and analyse current practice, highlight best practice and develop a new Lewisham alternative provision strategy with a three year action plan. The review included arrangement for key stakeholders from Lewisham schools, special schools and Pupil Referral Units, local authority services and key agencies to contribute to the review by sharing information and best practice, with feedback to also include parents, carers and young people.

12.2 The Review Action Plan includes 10 key recommendations as a result of the findings and these are monitored at the Lewisham Inclusion Board:

- Implement a programme to reduce the number of fixed term and permanent exclusions from Lewisham secondary schools.
- Implement a programme to increase the number of children and young people who are re-integrated back in to Lewisham schools.
- Implement a programme to improve levels of attendance of children and young people attending Lewisham Alternative Provision.
- Establish Inclusion Programme Board that reports within the Children and Young People Directorate structure and to Schools Forum.
- Review the Fair Access Panel's processes and procedures, as well as the restructuring of the composition of the panel, with the formation of separate primary and secondary panels.
- Improve the managed moves process by so that it is operating in the best interests of the children and young people and review and update the Managed Moves Protocol.
- Implement the recommendations of the High Needs Sub-group Alternative Provision Review work stream which were agreed by Schools Forum on 17 March 2016.
- Review the Alternative Provision Quality Assurance Framework to ensure all Key Stages and ensure that all provision accessed for Lewisham children and young people is Department for Education Registered.
- Ensure that the cohort of learners at New Woodlands School is in line with the legal designation of a 'special school'.
- Develop and implement provision that fills the gaps identified in the Review. This includes a need for
 1. Primary nurture provision
 2. Provision for primary girls (PRU and SEMH)
 3. Sixth day placements and short term intervention for two, six and twelve weeks (KS4)

4. A Key Stage 4 GCSE Alternative Provision Pathway
5. Special Educational Needs Provision for SEMH and other issues to be provided in Lewisham– linked with the SEND Strategy
6. Improved and enhanced Mental Health Specialist provision at Key Stage 3 and 4
7. Behaviour support at Key Stage 4
8. Transition support for those at risk of exclusion
9. Provision that meets the needs of Youth Offenders
10. Provision that meets the needs of Children Looked After

12.3 Moving forwards the Lewisham alternative provision review action plan is addressing the gap analysis and is reporting to, and monitored by, the Lewisham Inclusion Board.

DRAFT

13.0 Post 16 education

- 13.1 The impact on Further Education colleges in London - In July 2015, the government announced a rolling programme of around 40 local area reviews, to be completed by March 2017, covering all general further education and sixth-form colleges in England. The reviews are designed to ensure that colleges are financially stable into the longer-term, that they are run efficiently, and are well-positioned to meet the present and future needs of individual students and the demands of employers. Students in colleges have high expectations about standards of teaching and learning and the extent to which their learning prepares them to progress further, to higher education or directly into employment.
- 13.2 The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) and the Department for Education (DfE) are responsible for the area reviews and worked closely with the Greater London Authority (GLA) and London Councils to plan the London review. The London review covers 46 colleges, including twelve Sixth Form Colleges, three special designated institutes and 1 land-based provider. Due to the large number of colleges in London, the London Area Review was divided into four sub-regional reviews. Each sub-region had its own steering group and completed its own review.
- 13.3 The local steering group was chaired by Borough Leader, Cllr Peter John from London Borough of Southwark. The steering group met on 6 occasions between 17 March 2016 and 4 November 2016, and additional informal meetings also took place to consider and develop options in greater detail. Membership of the steering group comprised each college's chair of governors and principal, representatives from the Greater London Authority, Central London Forward (sub-regional partnership) and local authorities; 2 business representatives; the FE Commissioner; the Deputy FE Commissioner; the Sixth Form Commissioner, the Regional Schools Commissioner, and representatives from the Skills Funding Agency, the Education Funding Agency, and the Department for Education.
- 13.4 Visits to colleges and support throughout the process were provided by staff from the FE and Sixth Form College Commissioners' teams. The Joint Area Review Delivery Unit (JARDU) provided the project management, administrative support and developed supporting materials and papers used by the steering group. JARDU also led on consultations with local stakeholders.
- 13.5 The Central London Sub-Regional area review covers the 12 local authority areas, which are:
- Camden Council
 - City of London Council

