BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE COMMITTEE

4.00pm 17 NOVEMBER 2014

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present

Councillors: Councillor Shanks (Chair) Councillor Littman (Deputy Chair), Wealls (Opposition Spokesperson), Pissaridou (Group Spokesperson), Brown, Gilbey, A Kitcat, Lepper, Powell and Simson

Voting Co-Optees: Martin Jones, Amanda Mortensen and Sally Collins

Non-Voting Co-Optees: Eleanor Davies, Sue Sjuve, Alex Boyle and Riziki Millanzi .

PART ONE

46 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

46(a) Declaration of Substitutes

46.1 Sally Collins declared she was substituting for Ann Holt.
Adam Muirhead declared he was substituting for Ben Glazebrook

46(b) Declarations of interest

46.2 Councillor Wealls stated that he was a Governor at St Andrew's C of E Primary School and declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in item 54.

46 (c) Exclusion of Press and Public

46.3 In accordance with section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 ("the Act"), the Committee considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during an item of business on the grounds that it was likely, in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present during that item, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information (as defined in section 100A(3) of the Act) or exempt information (as defined in section 100(I) of the Act).

46.4 **RESOLVED**- That the press and public not be excluded from the meeting during consideration of any item on the agenda.

47 MINUTES

47.1 **RESOLVED:** That the Chair be authorised to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2014 as a correct record.

48 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

48.1 The Chair advised the Committee of the following:

The Chair, and Councillor Powell, had visited the newly refurbished Puffin Nursery School. The nursery had received funding from the Local Authority for new building work. The Chair thanked all those involved.

Friday 21 November2014 was Takeover Day, when a group of 10 young people from schools across Brighton & Hove would be stepping into the shoes of council officials and politicians. Those involved included the Chief Executive, Executive Director of Children's Services, Leader of the Council and Councillor Shanks.

The Chair had attended the launch of the College of Social Workers.

The Chair had attended the Family Justice Board Annual Conference.

49 CALL OVER

49.1 It was agreed that all items be called.

50 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

50a **Petitions**

50.1 There were none.

50b **Written Questions**

50.2 There were six Written Questions

50.3 Joshua Stanley submitted the following question:
The Governor's support for expansion is conditional upon the inclusion of the Haddington Street car park. However there is significant opposition to this proposal from local businesses, as demonstrated by the fact that a petition of 39 signatures opposing the proposed changes to the car park has been submitted to the council. There is therefore considerable uncertainty over whether or not the council will be able to expand the school onto the car park as this is likely to be opposed during the planning process. Would it therefore not be fairer to parents applying for places in 2015 to treat any additional places granted in 2015 as a bulge class as the council will not be able to

guarantee that expansion will be permanent until after the January 15th deadline for primary school applications? This would allow permanent expansion to be delayed until 2016, giving time for a fuller and more satisfactory consultation exercise with the local community, allowing the expansion to go ahead with the full blessing of the local community.

The Chair gave the following response:
The report is clear that any approval of the proposal to expand St Andrew's is subject to planning consent and the Committee will need to consider carefully the evidence of opposition to the car park changes and the risk this presents. The decisions on planning consent and on Section 77 consent from the Secretary of State for Education must be received in time for primary school allocations to be issued on 16 April 2015. The project team is working to this deadline. Your idea of a bulge class rather than a permanent expansion would need to be discussed with the governing body and would require another mobile classroom somewhere on the playground. As the report explains, if the expansion of St Andrew's does not go ahead , either a bulge class somewhere in this area will be needed or children will have to be allocated places in schools much further away.

Joshua Stanley asked the following supplementary question:
What is the nature of the deal with Haddington Street Car Park?

The Chair gave the following response:
A Written Question on that issue has already been accepted and so will be dealt with shortly.

50.4 Jessica Stanley submitted the following question:
Under point 3.16 in the report, a petition appears to be treated as a single objection. I believe these 39 signatures represent all the major traders on Blatchington Road and George Street who have not been consulted by the council in any way. In view of the risk they pose to the whole St Andrews expansion project, they should not remain anonymous and be swept up in a single sentence. I am not able to examine them myself as the report was only published a few hours ago and questions have to be submitted by noon on the 14th November 2014. Can the chair please advise me and the CYPC who these 39 signatories are?

