

A G E N D A

Please address any general enquiries on this agenda to Deborah Mitchell, County Hall, Oxford OX1 1ND (Tel: Oxford 815463). Press enquiries should be directed to the Media Manager on Oxford 815266.

NOTE: Members are reminded of the obligation to declare any interest relevant to business to be conducted at this meeting, and of the convention as to withdrawal from the meeting for the relevant item unless the interest is not one which debars the member from speaking thereon (see page G2 of the Council's Manual).

1. **Election to Chair** (Labour Group)
2. **Apologies for Absence and Temporary Appointments**
3. **Minutes**

Minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 1998(EM3).

4. **Matters arising from the Minutes**
5. **Petitions and Public Address**

OPERATIONAL ITEMS

6. **PROJECT APPRAISALS**

(a) **Outline Project Submissions prepared by the relevant Chief Officers (EM6(a)).**

- (1) St Nicholas School, Abingdon (EM6(a)(1))

The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to declare those playing-fields edged black on the attached plan surplus to the Council's requirements and to approve the outline project submission ED464.

- (2) Garsington CE Primary School (EM6(a)(2))

The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to approve the outline project submission ED465.

(b) **Detailed Project Submissions prepared by the relevant Chief Officers (EM6(b)).**

- (1) Bicester Community College (EM6(b)(1))

The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to approve the detailed project submission ED463/1.

7. **EVALUATION OF FROZEN SCHOOL MEALS PILOT**

Report by the Chief Education Officer, County Treasurer, Director of Environmental Services and Assistant Chief Executive (EM7).

As reported to the last meeting of this Sub-Committee, the Delivered Meals System (DMS) has been trialled in a number of primary schools during the first part of the autumn term. This report provides an evaluation of the pilot exercise. Additionally, the report provides details of the outcome of the tender exercise for the new school meals contract, which will commence 1 April 1999. Finally, the DfEE has issued the promised consultation paper under Fair Funding on the delegation of funding for school meals. All three issues are linked and recommendations are made in the light of this in relation to the operation of the school meals service from 1 April 1999.

The Sub Committee are **RECOMMENDED** to:

- (a) agree to implement the delivered meals system in the 50 schools previously agreed, as set out in the tender specification;
- (b) agree to award the school meals contract to Commercial Services, subject to the approval of the Secretary of State; and
- (c) determine the response to be submitted to the DfEE on the consultation paper on delegation of school meals.

8. **ROAD SAFETY EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS**

Report by the Chief Education Officer and the Director of Environmental Services (**EM8**).

At the meeting of the Highways & Road Safety Sub-Committee on 3 September 1998 Members asked the Director of Environmental Services to report jointly with the Chief Education Officer on traffic education in schools. A joint initiative by the Chief Education Officer and the Director of Environmental Services had already been undertaken to establish the current and future levels of road safety education provision for children in Oxfordshire schools. This report explains the background to this initiative and suggests the way forward to provide a wider and more effective programme of road safety education in Oxfordshire.

The Sub-Committee are **RECOMMENDED** to:

- (a) note the findings of the joint working initiative on road safety education in schools. (Annex 1);
- (b) agree that the existing cycle training programme should be maintained and continue to be expanded wherever possible;
- (c) adopt the principle for road safety education in schools that parents will have the primary responsibility for road safety training for their children, but that Schools will take every opportunity to support this work through road safety related activities within and outside the curriculum appropriate to the age and experience of the child;
- (d) ensure that all schools are informed of the new policy statement and respond to it as appropriate; and
- (e) advise the Highways & Road Safety Sub-Committee accordingly.

9. **NORTHFIELD SPECIAL SCHOOL - RELOCATION**

Report by the Chief Education Officer and Director of Environmental Services (**EM9**).

This report describes the outcome of a further site search for the relocation of Northfield School. The criteria used in the site search have been revised and a thorough study of land in public and private ownership has been completed by W S Atkins, officers from the Education and Environmental Services' Departments, and staff and governors of the School. A total of 28 sites were investigated and of these, 4 remain the subject of further study. The focus of that study is the relocation of the School to the existing hostel site because it is in the ownership of the County Council and the availability of the other sites is, at present, unknown. The search for alternative sites should continue in case any new opportunities arise.

Annex C to the report contains exempt information. The Sub-Committee will therefore be invited to resolve to exclude the public for the consideration of Annex C by passing a resolution in relation to the Annex in the following terms:

"that the public be excluded during the consideration of Annex C to the report since it is

likely that if they were present during that item there would be a disclosure of "exempt" information as described in Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act, 1972 ie, any terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods and services.

THE ANNEX HAS NOT BEEN MADE PUBLIC AND SHOULD BE REGARDED AS STRICTLY PRIVATE TO MEMBERS AND OFFICERS ENTITLED TO RECEIVE IT.

The Sub-Committee are **RECOMMENDED** to:

- (a) agree the site criteria listed in paragraph 5 and described in Annex A;
- (b) authorise officers to investigate the suitability of relocating the school to the hostel site at Sandy Lane West, Oxford, and report back the results of the study to the next meeting; and
- (c) authorise officers to continue the search for any further sites and report back the outcome to the next meeting.

10. **PREMATURE RETIREMENT COMPENSATION SCHEME FOR TEACHERS**

Report by the Chief Education Officer (EM10).

Education Committee resolved to refer the renewal of the PRC Scheme to the Sub-Committee on 25 November 1998, to enable the options available and financial implications to be considered in more detail and to delegate any decisions to be taken thereon to the Sub-Committee.

The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to determine which of the options set out in paragraphs 5(a) to (f) of the report to adopt.

11. **FUTURE MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF JOINT USE SPORTS CENTRES - SOUTH OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Report by the Chief Education Officer and the Director of Environmental Services (EM11).

At the meeting on 9 September 1998, the Sub-Committee approved in principle further consideration of the transfer of legal interest and the management of jointly used sports centres in South Oxfordshire to a Not For Profit Organisation (NFPO). Officers were authorised to proceed with detailed discussions and negotiation of terms and conditions. The Sub-Committee stated that their priority was to ensure the interests of school children are protected.

This report describes the outcomes of discussions and negotiations held to date. The proposal is that the Abbey Centre is sold and the other five centres are leased on a full repair basis to South Oxfordshire District Council. The District Council will then sub-lease to the NFPO. School use will be protected by the lease and the joint use agreements, with such changes as are necessary to reflect the new arrangements and address anomalies. The County Council will continue to pay a reduced management charge towards operating costs.

The Sub-Committee are **RECOMMENDED** to:

- (a) approve the transfer of the management of jointly used sports centres in South Oxfordshire to a Not For Profit Organisation, subject to officers being able to reach acceptable agreements to such changes to the joint use agreements and management charges as are necessary and being satisfied that the use by schools and the interests of school children are protected;
- (b) approve the release of such land at the school and education sites as is required, subject to officers being satisfied that the terms and conditions agreed are acceptable and in the long term interests of the County Council and school children,

and subject also to the approval of the Operations Sub-Committee to the freehold and lease disposals.

(c) **RECOMMEND** the Operations Sub-Committee accordingly.