- City of Westminster Council
- Hackney Council
- Haringey Council
- Islington Council
- Kensington and Chelsea Council
- Lambeth Council
- Lewisham Council
- Southwark Council
- Tower Hamlets Council
- Wandsworth Council

13.6 Area reviews of post-16 education and training institutions are predominantly focused on general further education and sixth-form colleges in order to ensure there is a high quality and financially resilient set of colleges in each area of England. Schools with sixth-forms have the opportunity to seek to opt in to a review if the local steering group agrees. Within Lewisham school sixth-forms are currently outside the scope.

13.7 The underpinning analysis for the review included current post-16 provision in the area made by schools with sixth-forms. Regional Schools Commissioners and local authorities have had the opportunity to identify any issues with school sixth-form provision, and feed these into the review. We expect Regional Schools Commissioners to take account of the analysis from area reviews in any decisions they make about future provision.

13.8 There are currently 140 funded schools with sixth-forms in the review area, including 78 local authority maintained and 55 academies. This includes 6 free schools and 1 university technical college. Most school pupils in the age range of 16-18 are enrolled on A-level courses.

13.9 At the start of the area review, seventeen colleges (four sixth-form colleges, ten general further education colleges and three specialist designated Institutions) participated in this review.

- City and Islington College
- City of Westminster College
- College of Haringey, Enfield and North-East London
- Hackney Community College
- Kensington and Chelsea College
- Lambeth College
- Lewisham Southwark College
- South Thames College
- Tower Hamlets College
- Westminster Kingsway College
- Brooke House Sixth Form College
- Christ the King Sixth Form College

- St Charles Catholic Sixth Form College
- St Francis Xavier Sixth Form College
- Morley College Limited (a special designated institute)
- The City Literary Institute (a special designated institute)
- Working Men's College Corporation (a special designated institute)

13.10 Sixteen recommendations were agreed by the steering group at their meeting in November 2016. Included for Lewisham were that Christ the King Sixth Form College is to remain a standalone sixth form college or become an academy, with the decision and any preference for a single/multi-academy trust depending on the position taken by the Diocese. Lewisham and Southwark College will also be addressed in due course but recommendations have yet to be made, however they are considering options for potential mergers with other institutions.

13.11 The agreed recommendations will now be taken forward through recognised structural change processes, including due diligence and consultation. Proposals for merger, conversion to academies, change of name etc. will require work by all parties involved to realise the identified benefits.

13.12 A national evaluation of the area review process will be undertaken to assess the benefits brought about through implementation of the options. It will include quantitative measures relating to the economy, to educational performance, to progression, to other measures of quality, and to financial sustainability. This analysis will also take account of the views of colleges, local authorities, LEPs, students and employers about how well colleges are responding to the challenges of helping address local skills gaps and shortages, and the education and training needs of individuals.

13.13 Outside of the scope of the review, it should be noted that Lewisham currently has nine school based sixth-forms, they are;

- Haberdashers' Aske's Hatcham College
- Haberdashers' Aske's Knights Academy
- Prendergast Sixth Form
- Sedgehill Sixth Form
- Addey and Stanhope School
- SFH6 Sydenham and Forest Hill Sixth Form
- Abbey Manor College (Pupil Referral Unit)
- Greenvale School (Special School)
- Drumbeat School (Special School)

13.14 Addey and Stanhope have currently suspended their sixth-form intake and are considering closing the provision (following statutory consultation), beyond that however there is no anticipated change.