The Chair gave the following response:
It is usual for a petition to be referred to in a report in this way. The Committee is informed of the number of names on the petition and it has been available for Committee members to inspect since 7 November 2014. The report explains that any decision to approve the expansion plans for St Andrew's would be subject to planning consent being obtained and the Committee will need to consider the concerns about the loss of parking spaces and how this might affect the planning decision when they decide whether or not to approve the recommendation. It would not be appropriate to mention the 39 signatories by name but the addresses suggest that most of them may be associated with businesses in Blatchington Road.

Jessica Stanley asked the following supplementary question:
Will the objections of local businesses be a risk to the forthcoming planning application?

The Chair gave the following response:
The Planning Committee will consider the application together with any objections.

50.5 Mr H Lambert submitted the following question:
If the proposals go ahead, the provision of outdoor space at St Andrews will be approximately one quarter of the 24,170m2 recommended by the DfE for an existing three-form entry primary school, even if the plan to build on Haddington Street Car Park rather than the school playground gets the go-ahead. There will be over 200 additional pupils using the playground and field, but no additional provision appears to have been made to cope with these extra pupils in the plans that have been made publicly available. The situation will be particularly problematic in the winter months when the school field is out of use. Under-provision of outdoor space in primary schools is not limited to St Andrews and, sadly, appears to have become the norm in Brighton & Hove. The council can point to the fact that the DfE guidelines are not statutory, however, it is reasonable to assume that they were put in place for a reason - presumably to support the development and welfare of pupils in terms of achievement, physical development, health & well-being, and the opportunity for connecting with the natural world. Many studies have highlighted the importance of providing children with access to adequate, good-quality play space. Benefits cited include improvements in motor function development, reductions in the incidence of ADHD, lower incidence of alcohol and substance abuse in later years, and improvements in children's ability to form social relationships. For many children the school grounds represent the only outdoor space to which they have regular access. In Brighton and Hove, a high proportion of children live in flats, gardens tend to be tiny, there is little opportunity for children to play in the street, and increasing work pressure on parents means that trips to the park are less common than they might have been for previous generations. The current policy of expanding existing primary schools rather than building new ones suggests that the adequate provision of outdoor space for primary school children is not high on Brighton & Hove Council's list of priorities. Reductions in the amount of outdoor space per pupil appear to be seen as a price worth paying for the cost savings and convenience that the expansion policy provides. In reaching this policy position, what expert advice have the council taken to satisfy themselves that reductions in space per pupil will not have a negative impact on the health, development, and welfare of children at St Andrews and other expanded schools*?*

The Chair gave the following response:
The highest priority must be to fulfil our statutory duty to ensure that all children have a school place. We have been flexible and imaginative in how we have provided new places for the increasing number of primary age children in Brighton & Hove. We have developed new sites at Connaught and the Hove Police Station site. We have collaborated with the Education Funding Agency and the Bilingual Primary School in making available the Hove Park Depot site as a permanent home for this free school. We have also expanded a number of schools. We do not in any way disregard the importance of outdoor play space. For each expansion proposal we have worked with the school to find ways that children's needs for outdoor space are met, even where, as is often the case in urban areas and not just in Brighton & Hove, the space available

does not meet the area recommended in the Department for Education guidance. This aspect has been an important part of our discussions with St Andrew's and is reflected in the governing body's response letter which is included with the report. Ultimately we must be able to satisfy the Secretary of State under the Section 77 regulations that despite the shortfall against the recommended minimum the curriculum and children's needs at St Andrew's can be met. This is a condition of approval of the expansion proposal. We have already submitted an application and expect to discuss this with DfE officials. Under the most recent guidance on the protection of school playing fields and powers to protect land for academies the DfE emphasises the importance of exploring joint use agreements with other schools and this is something that we will be doing in relation to St Andrew's.

Mr Lambert asked the following supplementary question:
There will be cost savings by expanding an existing school rather than building a new one; could you not use those savings to finance improvements to the outside play area at St Andrew's?

