

**GLASGOW CITY COUNCIL
EDUCATION SERVICES**

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

Proposal: To establish a new non-denominational primary school and catchment area within the North of the city and, to amend the catchment areas for Cadder, Caldercuilt, Kelvindale, Parkview, Highpark, Dunard, Saracen, Oakgrove and Royston Primary Schools.

School(s)	Ward(s)	Strategic Planning Area	Learning Communities
Cadder Primary School	15	North West	Cleveden
Caldercuilt Primary School	15	North West	Cleveden
Kelvindale Primary School	15	North West	Cleveden
Parkview Primary School	15	North West	Cleveden
Highpark Primary School	16	North West	Cleveden
Dunard Primary School	16	North West	Cleveden
Saracen Primary School	16	North East	Springburn
Oakgrove Primary School	11	North East	Hillhead/Glasgow Gaelic
Royston Primary School	17	North East	Smithycroft

REPORT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION

This document has been issued by Glasgow City Council for consultation in terms of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010, as amended.

The Ordnance Survey map data included within this document is provided by Glasgow City Council under licence from Ordnance Survey in order to fulfil its public function in relation to this public consultation. Persons viewing this mapping should contact Ordnance Survey Copyright for advice where they wish to licence Ordnance Survey mapping/data for their own use. Maps are not necessarily to scale.

1 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND AND THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

- 1.1 On 27 October 2016 the Executive Committee agreed to issue consultative documents on proposals to establish a new non-denominational primary school and catchment area within the North of the city and, to amend the catchment areas for Cadder, Caldercuilt, Kelvindale, Parkview, Highpark, Dunard, Saracen, Oakgrove and Royston Primary Schools.
- 1.2 Glasgow consulted in line with the requirements of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 as amended. This requires that local authorities adopt a robust and transparent framework for consultations on school closures and other major changes to the education estate, for example, catchment areas. The process requires authorities to actively involve and consult with all stakeholders and other school users. It is necessary to include an educational benefit statement – that is, the authority must produce a statement setting out its assessment of the effects on children and young people and other users of an affected establishment. There is a minimum six weeks term-time consultation period.
- Consultation papers were distributed to a wide range of stakeholders and interested parties;
 - Notices to advise of the consultation arrangements were placed in the local press;
 - Dedicated pages were set up on the Council website for both information and to enable interested parties to respond to the proposals;
 - The public consultation period ran from 7 November 2016 to 18 December 2016.
 - Public meetings were also held on 15 and 16 November 2016 in Maryhill Community Centre and Benview Education Campus respectively.
- 1.3 Prior to the statutory consultation process, two public engagement events were held on 27 and 28 September 2016. These events allowed stakeholders to engage with officers and influence the proposal which was set out in the consultation document. Around 20 people attended over both events.
- 1.4 At the formal public consultation meetings, 20 people attended the meeting hosted at Maryhill Community centre and 1 person attended at Benview Campus.
- 1.5 In addition to the public meetings, arrangements were also put in place to discuss the proposals with Parent Councils, Pupil Councils, staff groups and the Area Partnerships.
- 1.6 As part of the consultation process, officers ensured that the views and opinions of respondents were given due consideration. In order to ensure a rigorous and thorough examination of the responses received, a senior member of Education Services read every response to validate key aspects of responses in order that Elected Members are provided with a detailed, objective analysis.
- 1.7 The statutory consultation period concluded on 18 December 2016.
- 1.8 Officers focused on identifying the main issues and concerns (Section 3) giving each response equivalent weighting in order to ensure the basis of the response, rather than the number of people who made it, was fully explored and evaluated prior to offering conclusions and recommendations.
- 1.9 In a major consultation there is the possibility that errors may occur therefore there are procedures in place to identify, amend and record any errors. On this occasion no errors were identified or recorded

2 RESONSE TO THE CONSULTATION

- 2.1 The Council received 40 responses to the consultation, one of which included the results from a questionnaire completed by approximately 300 people that had been issued independently by the responder. An analysis of this single response is contained in paragraph 2.3
- 2.2 The high level analysis of the responses is contained in the table 2.2.1 below:

Table 2.2.1 – Analysis of Consultees Responses

Of the 40 Responses:

26 were For the proposal
9 were Against the proposal
5 were Unclear

Of the 26 responses For the proposal:

2 responses stated better traffic and access as reasons for support
5 responses stated the educational benefits of the proposal
17 responses stated the proposed community facilities (most notably the 11-a-side pitch) as a reason for support
1 response stated the health and wellbeing benefits of the proposal as a reason for support
1 response stated the employment opportunities that the proposal offered as a reason for support
7 responses stated the need for a non-denominational primary school as a reason for support
1 stated the preferred location as a reason for support
1 response stated that whilst in general support of the proposal, traffic and congestion at the preferred site was a concern
1 response stated that whilst in general support of the proposal, loss of green-space was a concern
2 responses stated that whilst in general support of the proposal, they did not like the preferred site
1 response stated that whilst in general support of the proposal, they suggested the site of the former Wyndford School as an alternative option

N.B. Total number of responses above is greater than 26 as some respondents highlighted more than one reason.