14.0 Strategy in Summary

14.1 In review, this strategy looks at how the council delivered the Primary Strategy for Change 2008-2017 along with the recommendations made by the Lewisham Education Commission and as such makes seven key recommendations;

1. We must finish what we have started, and learn from our experiences. Over 50 projects are currently still being worked on and must be closed out
2. We need to maximise use of the investment that has already gone into schools therefore we should be recycling of bulge classes where projections justify it – unless there is a good reason not to
3. We need to take advantage of free school opportunities – working with potential sponsors and the EFA to secure what Lewisham needs
4. We need to re-evaluate localities and previously considered expansion opportunities alongside demographic change and future growth projections to identify value for money projects as well as a more accurate forecasting model
5. We need to work with the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) team to consider the recent sufficiency review for EYFS and develop a plan for childcare and nursery education
6. We need clear plans for Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) places and Alternative Provision (AP) – providing more of the right kind of places within the borough and reducing the number of placements out of borough
7. We need to develop a better information sharing agreement with other local authorities to share data and information relating to school place planning and continue to work as part of London Councils

14.2 Building on those recommendations we have formed a revised set of five principles to guide our work, these are;

1. We aim to provide primary school places according to the level of need within different localities and we will continue to use 'planning areas'. Our aspiration is for children to go to primary school within one mile, but within two miles is reasonable
2. As far as possible our school expansion proposals will be for schools that are already achieving high standards and if not, have robust school improvement plans in place
3. We will work with external partners to overcome the financial challenges related to providing additional school places (i.e. Department for Education, Education Funding Agency, Dioceses, Multi Academy Trusts)

4. We will aim for efficient delivery of education, with consideration of the economies of scale and the viable size for schools and impact on revenue budgets
 5. We will ensure that any proposal for the provision of extra places is scrutinised both in terms of suitability and value for money as well as making best use of existing assets and resources
- 14.3 Taking the recommendations and principles into account, alongside our current forecasting we therefore believe that we will need to deliver the following to ensure sufficient places;
- 14.4 **Primary** – To ensure sufficient primary places the council will work with schools to recycle bulges where required. We will also work with the Education Funding Agency, Department for Education, Regional Schools Commissioner and potential free school sponsors to provide an additional four forms of entry (120 places) of new provision by 2022 (with plans for a further four forms of entry by 2025) via free schools.
- 14.5 **Secondary** - The council's first priority will be to make existing Lewisham secondary schools the schools of choice. We will work to provide a two form of entry (60 places) expansion of Addey and Stanhope School. We will also work proactively with the Education Funding Agency, Department for Education, Regional Schools Commissioner and potential sponsors to provide up to a further eleven forms of entry (330 places) of new provision by 2022 via free schools.
- 14.6 **Early Years Foundation Stage** – While sufficient capacity is already within the system, the council will work with providers to ensure that the system is flexible enough to help meet the needs of parents and the challenge of the 30 hour offer, and to place nursery classes and schools on a sustainable footing.
- 14.7 **Special Education Needs and Disability** – The council will work up business cases for capital investment to expand both Watergate and Greenvale School based upon an invest-to-save model. Additionally the council will pursue the Department for Education's 'commissioned' Special Education Needs and Disability free school opportunity to redevelop the old Brent Knoll site as a new 120 place school for 11-19 year olds that have been identified as having either Autism Spectrum Disorder and/or Social, Emotional and Mental Health needs.

15.0 Overseeing the Strategy - Governance

- 15.1 To ensure that the strategy can be delivered a new governance structure has been set up to ensure that officers are accountable, that projects progress to plan and to ensure that this work is overseen corporately as well as including schools and other stakeholder and partners.
- 15.2 The new governance structure can be seen in Appendix 4i along with the Terms of Reference for the main internal board, the Children and Young People Strategic Asset Board (Appendix 4ii).
- 15.3 As can be seen from the structure, this piece of work reports into officer and political structures as well as utilising the new School Place Planning and Admissions Forum as a sounding board and for challenge and consultation.

