

Minutes

RESIDENTS, EDUCATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES POLICY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

25 February 2020

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Wayne Bridges (Chairman), Michael Markham (Vice-Chairman), Allan Kauffman, Devi Radia, Stuart Mathers, John Morgan, Paula Rodrigues, Jan Sweeting and Tony Little</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer), James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration), Dan Kennedy (Director, Housing, Environment, Education, Performance, Health & Wellbeing), Iris Cerny (Senior School Improvement Link), Rani Dady (School Improvement / Governance / Moderation Manager), Sarah Phillips (School Place Planning Project Manager), Andre MacLeod (Lead Finance Business Partner) and Rebecca Yee (Infrastructure Planning Manager)</p>
61.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Tuckwell.</p>
62.	<p>DECLARATION OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
63.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT ALL ITEMS MARKED PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT ANY ITEMS MARKED PART 2 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items would be considered in public.</p>
64.	<p>TO AGREE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>Mr Little confirmed that his attendance had been omitted from the minutes.</p> <p>Regarding minute 55, Councillor Sweeting advised that the resolutions should include that officers were to share the detail of High Needs Places funding with the Committee, once available.</p> <p>Regarding minute 57, Councillor Morgan confirmed that the resolution on uniformed groups should cover all uniformed groups omitted from the report, and not be limited to the Northwood/Northwood Hills areas.</p> <p>Councillor Sweeting advised that it was her understanding that the referred-to £2.5m for Youth Services was not to be used for the items as listed in the minutes, but was instead to be used across a number of financial years. The Committee agreed that this</p>

point needed further clarity from finance officers.

Councillor Mathers highlighted a typographical error, highlighting that the correct number of attendances to the Universal Youth Services over the last year was 32k.

Regarding minute 58, Councillor Sweeting advised that she was yet to meet with the Chairman to discuss the amendments to the recommendations to the review into Littering and Fly-Tipping. The Chairman advised that he could speak with Councillor Sweeting after the meeting, should she wish.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2020 be approved as a correct record, inclusive of the above amendments.

65. **DRAFT SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT STRATEGY 2020-2023** (*Agenda Item 5*)

Rani Dady (School Improvement Officer / Governance / Moderation Manager), and Iris Cerny, (Senior School Improvement Link), introduced the report detailing Hillingdon's draft School Improvement Strategy for 2020-2023. It was confirmed that the proposed strategy had been updated to reflect new Schools Causing Concern guidance issued by central government, and had been designed to be school-led and collaborative in nature.

The Committee asked a number of questions, including:

Parents appeared to be absent from the consultees/stakeholders listed in the report. In addition, there did not appear to be any opportunities for whistle-blowers to liaise with the Council. Why was this?

The strategy set out working partnerships between the Council and the Borough's schools. Schools were felt to be best placed to consult directly with their parents and could then notify the Council of any issues, if identified. Whistle-blowers would follow the Council's complaints process.

What was the budget available to the service? How many children were classed as Special needs, and how much did it cost to educate a non Special Needs child versus a Special Needs Child? How was value for money assessed?

Budget and costs could be shared following the meeting. However, it was recognised that there was a big difference when allocating resource for a Special needs child versus a non-Special Needs Child. Each case is looked at individually, and an assessment of need is undertaken, before any funding is allocated.

The report referenced the Strategic Partnership Board. Was this a new board, and what were its responsibilities? Were sufficient financial resources available for it to meet those responsibilities?

The Board had been in place since 2015, and was comprised of representations from schools, governors and the local authority. The Board had also been responsible for the previous School-led Improvement Strategy. Though the Local Education Area Partnership (LEAP) had been in place for approximately a year, the Board would be responsible for driving and delivering the new strategy. Regarding finances, it was expected that the strategy would be delivered within current resources.

How effective was the previous strategy? How were children performing at key stages?

The forthcoming Standards and Quality in Education report would contain government-validated data that set out the effectiveness of the previous strategy and the subsequent attainment of the Borough's children.