The Chair gave the following response:
The important issue is to ensure there are sufficient places for children in that part of the city. As I said in my earlier response, discussions are taking with the DfE on outside playing areas.

50.6 Mr S Jacques submitted the following question:
In the DfE publication "School Organisation: Maintained Schools - Guidance for proposers and decision-makers", page 6, Governing bodies are expected to: "Ensure effective consultation with parents and other interested parties to gauge demand for their proposed change(s) and to provide them with sufficient opportunity to give their views". There have been major shortcomings in the consultation process that mean that these minimum requirements have not been met. In particular:
• there has been a lack of adherence to the requirements of applicable Public Law; and
• all interested parties have not been consulted or their views properly taken into account.
The failure to afford the interested parties a reasonable opportunity to be heard deprives the citizens of their right to a fair hearing, which is a key component of natural justice. It is implicit in the consultation process that adequate information must be provided. Yet this statutory consultation was rushed and took place with very little information to comment on – there were no elevational drawings available, access points into the school had yet to be determined and the traffic study had yet to commence. Even if all interested parties had been properly consulted, which is not agreed, there was still a lack of information. It is disingenuous to suggest that all interested parties will have another opportunity for consultation when the planning application is submitted as that is a different process held under a separate regime. At the 22 September CYPC meeting those who attended witnessed that the Chair requested that the plans now go on public display and also be put up in Hove Library – this is recorded in the CYPC's minutes of the meeting. The plans were not displayed in the school at the Architect's request because he did not want to pre-empt the planning application. The plans were only available to view in the school office and upon request. Nevertheless, the 28-day statutory consultation period (the "Statutory Consultation Period") had started running. No-one has reported seeing the plans on display in Hove Library. Within the Statutory Consultation Period for how long were the plans on public display at the school? They

were on public display for an insufficient period of two afternoons only one week before the end of the Statutory Consultation Period and 3 days before the school closed for its half term holiday. Were the plans put up on the glazed notice board outside the school? No. Was the Local Authority consultation portal open for comment during the Statutory Consultation Period? No. According to the Report there was a parents' meeting on 30 October. That is very unlikely to have taken place as it was during the school's half term week. It is understood that only two residents apparently attended a separate meeting on 4 November – after the statutory consultation period had closed. Apart from a flyer posted during the last week of the process was there any prior contact made with local residents? No. (The Cabinet Office Guidelines on Public Consultations suggest they should be digital by default, in other words, there should have been an opportunity to see the consultation document on a publicly available website and clearly interested stakeholders to be sent an email to advise them of the availability of the consultation documentation.) Were local traders, the very group of people for whose benefit the car park was created some 12 years ago, consulted? No. Was there any attempt to arrange a meeting with local traders to discuss their concerns? No. Have the Local Authority-appointed traffic consultants, Project Centre, yet made contact with local residents and local traders? No. The conduct of this process is open to challenge. It has cut corners and been rushed. There is nothing in the Government guidelines that permits dispensing with the need to consult with interested parties on the grounds that a planning application is to follow. Pinning notices to lamp posts in the hope that as few people as possible will notice is not the way forward. You need to engage with the people whose interests are to be most affected by your proposals – the parents [of children at the school], the local residents and, perhaps most of all, the local traders. For the various reasons above, we believe that interested parties have been penalised as they have not been given sufficient prior notice of the process or a fair opportunity to present their points of view and evidence. Will the Committee now accept that this exercise must be re-run in accordance with due process and, in particular, with an adequate and transparent consultation to enable all interested and/or affected stakeholders to contribute their evidence and points of view?