DRAFT

16.0 Risks to delivery

- 16.1 The delivery of places across Primary, Secondary and SEND relies upon the provision of new schools within the borough. Legislation demands that this is provided through new free schools run by Multi Academy Trusts.
- 16.2 Both the delivery of the infrastructure and the running of the resultant schools fall outside of the councils remit and control.
- 16.3 As such the working relationship between the council, the DfE, EFA and potential sponsors is key to ensuring that the approved free schools help meet demand, and also in terms of ensuring that projects are delivered when needed.
- 16.4 Additionally, the council has a role in working with these groups with regards to the identification of sites and the resultant design of the provision, from an educational perspective, regeneration and asset perspective, and also a planning perspective.
- 16.5 As a result the following provision that is previously alluded to are all 'at risk' of timely delivery;
- The Citizen School (4FE 4-19 year olds) – approved by the RSC but no site acquired
 - Harris Academy Lewisham (3FE 4-11 year olds) – approved by the RSC but no site acquired
 - 8FE Secondary School (11-16 year olds) – application submitted by Southwark Diocese but not yet approved by the RSC and no site acquired
 - 120 place SEND SEMH/ASD School (11-19 year olds) – expression of interest submitted by council to RSC but not currently approved and Brent Knoll site would be required to facilitate

17.0 Finance

- 17.1 The main source of finance for the school places programme is the Basic Need grant awarded by the Department for Education. The council has been allocated Basic Need grant of £10.6m for 2017/18 and £14.1m for 2018/19.
- 17.2 The council is currently awaiting an announcement from central government with regards future Basic Need grant from 2019 onwards, and also the recently announced SEND Capital grant. This is expected in January 2017.
- 17.3 The council has also been able to apply significant sums secured through section 106 agreements towards school expansion schemes. There are currently section 106 contributions in excess of £4m that are allocated to finance school expansion schemes. The council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), for which charging commenced from 1st April 2015, may also provide a future source of finance.
- 17.4 Unless other sources of funding such as contributions from schools are available, any expenditure which exceeds the available amounts of Basic Need grant and section 106/CIL contributions would have to be financed from the councils capital reserves, usable capital receipts or from prudential borrowing.
- 17.5 As previously mentioned, free schools are funded directly by central government (provided they have been applied for by eligible sponsors direct to the Regional Schools Commissioner), however their can often be additional costs incurred by the council to discharge planning conditions – such as highway works – that fall out of the Education Funding Agency's scope.
- 17.5 All on-going revenue costs of running enlarged schools will be met from the resources of the Dedicated Schools Grant. On-going revenue costs of running free schools will be met by central government directly.

18.0 Next steps

- ~~17 Oct 16 - 1st Draft - CYP Strategic Asset Board~~
- ~~18 Oct 16 - 1st Draft - School Place Planning and Admissions Forum~~
- ~~10 Nov 16 - 2nd Draft - School Place Planning and Admissions Forum~~
- ~~28 Nov 16 - 2nd Draft - CYP Strategic Asset Board~~
- ~~2 Dec 16 - 2nd Draft - Regeneration Board~~
- ~~5 Dec 16 - Consultation Draft - School Place Planning & Admissions Forum~~
- ~~7 Dec 16 - Consultation Paper Sign Off - CYP DMT~~
- 12 Dec 16 - 8 week Public Consultation Period commences (12 noon)
- 9 Jan 17 - Consultation Event – Lewisham Chair of Governors meeting
- 11 Jan 17 - Consultation Draft & interim responses – CYP Select Committee
- 18 Jan 17 - Consultation Event – Lewisham Special School Heads Meeting
- 19 Jan 17 - Consultation Event – Lewisham Secondary Heads Meeting
- 2 Feb 17 - Consultation Event – Lewisham Schools Leadership Forum
- 6 Feb 17 - Public Consultation closes (12 noon)
- 20 Feb 17 - Final Draft – CYP Strategic Asset Board
- 24 Feb 17 - Final Draft – Regeneration Board
Final Draft to M&C Agenda Planning
- 1 Mar 17 - (Draft) Strategy Sign off – CYP DMT
(Draft) Strategy Sign off – Cllr Liaison
(Draft) Strategy Sign off – Mayors Briefing
- 3 Mar 17 - Strategy M&C Paper to dispatch
- 22 Mar 17 - Strategy approval – Mayor and Cabinet
- w/c 3 Apr 17 - Strategy Launch