12. **LADYGROVE COUNTY PRIMARY SCHOOL, DIDCOT**

The Assistant Chief Executive & Solicitor to the Council reports as follows:-

Further to the approval of the detailed project appraisal for this School, (Minute 76/97(b) refers) notices were published on 15 July 1998 under Section 35 of the 1996 Education Act to establish the new school.

No objections having been received to the published proposals, **the Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to agree that the proposals be implemented in accordance with Section 38 of the Education Act 1996.**

13. **SONNING COMMON COUNTY PRIMARY SCHOOL - SURPLUS AREA OF PLAYING FIELD**

The Chief Education Officer reports as follows:-

The owner of 5 Maple Close has expressed an interest in acquiring a small parcel of land at Sonning Common County Primary School (approximately 32 m2) which is owned by Oxfordshire County Council and adjoins 5 Maple Close.

The land, marked on Plan (**EM13**), is an area of overgrown scrub land, located in a corner of the School's playing field. It is not used or needed by the School.

There is no other educational use for this land and the neighbour is keen to purchase the land in order to increase the size of his garden. He will be expected to bear the Council's legal and Agent's fees and erect and maintain a boundary fence similar to that forming the existing boundary of the School.

The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to declare the land shown on Plan EM1 surplus to Education requirements.

14. **BUS SERVICES FOR NON-ENTITLED SCHOOL CHILDREN - BANBURY AREA**

Public Transport Sub-Committee on 12 November 1998 considered this report and resolved:

- (i) to refer the report to the Education Management Sub-Committee to consider the extent to which transport requirements arose from parents wishing to send their children other than to the most local school, and what means there might be of countering this;
- (ii) to ask officers to cooperate with the schools in exploring the provision of suitable replacement services through other agencies.

The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to consider these requests.

EXEMPT ITEMS

The Sub-Committee will be invited to resolve to exclude the public for the consideration of the following exempt items (marked E) by passing a resolution in relation to each such item in the following terms:

"that the public be excluded during the consideration of the following items in the Agenda since it is likely that if they were present during those items there would be a disclosure of "exempt" information as described in Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act, 1972 and specified below each item in the Agenda".

THE REPORTS RELATING TO THE EXEMPT ITEMS HAVE NOT BEEN MADE PUBLIC AND SHOULD BE

15.E **PROJECT APPRAISAL**

Detailed Project Appraisal prepared by the relevant Chief Officers (EM15E).

Manor School, Long Hanborough

The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to approve the detailed project submission ED441/2.

(Information Exempt in that it relates to any terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services.)

16.E **SANDHILLS PRIMARY SCHOOL - REPLACEMENT SCHOOL**

Report by the Director of Environmental Services and the Chief Education Officer (EM16E).

This report updates the Sub-Committee on the consultations which have taken place with the school's governing body and Parish Council on the scheme to provide replacement school buildings at Sandhills.

The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to:

- (a) receive the report;
- (b) determine whether there should be further discussions with Minns Estates Ltd about the alternative scheme for the provision of a new school building, community facilities, and housing developments on part of the existing school site;
- (c) subject to (b) above, and approval of the proposed design of the school and community facilities, instruct officers to proceed with the submission of the planning application.

(Information Exempt in that it relates to any terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services.)

17.E **HILL END - FUTURE DEVELOPMENT**

Report by the Chief Education Officer (EM17E).

This report refers briefly to proposals already submitted to develop Hill End. It describes a possible further development proposal, led by the County Council but involving other partners, to rationalise and improve the Centre. It seeks approval to further work on developing this proposal

The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to:

- (a) note the current position on development proposals for the Hill End Centre;
- (b) authorise officers to continue investigation of the County Council led proposal to develop Hill End involving other funding and development partners.

(Information Exempt in that it relates to any terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services.)

18.E **HAGBOURNE CE PRIMARY SCHOOL**

Report by the Chief Education Officer and Director of Environmental Services (**EM18E**).

In 1996 a two class extension and new entrance reception area was constructed at this school to meet growth in numbers and to replace a temporary classroom unit. The limitations on the school site meant that the extension had to be built on the majority of the existing hard paved play area. It was therefore necessary to reprovide the hard play area within the existing recreational and playing field area. The playing field area was subsequently reduced in size to 1806m² compared with the minimum area of 5000m² specified in the Education (School Premises) Regulations 1998 for team game, playing fields. A site plan showing current layout is attached as 'Annex A'.

In consultation with school staff and the Governing Body a number of options were identified for meeting this deficiency and WS Atkins were commissioned to explore the possibility of purchasing or leasing sufficient land to be developed for use as team game playing fields within a reasonable and safe walking distance from the school.

This report deals with the search that has been undertaken to find a suitable site for development, the various options that have been considered, and seeks the sub-committee's approval to the use, if required, of Compulsory Purchase Orders to secure the preferred option.

The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to:

- (a) **authorise Officers to explore the possibility of using Compulsory Purchase Powers to acquire an area of about 5000 m² as identified in Option 3;**
- (b) **request Officers to report back to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee on the outcome of this investigation.**

(Information Exempt in that it relates to any terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services.)

JOHN HARWOOD
Chief Executive

November 1998

NOTE FOR SPOKESPERSONS/GROUP LEADERS AND RELEVANT OFFICERS ONLY

The pre-meeting briefing will be held at County Hall on Monday 23 November 1998 at 2.00 pm.

ITEM EM3

EDUCATION MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE - 9 SEPTEMBER 1998

MINUTES of the meeting commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 11.50 am

Present:

Voting Members:

Councillors Jerry Dempsey, John Dennis, M. Evans, Mrs C. Fulljames, Margaret Godden, Tim Horton, MacKenzie, Tom Richardson (in place of Councillor Jack Steer), Sylvia Tompkins and Barry Wood.

Mr P. Bean.

Non Voting Members:

Mr E. Moore and Mrs M. Randolph.

Ex Officio:

Councillors Brian Hodgson, Janet Morgan (in place of Councillor Dermot Roaf) and D.L.B. Spencer (in place of Councillor C.H. Shouler).

Officers:

Whole of meeting: J.T. Hehir and D. Mitchell (Chief Executive's Office); K. Borien, D. Brown and R. Smith (Education Department); N. Monaghan (Environmental Services).

Part of meeting: S. Tanner (Education Department).

The Sub-Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting, together with the following additional papers:

	<i>Agenda Item</i>
- <i>Errata Sheet</i>	-
- <i>Addendum to Paragraph 13</i>	7
- <i>Schedule A & B concerning reduction in Infant Class Sizes 1998/99</i>	8
- <i>letter from 'Save our Sandhills'</i>	11

Copies of which agenda, reports and additional papers are attached to the signed Minutes, and in relation thereto the Committee determined as follows:-

50/98 ELECTION TO CHAIR

RESOLVED: that Councillor Wood (Conservative) be elected to chair the meeting.

51/98 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

Apologies for absence, temporary appointments and Group Leader substitutions were reported as follows:

Apology from

Temporary Appointment/Substitute

Councillor Roaf

Councillor Janet Morgan

Councillor Steer
Councillor Shouler
Mr Leach
Revd Reeves

Councillor Richardson
Councillor Spencer
-
-

52/98 **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 13 May 1998 were approved and signed.

53/98 **MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

Minute 49/98 - Hill End Residential and Field Study Centre

In response to a question by Councillor Morgan, Mr Borien gave a brief progress report on the position concerning the future of the Hill End Centre site.