<u>The Chair gave the following response:</u>
It is not accepted that there has been a lack of adherence or understanding of the legal requirements for this process, or that there have been major shortcomings in the nature of the consultation process. The question refers in part to the non binding Cabinet Office Guidelines on Public Consultations – those particular Guidelines make clear that the governing principle is one of proportionality in relation to the type and scale of consultation, but those Guidelines do not prevail over statutory requirements. The School Organisation Statutory Notice process and the local planning process are separate but linked. The Statutory Notice process with which this committee is concerned is governed by the principles set out in Guidance issued by the Department for Education in January 2014 entitled "School Organisation: Maintained Schools-Guidance for proposers and decision-makers", and is led by the Children's Services Directorate. This statutory process is concerned with the principle of expansion and whether it can be achieved satisfactorily in terms of the education and wellbeing of pupils. The primary people concerned at this stage are all those associated with the school, including pupils, parents, staff, governors and families of younger children who will need a school place. In relation to the issue of consultation the Guidance states: " Although there is no longer a prescribed 'pre-consultation' period for prescribed alterations, there is a strong expectation on schools and LAs to consult interested

parties in developing their proposal prior to publication as part of their duty under public law to act rationally and to take into account all relevant considerations." In this case the consultation process carried out prior to publication of the Notice in respect of these proposals was extensive, and is set out in detail in the reports to CYP Committee dated 21 July and 22 September 2014. Following the publication of the statutory notice on 1 October 2014 there then followed a four week statutory representation period. There is no provision in the legislation for extending this time period. The Guidance states at Annex A.2 that:

"A statutory proposal for making significant changes to schools must contain sufficient information for interested parties to make a decision on whether to support the proposed change. As a minimum the department would expect a proposal to include:

- *School and LA details;*
- *Description of alteration and evidence of demand;*
- *Objectives (including how the proposal would increase educational standards and parental choice);*
- *The effect on other schools, academies and educational institutions within the area; Project costs and indications of how these will be met, including how long term value for money will be achieved;*
- *Implementation and any proposed stages for implementation;*
- *A statement explaining the procedure for responses: support; objections and comments"*

Paragraph 18 states: *"During this period, any person or organisation can submit comments on the proposal to the LA to be taken into account by the decision-maker."*

All of this has been complied with. The Statutory Notice and the Full Proposal documents have been available on the council's web site throughout the four week Notice period. All Members have been informed by email of two errors of fact in the report i.e. that the parents meetings were on 21 and 23 October 2014 and not on 30 October 2014 and that plans were not displayed in the glazed notice board outside the school. It is correct that the plans were not displayed in Hove Library as suggested by me at the 22 September 2014 Committee meeting and recorded in the minutes. While this would have brought the plans to wider attention, there will still be proper opportunity for local people to comment at the planning application stage, if the Committee approves the principle of expansion this afternoon. This committee does not make the planning decisions in relation to the proposed expansion. The local planning process is led by the Local Planning Authority and is concerned with the physical built environment, including highways aspects, and must properly consult all local people who may be affected by the proposal. As part of this process there are clear requirements about the information that must be provided and to whom it must be provided, and these will be followed in the event the proposal proceeds to planning. The report before the committee is clear about how these two processes are linked – if the Committee approves the principle of expansion, this must be conditional upon securing planning consent and the Secretary of State's approval under Section 77 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998. It would not be reasonable to expect a fully worked up design to be prepared before the principle of expansion was approved, but because of the

additional time for developing the St Andrew's project that was agreed after the initial consultation in the summer term it has been possible to engage school stakeholders and to a limited extent local residents in the development of the proposal. The Committee will need to consider from the work described in the report whether there is a reasonable expectation that the conditions will be met.

Mr Jacques asked the following supplementary:
The managers of the local Co-op and Iceland shops said they knew nothing about the consultation process. Would the Committee therefore agree that the consultation process has been a complete failure?

The Chair gave the following response:
The Committee will be considering the report and the recommendations shortly.

50.7 Mr J Stanley submitted the following question:
I feel that the Councils whole approach to the proposed expansion of St Andrews, which should have been open and transparent from the start, has been anything but. This has led to a disconnect between the council and vital local stakeholders such as the parents, local residents and local businesses. On the 4th July 2014, 86.64% of parents and local residents voted overwhelming against expansion. Despite huge concerns about how you could even begin to safely get 990 children and their carers safely in and out of St Andrews and West Hove (Connaught) the council continued with their proposed scheme. Fast forward to November 2014 and parents, local residents and local business are currently locked out of the safety loop by the Council who have employed Project Centre solely to achieve planning consent by way of an Independent Travel Statement. This falls far far short of what could, and should, be achieved to ensure the safety of the children and their parents and carers. One of the key skill sets of Project Centre, is that they can organise a full and open consultation with key stakeholders (parents, local residents and businesses) to come up with a set of safety proposals that would work in the real world. My question is: When are the council going to get serious about the safety of our children by giving Project Centre the funding to organise a full and open consultation with key stakeholders including parents, local residents and businesses in order to come up with a set of safety proposals that will work in the real world?

