

---

## Analysis Document of Gartcosh School Consultation Proposal

The education authority is required to make a Benefits Statement which is part 3 of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) 2010 Act.

### **Comment 1.**

5.10 - If the Benefit Statement states the site will be accessed from all directions of the community, the site will open the catchment area up to the children who were excluded from the catchment area in 2011. When all walkways and roads are complete, pupils who were excluded will be closer to the site than children on the roll. The community was unhappy when action was taken by the council regarding the catchment area to exclude pupils living in the Mount Ellen area was taken because the school could not support that part of the community. Parents have been in a situation of having their children in two different schools. Any new build school should address this issue and presents an ideal opportunity to do so.

**The education authority have therefore not addressed the likely effects of the pupils in any other school (Chryston primary school).**

**Under item 1 of part 3 (Benefit Statement) - the education authority has not carried out a proper assessment of likely effects of the relevant proposal on pupils, pupils who would be likely to become pupils, pupils of any other school.**

**The catchment area can be changed by the same mechanism used in 2011 to exclude part of our community and as the school is not even been passed yet, there is sufficient time to calendar this change in council business.**

**NB — planning has not been passed in all direction and is an issue which is greatly opposed by most residents. The comment made under 5.10 is also worrying regarding a new community. Residents are not looking for a new community, it is looking to create a better community but this comment reflects North Lanarkshire Council's thinking. It has also been confirmed that all road and walkways across the whole of the community growth area must be completed by the time the 1,000 house is occupied. The community growth area includes Glenboig. Residents will be pressing for new housing occupancy data since the local plan was passed in 2012 within the growth area and demanding walkways and roads are formed according to the conditions put forward by council.**

### **Comment 2.**

5.11 This statement is incorrect. After hours use of the school would provide (we presume, not confirmed) a larger space for community meetings, but that does not represent a gain as the community will have grown to fit the space on offer. School letting rates are not affordable even to community groups and availability creates competition between communities groups and does not foster good relations between groups competing for space when it is the only space available This is not a gain to the community and **the statement made does not address or reflect the likely effects it will have on other users of school facilities.**

### Comment 3.

5.13 and linked to 5.15. The authority has not given any indication if school day education areas are open plan or traditional classrooms. 5.13 describes flexible learning and teaching spaces. It seems to be common place now to reduce the sq meter per pupil when building schools by creating open plan learning spaces and sing it's praises. Parents and residents are very concerned regarding open plan learning spaces as a design feature. Pupils with additional support needs suffering from an array of conditions can be easily distracted sitting in a multipurpose learning space. Behavior issues which through design consideration can be reduced by traditional classroom design and can be made less disruptive to mainstream peers. The authority states where and what resources a LCSC offers with additional support needs. The authority states the following:

"A Small number of children or young people with speech, language or communication needs may require access to an alternative resource to meet their specific additional support needs. For those children and young people, North Lanarkshire Learning and Leisure Services provide a range of alternative resources located within mainstream schools in both the primary and secondary sectors. These are known as Language and Communication Support Centres. All the Language and Communication Support Centres are able to provide:"

- higher staff ratios to allow pupils to be taught in smaller groups within the centre and/or support in mainstream classes to facilitate inclusion
- access to the Curriculum for Excellence for all pupils
- additional support planning (ASP)
- integrated speech and language therapy input where appropriate
- multidisciplinary working
- co-ordinated support planning where appropriate (CSP)
- annual review of planning and progress
- support for pupils at social times where required
- social skills teaching sessions for pupils where required
- visual resources and supports
- personalised transition planning
- high level of home/school liaison
- parental support

As stated above only a small number of children require this type of support and is provided within an LCSC. There is no such dedicated provision in Gartcosh Primary School and pupils requiring this support will be currently in a placement throughout the area suitable for their additional support needs. The creation of the centre within the new school means that there will be pupils from other schools in the authority's area likely to be moved to occupy the centre. **The authority has not given a full assessment of the likely effects with regard to pupils of other schools within the authority's area moving to Gartcosh who require additional support needs.**

**NB elsewhere in the proposal capacity numbers are given for the new school. Pupils requiring placements within a LCSC are not within the current roll at Gartcosh as it is not a suitable learning environment. There has been no indication from the authority how many children should have a placement in Gartcosh primary and require additional support within an LCSC. Also the number of placements which will be devoted to pupils requiring additional support within the new LCSC provision.**