54/98 **THE NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL BRIEF**

(Agenda Item 6)

The Sub-Committee considered a report (EM6) which detailed the new school brief which the Authority were intending to use in the future for Educational design standards.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) receive and note the new primary school brief (1998); and
- (b) agree that a seminar be convened in October/November 1998, to which all members would be invited, and that attendance at the Seminar be deemed an approved duty for the purposes of allowances for members of the Sub-Committee only.

55/98 **EDUCATION ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN**

(Agenda Item 7)

The Sub-Committee considered a report (EM7) which outlined the Government's initiative to contribute to the raising of education standards and achievement, by instructing all Local Education Authorities to draw up and maintain Asset Management Plans.

The report set out what an Asset Management Plan was, the current position on the development of an Asset Management Plan and possible future priorities to be included in the authority's Asset Management Plan. The officers circulated a revised paragraph 13 to the report at the meeting, showing schemes in the capital programme, NDS bids and other schemes, in accordance with the existing priorities established by the Authority.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) note the current position on the development of an Asset Management Plan;
- (b) confirm that the existing priorities for repair and maintenance and improvement works at educational premises should continue to be applied pending further development of the Asset Management Plan.

56/98 **CAPITAL PROGRAMME**

(Agenda Item 8)

The Sub-Committee considered a report (EM8) which included details of the schemes to be added to the firm programme to keep it in balance, and the adjustments to the Education Committee's preparation pool. It also included details on the Authority's recent bid for grant funding for improvements to energy management in schools, for the removal of outdoor toilets and for the reduction in infant class sizes. A financial statement and updated capital programme was attached to the report.

In response to members question's Mr Brown confirmed that minor works extensions at Charlton-on-Otmoor School would be included in the minor works programme for 2000/2001 as a scheme for consideration.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) approve the addition to the firm programme of the schemes listed in Annex 4 of the report subject to the approval of project appraisals;
- (b) note the allocation of the minor works programme for 1998/99 at Annex 5 of the report;
- (c) include the projects for Crowmarsh and Fritwell in the firm programme; and
- (d) approve additions to preparation pool, as set out in Annex 6, table 3.

57/98 **PROJECT APPRAISALS**
(Agenda Item 9)

(In relation to Item 9(a)(iii) Councillor Fulljames declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item by virtue of her being a member of the Government body of the school. She did not withdraw from the meeting but took no part in the debate nor voted thereon).

The Sub-Committee considered Outline Project Submissions and Detailed Project Submissions prepared by the relevant Chief Officers.

RESOLVED: to

- (a) approve the Outline Project Submissions for:
 - (i) ED 461 - Henry Box School, Witney;
 - (ii) ED 462 - Cooper School, Bicester;
 - (iii) ED 463 - Bicester Community College;
- (b) approve the Detailed Project Submission prepared by the relevant Chief Officers:
 - (i) ED 447/1- Wood Green School, Witney

58/98 **RELOCATION OF NORTHFIELD SPECIAL SCHOOL**
(Agenda Item 10)

The Sub-Committee considered a report (EM10) which informed members of the Study that was being undertaken by W.S. Atkins to find a suitable site for the relocation of Northfield School. The study was to include a review of Council owned property - in particular any properties planned for disposal; land held by other Local Authorities; other land held by such bodies as the Health Authority, Ministry of Defence, Oxford University, as well as investigating any private opportunities, including schools in the independent sector and properties on the market. A split-site option would be considered again in case there were smaller properties which might be suitable: one to serve the North of the County and another the South.

The outcome of these investigations would not be known until the end of September/early October. Officers intended bringing a report to the November meeting of the Sub-Committee.

RESOLVED: to receive the report.

59/98 **SANDHILLS PRIMARY SCHOOL - REPLACEMENT SCHOOL**
(Agenda Item 11)

The Sub-Committee considered a progress report (EM11) concerning the proposed redevelopment of Sandhills Primary School.

RESOLVED: to receive the report.

60/98 ADVISORY TEACHERS IN MATHEMATICS: REQUEST TO MAKE TEMPORARY POSTS PERMANENT
(Agenda Item 12)

The Sub-Committee considered a report (EM12) outlining the need to establish two permanent posts of Advisory Teacher for Mathematics in place of two temporary posts. The posts would continue to be funded by Government Grant.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) agree to the establishment of two posts of Advisory Teacher in Mathematics; and
- (b) endorse the confirmation in these posts of the current temporary post-holders, in accordance with County Council Policy.

61/98 BECKLEY C.E.(C) PRIMARY SCHOOL - STANDARD NUMBER CHANGE
(Agenda Item 13)

The Sub-Committee considered a report (EM13) outlining the need to reduce the present Standard Number of the School from 19 to 16, so as to reduce overcrowding.

RESOLVED: to authorise the publication of the appropriate statutory notices with a view to reducing the Standard Number of Beckley C.E. (C) Primary School from 19 to 16.

62/98 MARLBOROUGH C.E. (V.C.) SCHOOL - LOTTERY FUND APPLICATION
(Agenda Item 14)

The Sub-Committee considered a report (EM4) which detailed a lottery application by a sports association to improve existing sports facilities at the Marlborough School and the proposed lease, joint use agreement and management arrangements.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) approve the lottery funding proposal in principle subject to officers being satisfied with the details;
- (b) approve the release of such land as was required to enable the construction of the additional facilities subject to officers being satisfied with the plans and specification, the terms of the lease and joint use agreement and the approval of the Operations Sub-Committee.

63/98 BADGEMORE COUNTY PRIMARY SCHOOL
(Agenda Item 16)

The Sub-Committee considered a report (EM16) which sought approval to declare surplus to requirements an area of land approximately 0.113 hectares/0.28 acres at Badgemore County Primary School.

RESOLVED: to declare the land shown on Annex 1 to the report surplus to Education requirements.

64/98 FUTURE MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF JOINT USE SPORTS CENTRES - SOUTH OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
(Agenda Item 17)

The Sub-Committee considered a report (EM17) describing South Oxfordshire District Council's proposals for changing the way in which sports centres which were jointly used by schools and the local communities were managed. It described the proposals, outlined the anticipated benefits and the safeguards required in transferring the management to a Not For Profit Trust and sought approval to officers proceeding with detailed negotiations.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) (on a motion by Councillor Horton seconded by Councillor Godden and carried nem con) approve in principle further consideration of the transfer of the legal interest and the management of jointly used sports centres in South Oxfordshire to a Not for Profit Operation;
- (b) authorise officers to proceed with detailed discussions and negotiation with South Oxfordshire District Council on terms and conditions;
- (c) request officers to report back to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee; and
- (d) (on a motion by Councillor MacKenzie seconded by Councillor Mrs Fulljames) affirm that the Sub-Committee's priority was to ensure the interests of the School children were protected.

65/98 HORTON VIEW SPORTS GROUND

(Agenda Item 18)

The Sub-Committee considered a report (EM18) which summarised the changes in the use of the Horton View Sports Ground which was subject to a joint use agreement with Cherwell District Council; and in sporting provision at neighbouring schools. It recommended the disposal of the Sports Ground.