Of the 9 responses that were Against the proposal:

5 responses stated traffic and parking at the preferred site as a reason to be against the proposal
2 responses stated the loss of green-space at the preferred location as a reason to be against the proposal
3 response stated the new catchment areas as a reason to be against the proposal
4 responses questioned the need for a new school as a reason to be against the proposal
2 responses stated the preferred location as a reason to be against the proposal
2 responses suggested the site of the former Wyndford School as an alternative location
1 response whilst generally against the proposal stated that the provision of community facilities was very positive

N.B. Total number of responses above is greater than 9 as some respondents highlighted more than one reason.

Of the 5 responses that were Unclear:

1 response stated that the preferred site offered good walking and cycling routes to school
3 responses stated that the proposed additional community facilities was very positive
1 response supported the need for a new non-denominational primary school in the area
1 response stated the changed catchment area as a concern

N.B. Total number of responses above is greater than 5 as some respondents highlighted more than one reason.

- 2.3 Although not explicitly mentioned in any of the consultation responses, the Council's proposal to include Early Years provision in the proposed new school was welcomed by those who discussed it informally with Education officers at the engagement sessions and formal consultation meetings. It was agreed that the inclusion of Early Years provision would assist in meeting the Scottish Government's commitment to increase early years learning and childcare provision from 600 hours to 1,140 hours by 2020 and the impact this would have on demand in the locality, particularly in relation to greater flexibility for extended day, extended year provision.

- 2.4 The proposal to relocate the existing Belhaven Nursery within the new building was recognised as having several advantages, the primary ones being: 1) The provision of a new state of the art building from which to deliver the service, 2) The opportunity to enhance the provision with additional places, 3) The opportunity to enhance the provision through a different operating model, i.e. extended day, extended year, 4) The location of the current Early Years provision could be re-purposed to provide drop-off and parking for the new development.
- 2.5 None of the responses raised any issues over the proposed associated secondary school as being Cleveden. Since the vast majority of the catchment area for the proposed new school was taken from primary schools associated with Cleveden Secondary, it was deemed both logical and appropriate to designate Cleveden as the associated secondary school.
- 2.6 As noted in 2.1 above, one of the consultation responses contained the combined response from a questionnaire that was circulated by the respondent/s independently. The single response that was submitted was Against the proposals, however, a detailed analysis of the responses to the questionnaire is listed below:

Question 1	This question received 304 responses, and asked people to identify the location where they lived. The results are not deemed relevant in terms of the consultation.
Question 2	This question received 301 responses, and asked people whether they believed that a new school in the area was required. Overwhelmingly, the respondents answered "yes" to this question (292).
Question 3	This question received 292 responses, and asked whether the provision should be: Denominational, Non-Denominational, or Both. 28 respondents suggested that denominational provision was required, 122 respondents suggested that non-denominational was required, and 142 respondents suggested that both were required.
Question 4	This question received 286 responses, and asked whether a joint denominational/non-denominational campus should be provided. 242 people suggested a campus would be their preference.
Question 5	This question received 287 responses and asked whether community facilities that were available in the evenings and at weekends should be included in the proposal. With 276 responses in the affirmative, the overwhelming preference would be for enhanced facilities to be included in the proposed new school.
Question 6	This question received 286 responses and asked whether the proposed new school should be located "broadly...between Queen Margaret Drive and Gairbraid Avenue. With 273 responses in the affirmative, this broad location appeared to be the preference.
Question 7	This question requested people to note their address. The results were not available and are not deemed relevant to the consultation.