The Chair gave the following response:
Project Centre are independent, professional traffic consultants who have been commissioned to carry out a traffic safety assessment and provide a detailed proposal to be included in the planning application. Project Centre has the expertise, experience and independence to undertake this commission effectively and with proper regard for what constitutes a workable set of safety proposals. It will be for the Planning Committee to decide whether to approve the application and what highway conditions if any should be attached to any consent.

Mr Stanley asked the following supplementary:
Are you going to appoint a consultant to undertake a proper travel plan?

The Chair gave the following response
This will be looked at further if required by the Planning Committee. Expanding the school will ensure children do not have to travel too far to school.

50.8 Dr A Tate submitted the following question:
At the first public meeting in which parents were made aware of the proposal to expand St Andrews, Gillian Churchill was asked why it was not possible to expand onto the Haddington Street car park. She replied that it would be virtually impossible due to legal agreements that had been reached with local shops when the current school was originally built on the site of a much larger car park. This position is confirmed in the redacted minutes to the Governor's meeting dated 5th March 2014 which state that: "The main issue with this option is that the Haddington Street car-park is owned by the Highways section of the council. The car park cannot be moved as it was part of the deal when the current school was built, to retain a car park for George Street and Blatchington Road. The school was built on an existing, much larger, car park." How come this Haddington Car Park "deal" is no longer relevant?

The Chair gave the following response:
At the time of the Governors meeting in March 2014 our understanding was that the car park in Haddington Street was provided as a planning obligation on the Tesco development. Having investigated this further with the Local Planning Authority we have been informed that this is not the case. As a result of this we continued to discuss the possibility of making use of this car park for the proposed school expansion hence the current proposal.

Dr Tate asked the following supplementary:
What steps do the council still need to take to be able to build on Haddington Street car park without significant risk of a legal challenge?

The Chair gave the following response:
In light of the previous answer, we do not believe there is risk of legal challenge on this point. The council will however need to secure planning consent for the revised car park arrangement

50c **Deputations**

50.9 There were none.

51 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

51a Petitions

51.1 There were none.

51b Written Questions

51.2 There were none.

51c Letters

51.3 There were none.

51d Notices of Motion

51.4 There were none.

52 MEMBER OF UK YOUTH PARLIAMENT FOR BRIGHTON & HOVE IN TELEVISED DEBATE - PRESENTATOIN

52.1 The Committee were given a presentation from Thomas Soud who is a Member of the UK Youth Parliament (MYP). Thomas is the MYP for Brighton and Hove. Thomas recently led a project that saw local participation in the UK Youth Parliament's national Make Your Mark campaign rise from 11% in 2013 to 21% in 2014. As recognition of his work he won an award from the UK Youth Parliament for increasing participation.

52.2 Thomas said that every year the MYPs from across the UK met in the House of Commons to debate the top five issues voted for in the Make Your Mark campaign. Nationally 869,000 young people voted on which topic to discuss, with 4,450 of those votes coming from Brighton and Hove. The issues this year were; Living Wage, Euthanasia, Exam re-sits, Mental Health and Work Experience. The event was held on 14 November 2014, and Thomas had been selected to open one of the debates. The proceedings were conducted by The Right Honourable John Bercow MP, Speaker for the House of Commons, recorded in Hansard and televised live on BBC Democracy Live.

52.3 Councillor Powell thanked Thomas for his presentation, and asked him about equalities of the UK Youth Parliament and whether he knew how many members were male/female and how many were identified as BME, LGBT and Disabled. Thomas said that membership was 56% female and 44% male, with approximately 30% BME but didn't know about disabled or LGBT membership as that information wasn't recorded.