RESOLVED: (on a motion by Councillor Wood, seconded by Councillor Mrs Fulljames and carried nem con) to:

- (a) approve the removal of the Drayton School pitches and the Banbury School hard porous area from the Horton View joint use agreement;
- (b) approve the continuance of the current joint use terms and funding arrangements with Cherwell District Council for the Banbury School sports facilities until such time as an acceptable solution to the future development, use and funding can be agreed, and the negotiation of a new agreement for the sporting facilities at Drayton School on such terms as are acceptable to officers;
- (c) approve the release of the Horton View Sports Ground on such terms as are acceptable to officers, to include the ability for future use by schools and subject to the approval of the Operations Sub-Committee to any lease or freehold disposal in due course;
- (d) affirm that the Sub-Committee's priority was to ensure the interests of the School children were protected.

66/98 FARINGDON AND WANTAGE LEISURE CENTRES - CHANGES TO MANAGEMENT COMMITTEES

(Agenda Item 19)

The Sub-Committee considered a report (EM19) on the Joint Use of the Faringdon and Wantage Leisure Centres by schools and the local communities which was currently governed by joint use agreements between the County Council and the Vale of White Horse District Council. These agreements date from 1977 (Wantage) and 1989 (Faringdon). During this time the constitution, powers and duties of the management committees of both had remained unchanged. The report sought approval to changes in these constitutions and powers to reflect current needs.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) approve the revised constitutions to the Wantage and Faringdon Leisure Centres Management Committee and Advisory Group as set out in the report;
- (b) authorise officers to agree and to take such action as is necessary to enter into revised agreements covering the changes.

MINUTES OF SUB-COMMITTEES, ETC.

67/98 URGENCY SUB-COMMITTEE*

The Sub-Committee had before them the Minutes of the Urgency Sub-Committee of 6 August 1998.

In relation to Minute 5/98 - Charlbury Old Primary School - Community Education Centre, Councillor Hodgson advised that a bid was being made for lottery funding and that the scheme was now proceeding.

In relation to Minute 7/98 - Compulsory Competitive tendering - School Meals and in response to a question by Councillor Morgan, Mr Smith reported that:

- (a) a tender was being issued on 16 September 1998;
- (b) 50 schools had been identified for conversion from production kitchens to serveries or DMS, depending on the outcome of the pilot. Tenderers were being asked to tender on either option;
- (c) 25 schools were converted already into serveries due to staff leaving, meaning no redundancy costs had been incurred;
- (d) the 17 schools which were previously identified for closure would be deferred, as there were no sufficient anticipated savings to warrant closure relative to the redundancy costs. This would be reviewed as and when staff left. A note to this effect was included in the specification; and
- (e) a further report would be submitted to the Sub-Committee in November on the outcome of the pilot and the evaluation of the tenders.

He further reported that the pilot now only consisted of 10 schools, instead of the original proposed number of 30. There were no set-up costs for the pilot as the equipment for the pilot was being met by the contractors. Schools, Education Committee and Education Management Sub-Committee political group spokespersons had all been notified of the reasons for the change in the size of the pilot by letter.

68/98 EXEMPT ITEMS

RESOLVED: that the public be excluded during the consideration of item 21E in the Agenda since it was likely that if they were present during that item there would be a disclosure of "exempt" information as described in Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act, 1972 and specified below the item in the Agenda, i.e. information relating to any terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services.

PROCEEDINGS FOLLOWING THE WITHDRAWAL OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

69/98 PROJECT APPRAISAL (Agenda Item 21E)

The Sub-Committee considered the Detailed Project Appraisal prepared by the relevant Chief Officers.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) approve the detailed project submission ED 434/1 - Mabel Pritchard School, Oxford;
- (b) **RECOMMEND** Operations Sub-Committee to approve the purchase of an alternative property for the secure tenants of the former caretaker's bungalow to facilitate the sale of the school site.

.....in the Chair

Date of signing1998

** The reports relating to the exempt items have not been made public and should be regarded as strictly private to those members and officers entitled to receive them.*

FUTURE MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF JOINT USE SPORTS CENTRES - SOUTH OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Report by the Chief Education Officer and the Director of Environmental Services

Introduction

1. At the meeting on 9 September 1998, the Sub-Committee approved in principle further consideration of the transfer of legal interest and the management of jointly used sports centres in South Oxfordshire to a Not For Profit Organisation (NFPO). Officers were authorised to proceed with detailed discussions and negotiation of terms and conditions. The Sub-Committee stated that their priority was to ensure the interests of school children are protected.
2. This report describes the outcomes of discussions and negotiations held to date. It seeks approval to the transfer of the management of the centres to the NFPO and the release of such land at the school and education sites as is required, subject to officers being satisfied that the terms and agreements are acceptable and in the long term interests of the County Council and school children.

Discussions and Consultation

3. A number of meetings have been held between officers of South Oxfordshire District Council and the County Council to establish the basis of agreements. All schools who use the six jointly used sports centres in South Oxfordshire were invited to a joint meeting with Council officers to ask questions and raise any concerns. Four of the five secondary schools with centres as part of their sites were represented. The District Council met with Gillotts School separately. The Heads of these schools are consulting their governing bodies on the principle, and the responses received support the initiative. The schools with centres on their sites will continue to be consulted on the details for each centre. Each of the Centres' Management Committees have received a report and have been recommended to make a nomination for an NFPO Board Member. The constitution of the NFPO Board will provide for 3 District Council nominated members, but it is not intended that there should be any direct County Council representation. The lease and the amended agreements for each centre will ensure that the County Council's interests are protected.

Proposals

4. The NFPO will be independent of both the District and County Councils. The NFPO needs to be in a position to take maximum advantage of tax and business rate relief and opportunities to invest in and develop the Centres. The District Council propose that to achieve this the NFPO, which is registered as a company limited by guarantee and is seeking charitable status, should have a legal interest in the Centres. This would be achieved by the sale of the Abbey Centre, including the Youth Centre, and the lease of the Didcot, Henley, Park Thame and Wallingford Centres to the District Council who would in turn enter into sub-lease agreements with the NFPO.
5. The sale of the Abbey Centre - which is on County Council owned land but not on a school site - would pass all responsibility for repair and maintenance and other premises costs to South Oxfordshire. It is felt that sale rather than leasehold is appropriate only for this site as it does not form part of a school's premises. The District Council propose that if the County Council can offer long, full repairing leases (i.e. 50 years) at the five Centres on school sites, the County Council will be relieved of the responsibility for carrying out and contributing to the cost of repairs and maintenance. Through the sub-lease the liability would pass to the NFPO. The long lease will give the security of tenure needed for investment in maintenance and improvement, and for seeking external funding. The value of the freehold and of the leasehold interests will be taken into account in the terms of the disposals.
6. The use by schools of all of the centres will not be changed by the lease arrangements. This will

continue to be protected under the terms of the joint use agreements and the leases. The Youth Service is involved in determining the extent of its continued use of the Abbey Centre. The existing joint use agreements will continue but will be made coterminous with the leases, with termination rights by the County Council after 21 years. Other changes would be necessary to reflect the new relationships and leases, and to address anomalies. The role and responsibilities of the Joint Use Management Committees will be reviewed. They have been established for a long time with varying functions. There is the opportunity to revisit and possibly standardise the role of the Committees, probably with advisory functions, so that the views, ideas and opinions from the local community representatives can be fed into the new NFPO Board.