3 MAIN ISSUES RAISED ON THE CONSULTATION

- 3.1 Overall there was overwhelming support to establish a primary school for the area given the immediate and predicted growing demand for primary school places.
- 3.2 There was general recognition and support for the Council's proposal to establish a new non-denominational primary school and catchment area within the North Kelvinside/Maryhill area of the city that would address the immediate and long-term need for primary school places consequent of the trend towards a rising population and housing development in the local area.
- 3.3 Although not explicitly mentioned in the written responses, some parents and carers who attended the public meetings raised concerns over the status of children and their siblings following changes to the catchment areas. Assurances that the status of siblings would be protected for a period of up to seven years or when any sibling who was at the school left (whichever is the sooner), allayed these concerns.
- 3.4 Generally those who were against the proposal cited the following reasons:
- Road congestion and parking issues at the proposed site

- Detrimental effect on other local schools
- Catchment area changes not convenient
- Preferred location for proposed new school not suitable

3.5 Generally those who supported the proposal cited the following reasons:

- Cognisance of the need for additional high quality primary school provision in the local area to meet rising demand
- The proposal contains strong links with the construction of enhanced outdoor sports facilities and community facilities
- Good location for the proposed new school in terms of accessibility to public transport, road network, cycle paths and pedestrian routes
- Opportunities to work with well-established local sports clubs in promoting and engaging in organised sport and exercise activities

3.6 There was general appreciation by children, parents/carers and staff that providing another high quality new primary school for the area would both avoid the existing local schools from becoming overcrowded and deliver flexibility to learning and teaching in a variety of settings, ensuring that adequate play spaces were maintained and that social and ancillary accommodation was not placed under undue pressure.

4 COUNCIL RESPONSE TO THE ISSUES RAISED IN THE CONSULTATION RESPONSES

4.1 **Issue:** The new catchment area designated for the north of Saracen Primary School is closer to Benview Campus.

Response: This concern was taken cognisance of and it is our intention to retain this portion of the catchment area in its current form.

4.2 **Issue:** The response containing the results of the independently issued questionnaire suggested a need for denominational provision as well as non-denominational and the idea of a joint campus was proposed.

Response: During the analysis of the local area that identified the need for a new non-denominational school to be constructed, the denominational primary school sector was also analysed. The data generated from that analysis showed that there was not significant pressure on the denominational schools in the area in general, and where pressure was seen to be polarised at a particular establishment, a variety of other interventions at these locations would be sufficient to ensure there was adequate provision within the denominational sector, for example: re-purposing of internal spaces to create additional classrooms or the construction of a small 2-classroom extension.

4.3 **Issue:** Selection of the preferred site.

Response: An options appraisal of the available sites was prepared for the engagement sessions before the consultation commenced, and this appraisal was available and on display at both the pre-consultation and consultation events. See appendix Q. The site was selected primarily for two reasons: 1) It is well-located to ease the pressure on the schools affected by rising rolls, and 2) It enables the Council to include enhanced sports facilities that had been planned for several years but which hadn't progressed due to insufficient funding being available. The opportunity to provide an 11-a-side 3G all-weather pitch along with an enlarged gym hall and changing facilities presented a significant opportunity to the Council. This model would save on capital expenditure and ongoing revenue expenditure through its operating model, thereby demonstrating best value for the Council. The local community had an expectation that the preferred site was to be developed into a facility containing two full-sized pitches along with a pavilion that would service the pitches. This development was predicated on the sale of nearby land, which for various reasons has not been realised. The opportunity afforded by the proposal in the consultation enables the Council to honour its commitment to providing 3G all-weather pitch play with community facilities in a far more cost-effective and joined-up model. The pitch

will be utilised during the day by the school and at the evenings and weekends the facilities will be utilised by the local neighbourhood, sports clubs, etc. The Council can achieve economies of scale associated with constructing one combined facility, along with the reduced operating and maintenance costs of having a combined facility. None of the other sites identified in the options appraisal offered this opportunity. The response to question number 6 of the independently issued questionnaire overwhelmingly supported the location of the school between Queen Margaret Drive and Gairbraid Avenue, this is where the preferred location for the proposed new school is located.

4.4 Issue: Traffic management arrangements at the preferred site.

Response: Glasgow City Council has constructed several new schools in highly trafficked areas. A significant level of thought and consideration is given to the access and egress, parking and drop-off arrangements by the design team. Additionally, Education Services works closely with our colleagues within the Traffic Operations and Road Safety at Land and Environmental Services, planning department, and Strathclyde Police. One of the reasons for selecting this particular site was due to it being viewed as having good accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists, and those using public transport, thereby reducing the dependence on vehicles to drop children off.