52.4 The Chair asked how the issues to be debated were selected, and was advised that various ideas were put forward, and then a short list drawn up which people could then vote for. The top five issues were then considered at the debate. The Members of the Youth Parliament then voted on which of those issues to campaign on.

52.5 Thomas said that if anyone wanted to watch the debate it could be viewed on http://www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/episode/b04ph3sn/uk-youth-parliament-debates-2014-14112014

52.6 The Chair thanked Thomas for attending the meeting.

53 SOLAR PANELS IN SCHOOLS

53.1 The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director for Children's Services in relation to solar panels in schools, which was introduced by the Head of Education Planning and Contracts. The report updated the Committee on solar panel installations in the school building portfolio and outlined how the ring-fenced capital budget would be used over the course of the year.

53.2 Alex Boyle asked whether it was cheaper to buy multiple panels, and was advised that the Energy Team within the Council was well placed to negotiate with suppliers to get the best possible price. Councillor Simson asked whether Children's Services were working with other departments, such as Housing to get better deals. The Chair said that the Energy Team was working with all departments within the Council.

53.3 Martin Jones asked if funding from the Solar Schools project was also being used. The Head of Education Planning and Contracts said that that project was a source of grants which schools could bid for, and that complimented the funding from the Council.

53.4 Councillor Littman thanked officers for the report and was very pleased with the success of the scheme, particularly at St Bartholomew's CE Primary School.

53.5 RESOLVED: That the Committee noted the report.

54 PROPOSED EXPANSION OF ST ANDREW'S CHURCH OF ENGLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL TO THREE FORMS OF ENTRY FROM SEPTEMBER 2015 - RESPONSES TO STATUTORY NOTICE

54.1 The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director for Children's Services in relation to the proposed expansion of St Andrew's CE Primary School to three forms of entry from September 2015 and the response to the Statutory Notice. The report was introduced by the Head of Education Planning and Contracts and the Head of Capital Strategy.

54.2 The Committee were advised that there were two corrections to the report. Paragraph 3.6 referred to a 'parents' evening held on 30 October 2014', that should have read 'two parents' evenings held on 21 and 23 October 2014'. Paragraph 3.6 also stated that the plans 'have been displayed in the school and on the notice board outside the school'. That was incorrect, and the plans were not displayed outside the school but the school did inform parents that the plans could be seen at the parents' meetings and that they were placed on the school web site; they were also available to be seen at the school.

54.3 Alex Boyle asked for reassurance that there would be sufficient scrutiny of the plans when the matter was considered by the Planning Committee. The Head of Education Planning and Contracts said that that Committee would follow the correct procedures and the public would have the opportunity to speak at the meeting.

54.4 Councillor Simson noted that one of the Governor's conditions was that there would be an additional entrance to the school, and asked if that was included in the plans. The Head of Education Planning and Contracts confirmed it was.

54.5 Alex Boyle asked how the architects for the proposals had been selected. The Head of Capital Strategy said that the Council used in-house architects who had experience of designing school expansions.

54.6 Councillor Pissaridou asked what the fall back position would be if the expansion proposals were not agreed. The Chair said consideration would have to be given to creating bulge classes, and allocating places at schools across the city which had places.

54.7 Councillor Wealls noted that when options for more school places were looked at before, it had been suggested that Kings House be used but officers had said that it wasn't necessary as there were spaces at schools in Portslade. Councillor Wealls suggested that because of the number of children who could be attending St Andrew's there be a restriction on lorry deliveries be made during school start and finish times to ensure the safety of children.

54.8 Sally Collins said that the Diocese of Chichester had been working with the school on the demand for places, and said that the Diocese supported the expansion.

54.9 Martin Jones said that after the initial consultation a majority of parents voted against the proposals and asked if there was any evidence to show that they still weren't opposed to it. The Chair said that the evidence was in the response to the Statutory Notice, and from meetings held with parents. The Committee also had to consider the position of parents whose children were not yet at school.

54.10 **RESOLVED**: That the Children and Young People Committee confirmed the proposal contained in the statutory notice and agreed the expansion of St Andrew's CE Primary School to three forms of entry from September 2015, subject to both planning consent and the Secretary of State's consent for change of use being obtained by 31 March 2015.