7. At present the County Council pays a percentage of identified employee, utilities, supplies and services costs. The County Council will continue to pay towards operating costs (excluding repair and maintenance) in respect of its use. This will be in the form of a management charge based on an average which will be fixed for a period of years with increases for inflation during that period. In this way there can be certainty over the level of the County Council's contribution to assist with the Centres' business plans and the Council's own financial planning.
8. South Oxfordshire is proposing that - subject to the necessary agreements being reached - the NFPO would be operating the centres from April 1999.

Financial Implications

9. Both Councils currently involved in sharing the funding of the jointly used centres will benefit from the mandatory relief (80%) from business rates and possibly the discretionary relief (20%) available to the NFPO (a saving of around £100,000 p.a. on 1997/98 figures). If the County Council is able to offer long leases, it will no longer contribute towards repair and maintenance costs. The total estimates for repair and maintenance costs for 1998/99 at all of the five operational centres is around £98,000, which is shared on a percentage basis by both Councils. This sum however only addresses the most urgent needs. The District Council has identified growing repair and maintenance needs estimated at £1.082 m. over the next five years, which will fall to the District Council under the new arrangements. The value of the freehold of the Abbey Centre and of the leasehold interests will be established and taken into account.

Staff Implications and Implications for People Living in Poverty

10. As far as the County Council is concerned there are no direct implications.

Environmental Implications

11. There are no environmental implications.

RECOMMENDATIONS

12. **The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to:**
 - (a) **approve the transfer of the management of jointly used sports centres in South Oxfordshire to a Not For Profit Organisation, subject to officers being able to reach acceptable agreements to such changes to the joint use agreements and management charges as are necessary and being satisfied that the use by schools and the interests of school children are protected;**
 - (b) **approve the release of such land at the school and education sites as is required, subject to officers being satisfied that the terms and conditions agreed are acceptable and in the long term interests of the County Council and school children, and subject also to the approval of the Operations Sub-Committee to the freehold and lease disposals.**
 - (c) **RECOMMEND the Operations Sub-Committee accordingly.**

G. M. BADMAN
Chief Education Officer

DAVID YOUNG
Director of Environmental Services

Background papers: Report to Education Management Sub-Committee (9 September 1998), Future Management and Development of Joint Use Sports Centres - South Oxfordshire District Council

Contact Officer: Gerald Hales, Education Officer Tel: 01865 815304

November 1998

AGENDA ITEM EM10

PREMATURE RETIREMENT COMPENSATION SCHEME FOR TEACHERS

Report by the Chief Education Officer

Introduction

1. The current Premature Retirement Compensation (PRC) Scheme for Teachers lapses on 31 December 1998 and the Sub-Committee, (to which this matter has been delegated for any decisions by the Education Committee), needs to determine in the light of consultation with teacher representatives, what scheme, if any, should replace it from 1 January 1999. The Teachers' Joint Committee, at their meeting on 9 July 1998, failed to agree on a recommendation to this Committee.
2. The current scheme is attached as Annex 1. In brief it grants the right to retire early on grounds of redundancy from age 50 with immediate payment of pension benefits; in cases of redundancy where the teacher is aged 57 or over these benefits are enhanced by up to 3 added years. Requests for early retirement without redundancy are considered only from teachers aged 57 or above and, if the request is granted, no enhancement is paid.
3. The costs of early retirement and redundancy during the academic year 1997/98 together with an age profile are set out as Annex 2. Because of Government changes to the Teacher Pension Regulations from September 1997 the LEA now has to pay a proportion of the basic pension costs of any teacher retiring before the age of 60, as well as the cost of any enhancement, for the rest of that teacher's lifetime. The LEA also has to pay a proportion of the basic lump sum payment. The proportion is determined according to a sliding scale (set out in Annex 3) with the amount payable by the LEA reducing as the age of retirement increases.

Options for the New Scheme

4. In order to decide on the new scheme, it is necessary to look at the cost, the effect on schools and the rest of the Education Service, the effect on individual teachers and the impact of other factors such as the age profile of the workforce and teacher supply in the coming years. The current age profile of the teacher workforce is set out in Annex 4.
5. Options include the following:
 - (a) Renew the scheme in its current form. The costs are likely to be similar to those in 1997/98 and it needs to be borne in mind that the on-going pension costs will accumulate year on year. It seems likely that the changes last year, which raised the age at which enhancement was payable, led to fewer volunteers for redundancy and consequently a larger number of compulsory redundancies of younger teachers. The number of compulsory redundancies among teachers in 1997/98 was eleven.
 - (b) To revert to the previous scheme, which granted enhancement of up to five years at the age of 55 in redundancy cases and allowed applications for early retirement without redundancy from age 50. If the pattern of redundancies and early retirements were the same in 1998/99 as it was in 1997/98, the likely additional costs of this option would be approximately ongoing pension costs of £13,200 and one-off lump sum costs of £39,600. However, if the scheme were to be made more "generous" in this way, it seems very likely that more volunteers would come forward and the costs would be greater than this, even when offset against a reduction in the number of compulsory redundancies. The costs for an increased number of "efficiency" cases cannot be estimated because teachers were not eligible to apply this year.
 - (c) To consider applications for early retirement without redundancy or enhancement (that is, on the grounds of "efficiency of the service") between ages 50 and 56 in certain

specified circumstances. Possible categories could be (i) Headteachers; (ii) those whose work is physically demanding for a substantial proportion of the time, such as Outdoor Centre staff and P.E. teachers, (iii) teachers who have been refused ill health retirement by Teachers' Pensions but whose retirement on health grounds is recommended by the Occupational Health Service. It is not possible to estimate the cost of this but each one granted would of course result in the Authority incurring additional pension costs for the remainder of the teacher's life. It should be clear that it will not be used when it is apparent that the Competence Procedure is the correct option.

- (d) To limit the on-going cost to the Council of early retirements on grounds of redundancy, by not allowing immediate payment of pension until, for example, age 53. Those made redundant aged 50, 51 and 52 would instead receive a one-off redundancy payment based on age and length of service in accordance with the Oxfordshire scheme (set out as Annex 5). If the pattern of redundancies in 1998/9 were similar to that in 1997/8, the comparative figures would be a one-off total of £402,813 compared with on-going pension costs of £44,769 and one-off costs of £238,646.

This measure would be likely to limit further the number of voluntary redundancies, with a consequent increase in compulsory redundancies of younger teachers. Whilst this would save on redundancy and early retirement costs, schools would lose the more recently trained, younger and possibly lower-salaried teachers and retain older teachers who ideally would like to retire. In addition, the effect on individual teachers made compulsorily redundant between ages 50 and 52 would be severe, with a resulting loss of morale throughout the workforce since they would only receive the one-off redundancy payment and would not be able to access their pension until age 60.

- (e) To consider raising the minimum age for premature retirement on grounds of redundancy since these are the most expensive retirements, but to reduce the age for "efficiency" retirement to allow more teachers to retire on their own benefits.
- (f) Some other option.

Financial Implications

6. These are set out in paragraphs 5(a) to (d) and in the Annexes. It is worth pointing out, however, that when the Teacher Pension Regulations were amended last year, the employer's contribution to the pension scheme was reduced from 8.05% to 7.2%.