How was the Council working with schools who were facing challenges due to pupil demographics and other external issues?

Academy schools were liaised with through the Regional School's Commissioner's office, to understand the context they were working within and ensure any inspection was fairly taking into account said context. Maintained schools were also supported through the School Improvement Link officers, who worked with all schools across the three borough 'patches' – North, Central and South. Academy schools who were not engaging with the local authority would be approached through the office of the Regional School's Commissioner.

Schools who were facing challenges due to the make up of their student body would be supported to always put the children first. Through the creation of development opportunities and other support mechanisms such as their own speech and language therapists, educational psychologists, parent support groups etc. The Civic Centre was central, to allow easy dialogue with colleagues across service areas as required.

Did the Council support schools where special needs children did not have Education and Healthcare Plans (EHCPs)?

The Council supported such schools in partnership with the SEN service, through observation to ensure quality of teaching, student performance tracking, etc. The Council often sought reassurances on how the schools were challenging their most able students, or how they were meeting the needs of the children who required additional support, and would hold the schools to account should the feedback not be satisfactory.

Support would be provided, should a school advise the Council that it was struggling to cope.

Did the Council have sufficient resourcing within the school improvement team? If extra resources were made available, where should these be allocated?

The team was resourced appropriately in order to meet its objectives. If extra resources were made available, these would be used to grow LEAP, further strengthening partnership working and supporting schools that were at risk of decline. It was important to ensure that all resources were used effectively.

How was the Council learning from alternative schools and other education providers, e.g. for those pupils who had been or were at risk of permanent exclusion?

Intelligence collected from the Admissions Service and a variety of schools was used to signpost schools to those that were performing well. Some excellent work was being carried out at schools that had specialist units attached, which was available as a resource that could be shared. For example, the success of autism units was recognised as a valuable source of sharable learnings.

How was the Council obtaining and measuring feedback from schools to the proposed strategy?

The strategy has been developed with schools, and through the LEAP and the Schools Strategic Partnership Board (SSPB), with further consultation to take place in order to obtain and incorporate feedback before being finalised. The SSPB had wide representation from primary, secondary and special schools, as well as the governing body, which allowed for engagement with all stakeholders to enable true partnership working within the strategy.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the report be noted;**
- 2. That detail on the service budget, costs for providing education to Special Needs and non-Special Needs pupils, and the relevant SEN value for money assessment be provided to the Committee following the meeting.**

66. **QUARTERLY SCHOOL PLACES PLANNING UPDATE INCL. SEPTEMBER 2020**
(Agenda Item 6)

Sarah Phillips (School Place Planning Project Manager) provided the Committee with the latest Quarterly School Places Planning Update.

Overall, trends showed that demand for places in primary schools was high and plateauing. A small number of primary schools had surplus places and in light of this, were planning to reduce their Planned Admission Numbers (PANs), while some schools were trialling informal caps in certain year groups. Places were being carefully managed to ensure parents still received adequate choice over their children's school places.

Demand for places at secondary schools was increasing, with higher numbers of pupils transitioning from primary to secondary places. Many schools within the Borough had been enlarged with new buildings and facilities to accommodate this increased demand. Some schools had added temporary extra places, and these had been carefully considered in light of parental preferences and the Borough's transport links. Offer day was due on Monday 2 March, upon which day most parents would receive a place for their children at one of their preferred schools. Planning for permanent solutions to meet demand was continuing.

The Committee asked a number of questions, including:

How many of the approximately 51k children attending Hillingdon schools actually lived in the Borough?

Of the 51k, roughly 15% of Hillingdon pupils did not live in the Borough. However, approximately 15% of residents also chose to attend schools outside of Hillingdon. Schools on the boundary of Hillingdon often saw large numbers of pupils attending from other boroughs, up to 65% in some schools.

From a planning perspective, what were the considerations for schools looking to use temporary accommodation to meet demand for places?