55 SCHOOL OFSTED - PRESENTATION

55.1 The Assistant Director Education and Inclusion provided an update on recent Ofsted Inspections on schools in the city. A copy of the presentation was circulated at the meeting.

55.2 The Committee were advised that Ofsted Inspectors had completed their inspections on six schools since the start of the autumn term, with more due in the coming months. Mile Oak Primary School received a 'Good' rating; previously it had been deemed to require improvement. St Peter's Community Primary School had previously been rated as 'Outstanding', but was now classed as 'Needing improvement'. Brackenbury Primary and Downs Park had retained their 'Good' rating. The reports for Hillside and Bilingual Primary School had yet to be published.

55.3 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee note the presentation.

56 EARLY PARENTING ASSESSMENT PROGRAMME - PRESENTATION

56.1 The Committee received a presentation on Early Parenting Assessment Programme (EPAP and the Looking Forward Project. The presentation was made by the Sure Start Manager.

56.2 Councillor Lepper thanked the Sure Start Manager for the work being undertaken and asked whether funding would continue for the EPAP and Looking Forward Project. The Executive Director for Children's Services said that there were funding challenges for the Council, but this was not an area where reduction in funding was being considered. The Chair added that the cost of removing a child from its mother was high, and so from a funding perspective it was 'value for money'.

56.3 Councillor Lepper asked whether the Council were working jointly with the NHS in this area of work. Sue Sjuve said that the NHS had a Family Nurse Partnership (FNP) Programme, and they were working closely with the Council.

56.3 Martin Jones said that some parents would have multiple problems, and asked if early intervention helped identify what support was needed. The Sure Start Manager said that assessments were undertaken on a range of issues, such as mental health assessment, an ability to live independently etc.

56.4 Alex Boyle asked if work was undertaken with fathers too. The Sure Start Manager said that they did.

56.5 Adam Muirhead asked if work was undertaken with the Community Voluntary Sector Forum, and was advised that it was and the Council would be working with OASIS on the Looking Forward Project.

56.6 **RESOLVED**: The Committee noted the presentation.

57 ANNUAL STANDARDS REPORT FOR CHILDREN IN CARE (EARLY HEADLINES)

57.1 The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director for Children's Services in relation to the Annual Standards report for Children in Care. The report was introduced by the Virtual School Head Teacher. The report updated the Committee on recent results for Children in Care and informed the Committee on the proposed priorities of the new Head Teacher of the Virtual School.

57.2 Councillor A Kitcat asked if a fuller report would be provided for Councillors. The Virtual School Head Teacher said that the full Annual Standards report would be presented at the next meeting of the Corporate Parenting Board and more information provided at a future meeting of the Children & Young People Committee.

57.3 Councillor A Kitcat noted that the report gave a lot of percentages for what the children had achieved but not the actual number of children, and asked if that information was available. The Virtual School Head Teacher said that it would be included in the fuller report which would be going to Corporate Parenting Board. Riziki Millanzi agreed with Councillor A Kitcat, and said that the actual number of children would be useful.

57.4 Alex Boyle referred to paragraphs 3.3.1 – 3.3.3 in the report and asked if there were reasons why children in care locally were above the national average for KS4, but below for KS1 and KS2. The Virtual School Head Teacher said the percentages had been included in the report, but comparisons could be misleading; if there was a small cohort the figures could be misleading. This year those in KS4 had performed well, which was good, but last year it was below the national average.

57.5 Riziki Millanzi asked whether the Virtual School dealt with children themselves or through agencies. The Head Teacher of the Virtual School said it was both. Some children were aware the Virtual School existed and dealt with them direct, but sometimes they didn't as they didn't want the children to feel that there was another service was observing them.

57.6 Councillor Simson asked if children were supported through university. The Chair said that children are supported until the age of 25,

57.7 RESOLVED:
(1) That the Committee noted the report
(2) That the Committee supported the initial priorities as outlined in the report.

58 ITEMS REFERRED FOR COUNCIL

58.1 It was agreed that there were no items to be referred to Council.

The meeting concluded at 6.40pm

Signed Chair

Dated this day of