Staff Implications

7. These are set out in paragraphs 5(a) to (d).

Environmental Implications

8. There are none arising directly from this report.

Implications for those living in Poverty

9. Those teachers made compulsorily redundant could find themselves living in poverty if they fail to find alternative work quickly.

RECOMMENDATION

- 10. The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to determine which of the options set out in paragraphs 5(a) to (f) above to adopt.**

G.M. BADMAN
Chief Education Officer

Background Papers: Nil

Contact Officer: Sue Tanner, Tel: (01865 81) 5472

October 1998

PREMATURE RETIREMENT COMPENSATION SCHEME FOR TEACHERS
ANNEX 1

PREMATURE RETIREMENT COMPENSATION SCHEME FOR TEACHERS

1. GENERAL NOTES

- 1.1 This Scheme must be compliant with any provisions of The Teachers (Compensation for Redundancy and Premature Retirement) Regulations current at the time.
- 1.2 This is a Local Scheme for the use of Premature Retirement Compensation (PRC) by the Council in cases where the Council wishes to offer and a teacher wishes to take early retirement on the grounds of voluntary redundancy or in the interests of the efficient exercise of the Council's function. No teacher will be required to accept early retirement under this Scheme against their wishes, except in cases of compulsory redundancy where the Council is unable to offer suitable alternative employment.
- 1.3 Any proposed use of PRC will be the subject of local consultation between Oxfordshire County Council and Recognised Teacher Organisations. The Council will abide by any requirements of relevant Acts and local and national agreements.
- 1.4 This Local Scheme applies to all full and part-time teachers over the age of 50 employed by the County Council in the provision of primary, secondary, special and community education. All pensionable service will be taken into account in calculating both the pension to be paid by Teachers' Pensions and in calculating any enhancement to be awarded by the Council, provided that there has been no refund of contributions.

2. PREMATURE RETIREMENT ON GROUNDS OF REDUNDANCY

- 2.1 The Council will offer premature retirement by reason of redundancy where they are satisfied that the early retirement of a teacher aged 50 or over and with 2 years or more reckonable service would mean that an educational establishment's teaching force would thereby be brought closer to its staffing requirements by an actual saving of a post. Enhancement of service will only be available for teachers aged 57 or over.
- 2.2 The Council will consider offering premature retirement to a teacher aged 50 or over with 2 years or more reckonable service, whose particular teaching specialism is no longer required, and who is redundant within the meaning of the relevant Acts. Enhancement of service will only be available for teachers aged 57 or over.
- 2.3 Any teacher aged 57 or over being granted PRC on redundancy grounds will be offered the full enhancement appropriate to their age and service, up to a maximum of 3 years enhancement.
- 2.4 **Method of selecting employees**

Applicants for premature retirement will be considered on the following basis:-

- (i) Operational needs of the service for particular types of employees will be considered first;
- (ii) The person with the longest Local Government Service who volunteers for redundancy will be selected. If further volunteers are required, then the volunteer with the next longest service will be selected, and so on.

3. PREMATURE RETIREMENT IN THE INTERESTS OF THE EFFICIENT EXERCISE OF THE

COUNCIL'S FUNCTION

- 3.1 There may be circumstances in which it is in the interests of the Council's efficient exercise of its functions to offer early retirement under the terms of the PRC regulations to teachers aged 57 or over. These include:-
- (a) Teachers with problems of ill health not at present provided for in the Teachers' Superannuation Scheme, i.e. teachers under the age of 60 who are not eligible to retire under the ill health scheme;
 - (b) A change in the function of an educational establishment;
 - (c) Teachers whose application is granted by the Authority on compassionate, personal or professional grounds;
 - (d) Such other circumstances as may be agreed from time to time between the Council and the Teachers' Associations.
- 3.2 No enhancement of service will normally be offered. Enhancement may be appropriate where, for example, there is a financial saving to the Authority (e.g. a teacher on a protected salary) or there is a change in the function of an educational establishment.

4. GENERAL INFORMATION

- 4.1 Teachers may apply, without commitment on either side, to the Council for details of the lump sum, pension and redundancy payments that they would receive if they elected to retire early.
- 4.2 The Council shall advise the teacher to consult his or her own trade union or professional organisation.
- 4.3 The normal requirements to give notice will be waived on either side for a teacher who retires early, in accordance with this Scheme.
- 4.4 Only after a written offer of PRC has been received and accepted by the teacher in writing is the decision to terminate an appointment final. The written offer will make it clear that it applies only if a redundancy situation still exists when the employee leaves.
- 4.5 Schools who wish to offer either additional enhancement (within the PRC regulations) or to grant premature retirement in cases which are not covered by the usual application of this Scheme will be charged the additional costs involved.
- 4.6 Any collective dispute between the parties to the Scheme or the use of PRC provision shall be dealt with in accordance with agreed procedures for collective disputes.
- 4.7 If any teacher is aggrieved by a decision of the Council not to offer premature retirement under this Scheme there shall be a right of appeal under the appropriate Teachers' Grievance Procedure. There is no right of appeal against the detail of an offer which can, of course, be turned down.
- 4.8 This Scheme may be revised at any time only after consultation between the parties thereto. It has been agreed to take effect up to 31 December 1998 and a further scheme will then be considered.

EDUCATION COMMITTEE - 6 OCTOBER 1998
EDUCATION MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE - 25 NOVEMBER 1998
AGENDA ITEM EM10

PREMATURE RETIREMENT COMPENSATION SCHEME FOR TEACHERS
ANNEX 2 Costs of Early Retirements and Redundancies: September 1997 - August 1998

Costs of Early Retirements and Redundancies: September 1997 - August 1998

Total Costs (Teachers)

	£
Basic Pension	70,385
Basic Lump Sum	136,606
Enhanced Pension	5,705
Enhanced Lump Sum	17,116
Redundancy - PRC cases	353,804
non-PRC cases	<u>157,374</u>
	511,178

PRC Age Profile (Teachers)

Age	Redundancy			Efficiency		
	Primary	Secondary	Other	Primary	Secondary	Special
50	2	4				
51		5				
52	1	1				
53						
54	1	1				
55		1	1			
56	1	3				
57		1		2		
58	1			3	1	1
59		1		2	2	
60		2				
61		1				
62			1			
TOTAL	6	20	2	7	3	1

ROAD SAFETY EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS

Report by the Chief Education Officer and Director of Environmental Services

Division(s) affected: All

Introduction

1. The Highways & Road Safety Sub-Committee on 3 September 1998 resolved that the Director of Environmental Services should report jointly with the Chief Education Officer on traffic education in schools (Minute 45/98 refers). A joint initiative by the Chief Education Officer and the Director of Environmental Services had already been undertaken to establish the current and future levels of road safety education provision for children in Oxfordshire schools. This report explains the background to this initiative and suggests the way forward to provide a wider and more effective programme of road safety education in Oxfordshire.

Background

2. Road Safety Officers in Oxfordshire have been proactive in trying to establish a consistent and effective programme of road safety education for all children in schools. In doing this they followed national guidelines from the Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR). These guidelines have often been at odds with the views of the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) who have not included road safety education in the National Curriculum and whose policy is to allow individual schools to decide whether or not to include road safety in their curriculum.
3. Although there have been pockets of good practice in road safety education in Oxfordshire, these are usually short term and dependent on the personal commitment of individual teachers. The problem is compounded by the assumption by many parents that someone else will teach their children road safety and therefore few parents take any active part in training their children. As a result children do not receive a planned and progressive programme of road safety education.