5 REPORT FROM EDUCATION SCOTLAND

- 5.1 The Council has fully considered the report from Education Scotland (Appendix T).
- 5.2 Overall Education Scotland believes there are considerable educational benefits for children aligned with the proposals.
- 5.3 Almost all children, parents/carers and members of school staff who met with HM Inspectors were in favour of the proposals.
- 5.4 Education Scotland also noted that the Council has made appropriate arrangements for children and their siblings, who would reside in the catchment area for the new school to continue to attend their existing school.
- 5.5 The six issues noted in the report that require to be specifically addressed are as follows:

The authority needs to:

- be clear on how it intends to resolve the potential roll pressures at Saracen Primary School
 - be clear on the consideration of travel routes and distances during the development of the proposals
 - confirm whether the existing transport arrangements will continue to apply
 - confirm that traffic management at the proposed site has been considered
 - demonstrate clearly why the preferred site contained within the proposal was selected
 - allay concerns that the school roll at the proposed new school will be managed effectively
- 5.5 The report also highlighted that in taking the proposals forward the Council should continue to ensure that all stakeholders are kept suitably informed about, and involved in, preparations for the establishment of the new school. Education Services along with other Council services is very experienced in the development of education provision across the city. They would undertake this as part of their standard planning processes, both formally and informally, through their engagement with parents/carers, staff, children and other stakeholders, for example in this case, the local sports club(s).

6 COUNCIL RESPONSE TO THE ISSUES RAISED BY EDUCATION SCOTLAND

- 6.1 **Issue:** Roll pressure at Saracen Primary.

Response: This consultation was undertaken primarily to resolve the pressures on the rolls of schools within the Maryhill/North Kelvinside area. When the authority started to analyse the catchment area changes that would be required in order to create a new catchment area for the proposed school the opportunity was taken to “better align” the catchment area of Saracen Primary School. The area near the school which is zoned for new housing will not be constructed in the short-term future. In response to the concerns raised, we have reviewed the proposed catchment area for Saracen Primary School and not included a section of housing in Panmure Street. A new map is shown in the Appendices.

6.2 Issue: Consideration of changed travel routes and distances

Response: When the proposed new catchment areas were redrawn to create a new catchment area for the proposed school, travel distances were considered. Additionally, cognisance was taken regarding travel routes for pedestrians, cyclists and those using public transport. The travel distances within the proposed catchment areas are not significantly different from those currently in place. There would be some families who would have less distance to travel to their catchment school as a result of the changes and some families would have to travel further. The Council's transport policy would, of course, apply which is more generous than the statutory entitlement.¹ As the completed development of the proposed new school is still approximately three years in the future, we would not undertake detailed traffic impact assessments at this stage. We would engage with this as part of the planning process nearer the time of the proposed new school opening using the actual traffic network data that will be in existence at the time.

6.3 Issue: Existing policies and arrangements for school transport for new catchment areas.

Response: The Council's transport policies are applied equally to all schools in the city.

6.4 Issue: Traffic management arrangements at the preferred site.

Response: Glasgow City Council has constructed several new schools in highly trafficked areas. A significant level of thought and consideration is given to the access and egress, parking and drop-off arrangements by the design team. Additionally, Education Services works closely with our colleagues within the Traffic Operations and Road Safety at Land and Environmental Services, planning department, and Strathclyde Police. One of the reasons for selecting this particular site was due to it being viewed as having good accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists, and those using public transport, thereby reducing the dependence on vehicles to drop children off.

6.5 Issue: Selection of the preferred site.

Response: An options appraisal of the available sites was prepared for the engagement sessions before the consultation commenced, and this appraisal was available and on display at both the pre-consultation and consultation events. See appendix Q. The site was selected primarily for two reasons: 1) It is well-located to ease the pressure on the schools affected by rising rolls, and 2) It enables the Council to include enhanced sports facilities that had been planned for several years but which hadn't progressed due to insufficient funding being available. The opportunity to provide an 11-a-side 3G all-weather pitch along with an enlarged gym hall and changing facilities presented a significant opportunity to the Council. This model would save on capital expenditure and ongoing revenue expenditure through its operating model, thereby demonstrating best value for the Council. The local community had an expectation that the preferred site was to be developed into a facility containing two full-sized pitches along with a pavilion that would service the pitches. This development was predicated on the sale of nearby land, which for various reasons has not been realised. The opportunity afforded by the proposal in the consultation enables the Council to honour its commitment to providing 3G all-weather pitch play with community facilities in a far more cost-effective and joined-up model. The pitch would be utilised during the day by the school and at the evenings and weekends the facilities would be utilised by the local neighbourhood, sports clubs, etc.