#### **Comment 4.**

5.9 states that the site is easily accessible. The site is marked within what is today a greenfield bog site area with no access roads. There has been no attempt to provide a visual display as to what the area will look like. There are numerous planning applications all around this area. The community has genuine concerns regarding pupils health and safety with regard to this area and concern regarding the long lead times in construction which is felt will continually cause stress and disruption of a learning environment. Concerns have been summarised as follows:

- Air pollution
- Noise pollution
- Presence of heavy plant and machinery
- Clay mine works leading to escape of dangerous gases
- Clay mine subsidence and sink holes caused by the development and school building which is caused by dry weather creating shrinking of the clay when the water table drops
- The proximity of the railway lines
- Long lead times of construction causing stress and disruption to learning

**NB - The authority actually put extensive building staged over a long period of time as a positive observation when discussing the school roll. If someone is building a house, they want the process over as quick as possible. Why would the authority think that a community would want to be subjected to a long construction period any more than an individual would. The build time has been suggested between 10- 15 years. Pupils in our community will have completed all of their education and building would not have finished. They may also be in this situation when attending secondary education if expansion of Chryston high school is required.**

#### **The Proposal Document**

The document does not set out the detail of the proposal in terms of information requirements. The authority has not referred to such evidence or other information in support of (or otherwise relevant in relation to) the proposal.

#### **Comment 5**

The document is disappointing on a number of fronts:

- The lack of Forward Planning - It should contain assessment of the need for a replacement school and other changes in school provision taking account of factors such as population trends and new housing. The school capacity being planned for is not fit purpose with regard to the level of housing development in the community growth area. It does not include the pupils and families who were affect by capacity issues of the old school. In short the proposal does not “catch” all the children in the area which the community regards as Gartcosh and is within an acceptable distance to any new school. Below is the known planning activity in the area, with more planning application to be added.

<b>Planning Ref.</b>	<b>Planning Stage.</b>	<b>Number of Houses</b>
14/1849/PPP.	Planning Application in Principle Persimmon/Gladedale south of Johnstone Loch	Up to 300
13/01958/PPP.	Planning Application in Principle Various sites on Johnston Rd	Up to 450
16/01850/MSC.	South of Johnston Loch under construction Persimmon/ Avant	247
17/01889/EIASC.R.	EIA required. North of Coyle Drive	42
12/01210/PAN.	PAN Agreed. Site west of 125 Lochend R.	Please indicate # of houses Please identify developer
12/01151/PAN.	PAN Agreed. Various sites on Johnston Rd Please identify developer	Please indicate # of houses
16/02384/PAN.	PAN Agreed. Johnstone Farm Johnstone Rd	Please indicate # of houses
17/01766/PAN.	PAN Agreed. Heathfield Farm, Drumcarvel Rd.	Please indicate # of houses Councilors have stated <b>to be 1400</b>

**NB - Proposal of Application Notice (PAN). It is recognizing that this stage in planning gives the council a very clear idea through its consultation with each developer the number of houses being put forward in any formal planning application. Transparency in planning applications is essential, therefore any PAN would have given the number of houses and the indicative bedroom sizes. This would be information which would assist in any capacity planning of Gartcosh School and is relevant to parents and the community with regard to information requirements.**

Pupils who were excluded by the change in the catchment area are additional and have not been identified within the proposal.

Pupils who attend LCSC elsewhere but may move to LCSC provision in the new school have not been identified, calculated, expressed or accounted for within the proposal.

The authority will use a formula and build a model to establish a capacity for the school. An established element and calculation is referred to as variable pupil product. A numerical value is applied to the number of 1 & 2 bed room homes (0.21% ) of all new development and the calculation value increases for three and above three bedroom houses. It is accepted that new builds will be more family orientated and gives higher occupancy rates.

Based on the the planning applications above the variable pupil product would be 516.30 for the following housing application  $300 + 450 + 247 + 42 + 1400 = 2459$  if all the houses are calculated as 1 & 2 bedroom ( which they are not) . The current school roll would be added, plus those other planning applications above with no house building totals attached, any other planning applications which are still to be received from land availability within the growth area. The number is substantial and produces a completely different profile to that which exists at the present time. Even if a lower variable pupil product value is used, and there are other considerations, the suggested capacity being considered for school is wrong.

The only hard data which does not need to be modelled is the current school roll, pupils which will be affected by the re-zoning in 2011 and pupils who would transfer to the LCSC. Those numbers can be easily identified. There has been announcements that a new build on the same site at Chryston is being scheduled. The modelling associated with our school can take account of the catchment area being modified to rectify the change in 2011. There is no problem in readjusting capacity when both areas are receiving new schools.