Effective Road Safety Training

4. Road Safety Officers in Oxfordshire have carried out informal evaluation of road safety initiatives in schools for a number of years. Traditional theory-based sessions have not been shown to change road behaviour or reduce casualty figures. Experience and research indicates that practical on-road training supported by an element of theory is the only effective way to achieve these aims.
5. Oxfordshire's practical on-road child pedestrian training scheme 'Footsteps', where parents are a key element, was developed specifically to address this need. The primary role of schools in this programme is to recruit volunteer parents/tutors and to provide a base for the practical training activities. Schools are also encouraged to carry out supporting work in the classroom wherever possible.
6. An area of comparative success is the cycle training programme, which has been evaluated nationally and shown to be effective. The programme is mostly on-road and practical and is carried out by volunteer instructors who are trained by Road Safety/TravelWise Group staff because of the specific skills needed to train child cyclists. It is supported by an element of theory and off-road preparation. As with pedestrian training the primary role of schools is the recruitment of instructors and provision of classroom facilities for the off-road elements of the course.

Road Safety Education Joint Initiative

7. A series of meetings took place last year between officers from Environmental Services and the Education Department to discuss the level of road safety education in schools. As a result of these meetings a joint initiative was set up by the Chief Education Officer and the Director of

Environmental Services to establish the current status of road safety education in Oxfordshire schools and to assess the likely future involvement of teachers. Each school partnership in Oxfordshire was invited to nominate a teacher funded to carry out research in their partnership schools. Four partnerships, from the total of thirty one, nominated a teacher to be their representative. A detailed report on this initiative is attached (Annex 1). It confirms that road safety education is not currently being delivered in any consistent way and that this position is unlikely to change in the foreseeable future. It also establishes that teachers feel that parents should have the main responsibility for practical road safety training, and that a teacher's role should be to support this work.

The Way Forward

8. We believe that the current situation would be improved if the County Council were to adopt a schools' policy which clarified whose responsibility it is to teach road safety. It is proposed to make it clear that it is primarily a parental responsibility to train children as pedestrians with support from schools. To support parents, training packs are already being developed, based on the 'Footsteps' programme. A key partner in this programme will be the Oxfordshire Health Authority and the packs will be distributed to all parents by health visitors who will encourage them to carry out practical on-road training and will emphasise that parents are the best trainers of their children as pedestrians.
9. It is therefore proposed that schools should clearly state that road safety is not part of their curriculum work, but that they will take every opportunity to support ongoing training by the parents. Where schools are able to include theoretical work into their curriculum, resources and support will continue to be available from the Road Safety/TravelWise Group.

Environmental Implications

10. Pedestrian skills training may encourage more journeys on foot instead of by car, which is in line with Oxfordshire County Council's TravelWise policy and the DETR funded 'Better Ways to School' project.

Financial and Staff Implications

11. There are no funding or staffing implications for schools. Funding for the training packs for parents can be found from the existing Road Safety Education Training and Publicity budget by diverting resources from other areas of the existing business plan. We do not anticipate additional demands on road safety staff as training requirements for parents will be offset by a reduced need to train volunteer tutors.

Implications for People Living in Poverty

12. Those families on low incomes are less likely to drive and more likely to be involved in injury accidents. Walking can be risky and pedestrians are vulnerable to severe injury in road traffic accidents. Practical training could help to reduce the level of risk to pedestrians by providing skills and raising awareness of road safety.

RECOMMENDATIONS

13. **The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to:**
 - (a) **note the findings of the joint working initiative on road safety education in schools. (Annex 1);**
 - (b) **agree that the existing cycle training programme should be maintained and continue to be expanded wherever possible;**
 - (c) **adopt the principle for road safety education in schools that parents will have the primary responsibility for road safety training for their children, but that Schools will take every opportunity to support this work through road safety related**

activities within and outside the curriculum appropriate to the age and experience of the child;

- (d) ensure that all schools are informed of the new policy statement and respond to it as appropriate; and**
- (e) advise the Highways & Road Safety Sub-Committee accordingly.**

G.M. BADMAN
Chief Education Officer

DAVID YOUNG
Director of Environmental Services

Contact Officers: Education: Giti Paulin, Schools Adviser for Personal, Social & Health Education Tel: Oxford 428041

Environmental Services: Ian Harris. Principal Road Safety Officer Tel: Oxford 815717

November 1998

EDUCATION COMMITTEE - 6 OCTOBER 1998
EDUCATION MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE - 25 NOVEMBER 1998
AGENDA ITEM EM10

PREMATURE RETIREMENT COMPENSATION SCHEME FOR TEACHERS
ANNEX 4 Age Distribution - Teachers in Schools at September 1998

Age Distribution - Teachers in Schools at September 1998

<u>Age</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
50	63	136	199
51	52	127	179
52	37	87	124
53	29	84	113
54	18	60	78
55	19	60	79
56	17	29	46
57	10	36	46
58	7	31	38
59	10	14	24
60	8	14	22
61	1	10	11
62	2	3	5
63	2	3	5
64	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>
TOTAL	278	696	974

ROAD SAFETY EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS

ANNEX 1 Report of Road Safety Working Initiative in Oxfordshire Schools

REPORT OF ROAD SAFETY EDUCATION WORKING INITIATIVE IN OXFORDSHIRE SCHOOLS

Background

Because of concerns about the poor level and coverage of road safety education in Oxfordshire Schools, a meeting took place in February 1997 between the Chief Education Officer, the Principal Road Safety Officer and the Senior Road Safety Officer to discuss the situation. It was recognised that in the absence of a County Council policy on road safety education provision that there was no consistent practice in schools. Furthermore there appears to be an unreasonable expectation by parents that schools have a responsibility to teach children road safety. It was decided to carry out a joint consultation exercise to establish the current level of school involvement and also the potential for future development.

Methodology

Every school partnership was invited to nominate a member of staff for secondment to establish current practice and individual requirements for future activity within their partnership. These secondments were funded by Environmental Services to cover supply teacher costs and were administered by Education Department.

A letter was sent by the CEO's Adviser for Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE) to all partnership headteachers in September 1997. The secondments were also advertised in the Education Department circular 'Noticeboard' and the PSHE newsletter.

Of the thirty one partnerships contacted, four nominated a secondee. Three partnerships declined to make a nomination and there was no response from the remainder. In view of the low response a questionnaire was circulated by the Adviser for PSHE in January 1998 to encourage more responses. As a result one further nomination was received. Eleven partnerships gave one or more reasons for not taking up the secondment which included:

- * not able to find anyone interested in taking up the secondment;
- * Road Safety Education was not a priority;
- * this area is primarily the responsibility of parents;
- * not able to address Road Safety Education because it is not part of the National Curriculum;
- * schools are saturated with demands and simply cannot take on any more responsibilities;
- * it is not on the primary partnership plan and work overload makes it impossible to put forward a secondee.

The four secondees were briefed at meetings in January 1998 and agreed to supply written report of their contacts with the schools in their partnership. The results of the secondments were discussed at a further meeting in June 1998.