¹ Families in Glasgow living more than 1.2 miles (measured by suitable walking route) from their catchment primary school are entitled to free school transport. The statutory entitlement is 2 miles for children under 8 years of age and 3 miles for other children.

The Council can achieve economies of scale associated with constructing one combined facility, along with the reduced operating and maintenance costs of having a combined facility. None of the other sites identified in the options appraisal offered this opportunity. The response to question number 6 of the independently issued questionnaire overwhelmingly supported the location of the school between Queen Margaret Drive and Gairbraid Avenue, this is where the preferred location for the proposed new school is located.

6.6 Issue: Management of the school roll at the new school and surrounding schools.

Response: The city, for many years, has experienced a declining population and during this time Education Services has been able to accommodate, insofar as practicable, parental choice when placing requests have been submitted. More recently, however, the rising population within Glasgow has meant that Education Services has had to manage the estate more robustly in relation to placing requests. In order to do so, Education Services adopted the guidance received from the Scottish Government in October 2014 regarding the calculation of school capacities, and amended their own policy on the calculation of school capacities contained within Management Circular 60. This guidance and policy is now used to refuse placing requests where it is clear that in doing so it can demonstrate that the reasons for doing so are to ensure that adequate space is available to meet the catchment area demand both at that time and in future years, and additionally, to ensure that the educational environment at each school would enable flexibility in learning and teaching in a variety of settings, ensure that adequate play spaces are maintained, and that social and ancillary accommodation is not placed under undue pressure.

7 SUMMARY

- 7.1 Overall, there has been positive recognition and support for the proposals. Having considered written and verbal responses in parallel with the Education Scotland report, it is proposed to establish a new non-denominational primary school and catchment area within the North of the city and, to amend the catchment areas for Cadder, Caldercuilt, Kelvindale, Parkview, Highpark, Dunard, Saracen, Oakgrove and Royston Primary Schools as detailed in the original consultation document, with the exception of Saracen and High Park Primary Schools as detailed on the map appendices.

8 SCOTTISH MINISTER'S CALL IN

- 8.1 The Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 as amended does not require referral to Scottish Ministers in cases other than closure of schools.

9 EQUALITY STATEMENT

- 9.1 An Equality Impact Assessment was undertaken as part of the consultation exercise to assess if the proposals discriminate against anyone on the basis of:

- Age
- Gender
- Religion
- Racial group
- Disability
- Sexual orientation

The statement is in Appendix S.

10 LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A Cadder Primary Existing Catchment and Proposed Revised Catchment Area

Appendix B	Caldercuilt Primary Existing Catchment and Proposed Revised Catchment Area
Appendix C	Kelvindale Primary Existing Catchment and Proposed Revised Catchment Area
Appendix D	Parkview Primary Existing Catchment and Proposed Revised Catchment Area
Appendix E	Dunard Primary Existing Catchment and Proposed Revised Catchment Area
Appendix F	Highpark Primary Existing Catchment and Proposed Revised Catchment Area
Appendix G	Saracen Primary Existing Catchment and Proposed Revised Catchment Area
Appendix H	Oakgrove Primary Existing Catchment and Proposed Revised Catchment Area
Appendix I	Royston Primary Existing Catchment and Proposed Revised Catchment Area
Appendix J	Highpark Primary Existing Catchment and Proposed Revised Catchment Area – Based on Response to the Public Consultation
Appendix K	Saracen Primary Existing Catchment and Proposed Revised Catchment Area – Based on Response to the Public Consultation
Appendix L	Ward 15 Current Roll Projections and Proposed Revised Catchment Projections
Appendix M	Ward 16 Current Roll Projections and Proposed Revised Catchment Projections
Appendix N	Oakgrove/Royston Current Roll Projections and Proposed Revised Catchment Projections
Appendix O	Proposed Catchment Area for the New Non-denominational Primary School
Appendix P	Proposed Location for the New Non-denominational Primary School
Appendix Q	Site Options Appraisal
Appendix R	Notes from Public Meetings
Appendix S	Equality Impact Assessment
Appendix T	Education Scotland Report
Appendix U	Respondent Category
Appendix V	List of Respondents
Appendix W	Total Issues Raised For the Proposal
Appendix X	Total Issues Raised Against the Proposal
Appendix Y	Breakdown of Reasons Given For the Proposal
Appendix Z	Breakdown of Reason Given Against the Proposal
Appendix AA	Consultation Summary Report