Parents and the community as a whole require a full understanding of the pupil variable product model used by the authority. The value used above was taken from other schools consultation process documents which took place in other parts of Scotland and the value stated for 1 & 2 bedroom. When the true number of 3 bedroom and above 3 bedroom is given by the council the value increases with additional bedroom size. The community would question why there would be a huge variation in the modelling. The conclusion is that we are dealing with an unknown demographic mix but it will be a lot higher than the current population profile because the major change in the roll is exclusively coming from new developments. If there is a huge difference in the formula to complete capacity planning it has to be addressed. The authority has provided little or no insight or information of the rolls and capacities in 7.1 of the proposal. The implications are that no matter what the formula is the capacity planning is wrong to the detriment of future pupils, their families and the community. **The authority did not attempt to provide all interested parties relevant data on capacity planning.**

#### **Comment 6**

The site has raised a number issues but the lack of choice in this consultation is very disappointing. At the meeting of the 5th of March it was revealed that 8 sites were under consideration and the proposal would contain more than one site for consideration. No choice was given.

Again interested parties have been given a map with an area marked out as the site location of the new school. It gives parents and the community the impression that this area will be taken up by the footprint of the school. Information should have been supplied with a map to scale and an informed representation of the area a 14 classroom school footprint will take up within the marked area. The map is not to scale and is marked for information only. There is also no meaningful information that gives a representation that relates to the school footprint being proposed within the marked area.

The community have been informed the authority does not own any land in the area. So no matter where the school is placed the authority will have to enter into a commercial transaction to purchase land. A community growth area has been created so all the land has increased in price to reflect the market. Assuming land ownership is nil by the authority the proposal can and should have explored more than one site based on the fact the council will have to purchase land from someone. This area raises concern based on some of the reasons previously mentioned above. The community growth area has rezoned all the land round the Loch. The area is being sold to the public by developers as having great transport links and

semi rural views of the Loch. The community would like community assets and amenities to feature and be placed on the Loch side if it has to be built on, so as many residents as possible can enjoy this semi rural setting. Instead these views and setting have to be reserved for housing development. There may be a number sites which may service the community better and as the council has to purchase land, there is no reason the council could not offer multiple sites creating more than one option.

The authority has not given any indication that they own this site or that they have heads of agreement or any legal claim on the land being proposed. This would be considered relevant information and clarification of the position would be required.

### **Comment 7**

Curricula and organisational needs - this proposal should establish the number of pupils for whom the school can provide the desired curriculum, and to allow assessment of the implications of any new staffing standards, changing methodologies and new resources.

The LCSC is a new resource, again it should be highlighted in terms of organisational needs. This point also skimmed over. The resource is significant and although the school would be increasing in size additional resource will be required to support pupils with additional support needs. It would have been helpful to give relevant information in relation to the impact of this organisational change such as teaching staffing numbers, support staff and again the number of pupil placements involved. The current school has composite classes. No indication was given if this would continue. It is significant in terms of the number of classrooms as class sizes are reduced in composite classes.

### **Comment 8**

Placing requests - establish a clear and consistent basis for determining whether placing requests should be granted or refused where the number of pupils who can be provided for in a school is an issue. There has been no relevant information with this regard. A possible scenario would be that the Chryston Primary school would be decanted to Gartcosh while that same site build is taking place. Gartcosh may have enough room to accommodate in part or as a school because house building may not have fully impacted the roll and capacity in Gartcosh. This would be a sensible decision if taken, it is also a relevant issue to include in the proposal. It may be it is not the case but it is relevant to state if this is an intention or ruled out completely as it may affect pupils requiring a place at Gartcosh when building of Chryston primary is on going.

LCSC placement is relevant. Placements for pupils who require additional support are not catchment area bound. The authority may try to place pupils close to home and in the appropriate catchment area but sometimes this is not possible. Chryston or Glenboig or surrounding areas may not have enough placements available for additional support needs and Gartcosh is utilised. This may not be the case but the relevant information pertaining to this type of placement has not been provided in the proposal.

There has been no relevant information or statement with regard to families who have pupils at the school under a placing request and how they will be supported if they make another placement request for other children from the same household.

### **Comment 9**

The information taken from the school handbook (2017/2018) and in previous years has stated that:

The main building is equipped to take 139 children and 66 spaces in temporary modular classrooms (2).

Gartcosh has stated it has one p1 class (25 pupils) 4(one being p1 & 2) composite classes 25 pupils each (100) between P5, 6, 7 can have a maximum of 33 pupils. This is a capacity of 224. The mix of pupils which assimilate classes is the capacity and that is currently well over 90% and not 78%. The council knows full well the school cannot have a capacity of 250 when there are a significant number of pupils above primary one in a composite learning environment. This reduces the class size to 25 and should be reflected in the working capacity of the school. The capacity number changed a few weeks ago when the 2018/2019 hand book was published.