The school would need to consider whether the land in question was within a Green Belt, within a floodplain, or whether the land was currently a playing field. Schools would be required to consult with all stakeholders, including Sport England (on the matter of the playing fields). Appeals to the Secretary of State would be required to overcome any veto by Sport England.

How long was considered 'temporary' accommodation?

The length of term for temporary accommodation would be conditioned at the outset, e.g. for 3 years. Renewals could then be considered as and when required.

The report listed the number of pupils transferring to secondary from primary. What was the rate for this transition?

The ratio of pupils transferring from primary to secondary schools was approximately 96%, with some pupils moving to schools outside of the Borough. Conversely, pupils from other boroughs also chose to attend Hillingdon schools. It was highlighted that since the publication of the report, the number of extra bulge places being offered by schools across the Borough was 145.

Primary schools were facing difficulties regarding pupil places. The example of a school within Northwood was highlighted. Were too many primary places being put into schools?

At the time of the commissioning of places, forecasts showed a certain level of demand. However, changes in population across the Borough, for example due to location of jobs, choice of settlement areas, family birth rates etc. had resulted in a change of demand in certain areas. It was expected that such demographics would naturally ebb and flow across 30+ years. All children within the Borough had been provided with a school place, on time, during a period of considerable increased demand for primary school places.

The demand for secondary school places was being managed through temporary measures such as bulge years. The Borough was currently holding a small amount of surplus places, 1%, when guidance from central government suggested authorities should provide 5-10%. The number of children currently in certain primary school years was exceeding secondary places. Could the officers provide any information around a potential new school in the south of the Borough that could help alleviate these issues?

The Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) was responsible for identifying a site for the approved new secondary free school.

Options were begin presented to Cabinet members on how to address demand for school places in the long term. A firm agreement was in place to expand a school in the south of the Borough, with options available to expand two further schools, (though this could require reconfiguring the schools, which would result in a high unit cost). Officers were continuing to work closely with schools, and would provide further updates to the Committee when able.

If a school was struggling to accommodate its pupils, did the Council have the power to install new accommodation?

The Council retained a budget for such matters, though the need to install new accommodation was assessed on an individual basis.

How much interaction did the Council have with schools outside of Hillingdon when assessing population growth and potential demand for places in the Borough?

Regular meetings with neighbouring authorities were held throughout each school term, for the purposes of assessing growth and demand.

A school within the north of the Borough as struggling financially due to a lack of pupils. Was the Council working to address this?

Officers were in close dialogue with the school and the ESFA. It would not be appropriate to share further detail at this time.

The report made reference to new 'arrivals'. Were these people new to the Borough, or new to the UK?

This could be both, or either. The report did not specify.

How many unfilled places were expected in Year 7 for September 2020?

Unfilled places were expected to be lower than 5%.

Members requested that future reports include a detailed section on Special Needs cohorts, and that tables and charts were enlarged to aid comprehensibility.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

67. **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) REPORTING** *(Agenda Item 7)*

James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Rebecca Yee (Infrastructure Planning Manager) and Andrew Macleod (Lead Finance Business Partner) introduced the annual report on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Officers confirmed that CIL was a charge which allowed the Council to raise funds from developers undertaking new building projects, which supported the financing of infrastructure costs across the Borough. In line with regulatory requirements, a detailed annual report on CIL total income and expenditure was required to be published to the Council's website by 31 December in respect of the previous financial year.

CIL formed one of the sources of funding towards the overall capital programme. The level of CIL receipts achieved for capital financing each year was set out within the report, and at the end of December 2019, a total of £3,961k CIL receipts had been invoiced or received within the financial year.

CIL regulations stated that a minimum of 15% of receipts must be allocated to local neighbourhood projects. The Chrysalis programme met the criteria for local CIL infrastructure spending, with projects ranging in scale from £5k to £100k for local initiatives. Annual spend on the programme was approximately £1m, fully financed by CIL, which was in excess of the 15% total CIL receipts.

CIL regulations were amended in September 2019 and have introduced the requirement to produce an Infrastructure Funding Statement each year, by 31 December. Infrastructure funding statements must cover the previous financial year, from 1 April to 31 March. As part of these new regulations, authorities are encouraged to include details of both S106 and CIL funding, where previously these have been set out in separate reports.

Hillingdon has spent all of its CIL funding, with nothing left to allocate.

The Committee asked a number of questions, including:

The report lists funding of circa £600k for outdoor sports and play facilities. Who is responsible for determining where that money is spent?

These projects were determined through the Chrysalis programme, which responds to resident suggestions for projects. A large number of requests from residents relate to sports and play facilities.

The report did not indicate CIL monies were being spent on health facilities. Why was this?

On large-scale developments, planning officers were often requesting that the developers include room for health facilities. For example, the Old Vinyl site development would hopefully include room for a 900sqm health facility. However, for a variety of reasons, many of which were beyond planning's ability to overcome, such developments often fell through, with not all planning developments reaching the finishing line.

How much were residents involved via consultation on how CIL/S106 monies were spent?

Residents were consulted on all planning applications where required. CIL money in particular was often used for improvements to the public realm. Highlights of completed projects were also set out in Hillingdon People.

Councillor Sweeting referred to a request made at a previous Planning Committee meeting, for officers to provide additional detail of how CIL money was being spent within each ward. The Committee considered this request, and it was agreed that the clerk would review the nature of the request made at the earlier planning committee before feeding back to the Committee.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the report be noted; and**
- 2. That the clerk review the nature of the request made at the earlier planning committee before feeding back to the Committee.**

68. **VERBAL UPDATE ON PROGRESS OF REVIEW INTO LITTERING AND FLY-TIPPING** (*Agenda Item 8*)

The clerk provided Members with a verbal update on the progress of the Committee's review into Littering and Fly-Tipping within Hillingdon.

It was confirmed that the majority of the suggested amendments to the draft recommendations presented at the previous meeting had been approved in principle, and revised draft recommendations would be forwarded to Members in the near future. The final report to Cabinet would include a section setting out the Committee's detailed suggestions for how some of the recommendations could be implemented.

The Committee's suggestion that the report and recommendations include further innovation and best practice, such as initiatives being undertaken at other local authorities, was being reviewed. If any such innovation was identified, further detail would be brought to a future meeting of the Committee.

	RESOLVED: That the verbal update be noted.
69.	<p>CABINET FORWARD PLAN (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Consideration was given the Cabinet Forward Plan.</p> <p>It was requested that the clerk review whether the forthcoming item on Standards and Quality in Education would need to be rescheduled, in light of a report on the subject being due for consideration by Cabinet in April 2020.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the Cabinet Forward Plan be noted; and 2. That the clerk review the scheduling of the forthcoming item on Standards and Quality in Education.
70.	<p>WORK PROGRAMME (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Consideration was given the Work Programme for forthcoming meetings. Several suggestions for new information items were discussed, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A briefing note regarding the enforcement of parking management schemes; • A report on the updated strategic plan for the Adult Learning service (potentially with a visit to the Brookfield site); • An update on the Arts provision across the Borough (with potential expansion into an item on the investment into Heritage within the Borough); • An item on the new Battle of Britain Bunker, including how successful it had been, financial information etc. • An item on the provision of Sports facilities across the Borough (not limited to children); • An item on mortuary services and relevant partnership working; • An item on the local impact of HS2; • The impact of capital expenditure on youth services; • The impact of the reorganisation of children's' centres. <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the Forward Plan be noted; 2. That the suggested items above be considered for inclusion on the Work Programme for future meetings.
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.50 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Neil Fraser on 01895 250692. If you are attending the meeting, please enter via main reception and visit the security desk to sign-in and collect a visitors pass. You will then be directed to the Committee Room. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.