### **Comment 10**

There are a number of issues relevant to this proposal which are connected to the Gartcosh/ Glenboig community growth area and local plan for the area The documentation states the total number of houses is 3,000 pages 50/ 53 of the plan for Gartcosh / Glenboig. Based on planning applications received, Gartcosh alone as a single location will be well over 3,000. There are two planning applications associated with Glenboig which is over 2,000 houses and there are other applications being processed for both areas.

The local plan was passed in 2012 and to be reviewed in 2017. The review has not been carried out which is required as stated in council policy and confirmed on the council's website The reviewed period is every 5 years. The community has been informed that the council is subject to a legal challenge by developers in relation to the strategic plan which we believe challenges the council's authority to reject standard planning applications as unlawful within the community growth area. This would pave the way for additional development. Again if this is true it would be another factor that severely affects the capacity planning of the school. The first page of this minute (link below) suggests to the lay person that North Lanarkshire council may have lost the ability to reject planning applications through developers legal intervention, plan for the future and through this conduit destroy the community of Gartcosh and the other communities in Northern corridor partnership.

<https://mars.northlanarkshire.gov.uk/egenda/images/att87453.pdf>

### **Comment 11**

No North Lanarkshire Nursery provision in Gartcosh

The nearest is Jigsaw in Muirhead which is a family learning centre. The capacity for this facility is 69 and in September 2016 the following information was recorded in the care.

- 6 children 0 to under 2 years
- 15 children 2 years to under 3 years
- 48 children 3 years up to those not yet attending primary school.

This information indicates it has reached capacity.

The Children and Young People (Scotland) Act requires local authorities to offer eligible families of two-year-old children up to 600 hours of free early learning and childcare. To qualify, parent(s) need to be in receipt of one of the following benefits:

Income support, Income based job seekers allowance, Any income related element of the Employment and Support Allowance, Child Tax Credit, but not Working Tax Credit and your income is less than £16,010 per year, State Pension Credit, Maximum Child Tax Credit and maximum Working Tax Credit and your income is less than £6,240 per year, Support under Part VI of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999, Universal Credit, Looked after (as defined in section 97(2) of the Children (Scotland) Act 1995), Under kinship care order (as defined in section 11(1) of the Children (Scotland) Act 1995) or with a Parent Appointed Guardian (as defined in section 72(1) of the Children (Scotland) Act 1995).

At the public meeting of the 5th of March, Residents asked why pre school learning and nursery provision was not part of the proposal. We were informed that there is a national review regarding this provision so it has been excluded from the proposal and a decision will be made outside the consultation process with this regard. The same answer was applied when residents requested information regarding LCSC. Residents were told this provision was part of a national consultation and based on that consultation more concrete decisions would be made but again outside this consultation. Residents have to ask, why carry out a consultation against the backdrop of national activity which has direct influence on school being proposed? It seems the only items the council wish to engage in are:

- Are you for a new school?
- Are you for the site proposed?

Everything we consider relevant information is referred to decisions to be taken outside this consultation.

Pre school education is also of great importance and the community considered it would be provided on the campus of a new school. The area does not have provision and it will have to be provided.

## **Comment 12**

**With regard to the process, the 2010 Act requires the consultation/ proposal to be available digitally as well as in print. Digital copy was not made available from the start of the process. Members of the community had to call the council on three occasions and reported it to the local Councillor before it became available.**

The form to communicate views is inadequate and inappropriate. It provides two boxes relating to who you are i.e. parent or other. The community would be concerned if a different value was placed on any particular group. This point requires to be clarified.

There is no box for parents who have children who will be pupils in the future, therefore confusing on completing the form, are they are parents or if they are "other".

There is no indication on the form to continue on a separate sheet of paper your comments if it is longer than the lines allotted.

The questions should relate to the proposal of a new school not the construction of a new school. The construction/ build of the school is not the issue, it is the information in the proposal that is important. Question 2 in the form is inappropriate. You may have issues and make comment concerning the the proposal of a new school and until your concerns have been addressed or answered how can that question be answered.



There was not an option of undecided placed on the form with regard to the site. It looks and feels more like a polling form which supports or does not support the proposed site rather than a form to make constructive comments regarding the proposal.

Schools were closed for a number of days by extreme bad weather. Interested parties in the spirit of the consultation process are hoping for an extension of the process due to these extreme conditions.