Forty schools were contact by the secondees, which represents about 10% of the County Schools.

Findings of the secondees

The general picture in each partnership was found to be very similar. The following are the main points to

emerge:

- * no school had a specific road safety policy;
- * schools are not in a position to be the main providers of road safety education;
- * a greater emphasis on road safety as part of the existing formal curriculum was generally viewed as an unlikely possibility.
- * teachers felt that road safety is a parental responsibility (possibly in conjunction with schools).
- * Road safety input in many schools is limited to mentioning issues at whole school assemblies on an ad hoc basis. In a minority of schools a little road safety related material was very occasionally included as an element of topic work.

Conclusions

The findings point to the need to establish a clear policy on road safety education in Oxfordshire schools.

OUTLINE PROJECT APPRAISAL NO. ED 465

Garsington CE Primary School

Division(s)

affected: Chalgrove

OUTLINE PROJECT APPRAISAL

APPRAISAL NO. ED 465

NAME OF SCHEME: Garsington CE Primary School

COMMITTEE(S): Education

Start Year: 1999/2000

BASIS OF ESTIMATE: Initial Budgetary Assessment

1. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

(a) Included in the schedule of Minor Works Projects for 1998/99 attached as Annex 5 to the Capital Programme Report approved by the Education Management Sub-Committee on 9 September 1998 was a proposal to undertake internal remodelling of this school to improve the layout of the teaching accommodation for the more effective and appropriate delivery of the curriculum. This first phase in the future redevelopment of the school was given a notional value of £125,000.

(b) The school has also been successful in attracting a grant from the Government for the reduction in Infant class sizes in the sum of £94,000 inclusive of professional fees.

Detailed discussions are taking place with school staff and Governors concerning the preparation of the brief for the future development of the school. The proposals include the construction of a new KS1 classroom, the remodelling of both the Infant and Junior Departments to improve the size and layout of classrooms and resource areas, and an extension to provide a more welcoming and secure entrance and reception area, and office accommodation.

These proposals are being designed to reflect the changing needs of the curriculum and to raise the quality of the educational provision.

2. JUSTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF NEED

This school was constructed in 1968 and extended in 1972 and 1974. In 1983 adaptations were undertaken to enable the school to vacate the former Victorian building and to come together onto one site. In addition in 1990 a 2 class temporary classroom was placed on the site. The Infant Department consists of one discrete classroom of appropriate size and a 2 class co-operative teaching area with a shared central resource area. This space also provides access to the staffroom, toilets, cloakrooms and hall and therefore cannot be effectively utilised for teaching purposes. The modern curriculum requires more activities to be conducted on a class based model. The proposal is therefore to remodel these spaces into discrete classrooms.

In the permanent building, the Junior Department consists of a 2 class co-operative teaching space with a central resource providing access to the teaching bases, the library the music/special needs room and toilets/cloakrooms as well as the main circulation route to the hall and administrative areas. Once again this central resource cannot be effectively used because of through circulation. This space will also be remodelled to create discrete and appropriate classrooms. The existing layout of the teaching areas is considered to be totally unsuitable for current and future educational use. At the same time as the teaching areas are improved the opportunity will be taken to create a new entrance and reception area with offices for school staff and the Headteacher. The scheme

achieves the most economic and effective use of the space available.

The new KS1 classroom will meet the requirements of the new legislation to reduce infant class sizes.

3. OTHER OPTIONS

The school could continue to operate in the existing premises without any alterations or improvements. No action will mean that the staff and pupils will continue to work in a poorly designed environment.

If the new KS1 classroom is not constructed to reduce infant class sizes the Council will fail to meet the requirements of the Standards and Framework Act 1998.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

(i) Capital

The scheme has already been included in the approved Minor Works Programme for 1998/99. The proposals have been given a notional cost of £234,000 inclusive of professional fees. The scheme will be resourced in the following way:

(i)	Annual Capital Guidelines Credit Approval (Minor Works)	£140,000
(ii)	Government Grant for reducing Infant Class Sizes	<u>£ 94,000</u>

£234,000

(ii) Revenue

The running costs and non-structural maintenance will be met from the delegated budget. The structural maintenance costs will be met from the central non-delegated budget for repair and maintenance.

These arrangements may change as a consequence of the proposals under the 'Fair Funding of Schools' initiative by the Government.

5. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

The extension and improvement of the school premises will make a significant improvement to the aesthetic nature of the site and will improve circulation between different parts of the buildings.

The improved layout of the teaching areas will be particularly beneficial to the school.

6. STAFF IMPLICATIONS

Staffing of the additional KS1 space will be provided through funding allocated by the Government under the Class Sizes Initiative.

G.M. BADMAN
Chief Education Officer

CHRIS GRAY
County Treasurer

DAVID YOUNG
Director of Environmental Services

Contact Officer: David Brown, Principal Premises Development Officer Tel: (01865) 815107.

November 1998

ITEM EM6(a)(1)

OUTLINE PROJECT APPRAISAL

APPRAISAL NO. ED 464

**ABINGDON, ST NICOLAS CE PRIMARY SCHOOL - Replacement of Temporary and Horsas
Accommodation**

Division(s) affected: Abingdon

OUTLINE PROJECT APPRAISAL

APPRAISAL NO. ED 464

**NAME OF SCHEME: ABINGDON, ST NICOLAS CE PRIMARY SCHOOL - Replacement of Temporary
and Horsas
Accommodation**

COMMITTEE(S): Education

Start Year: 1999/2000

BASIS OF ESTIMATE: Initial Budgetary Estimate

1. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

At its meeting in March 1998 the Education Management Sub-Committee agreed to part of the Capital Receipts released from the sale of the former Letcombe Regis Primary School buildings and site to be used to undertake minor improvements at St Nicolas School in Abingdon. Since then discussions have taken place with the school and the Oxford Diocesan Board of Education about the replacement of the school's temporary and horsas buildings utilising part of the Letcombe Regis receipts, and receipts from the sale of part of the school's playing-fields, which are in the ownership of a Trust, and which are considered to be surplus to the school's requirements.

In recent weeks an agreement has been reached with the Trustees and the Oxford Diocesan Board of Education for an application to be made to the Charity Commission for a capital recoupment scheme in order that 70-80% of the capital receipts can be used for the redevelopment scheme (maximum permissible under Charity Commission rules).

The scheme will consist of the replacement of four temporary classrooms and two horsas classrooms with permanent accommodation, the demolition of the school's swimming pool and improvements to car parking and access. Further phases will seek to replace the four remaining temporary classrooms, and provide improvements for IT and Technology, the relocation of hard play area onto the playing-field and additional car parking facilities. Funding has not yet been identified for these works.

2. JUSTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF NEED

St Nicolas's capacity of 419 places is arranged across 14 classrooms. Of these 419 places, 176 are in temporary accommodation and 60 are in horsas accommodation. Of the remaining classrooms three are less than 54m². The school's buildings and hard play area are contained within a site which makes further expansion and vehicular access extremely difficult. This scheme will relocate the children's hard play area onto playing-field land, and introduce a new vehicular access.

3. OTHER OPTIONS

There is no other option for securing the replacement of a large percentage of the school's buildings. Although a submission will also be made under the New Deal for School's Initiative (NDS) in January 1999 for additional funding, there is no guarantee that the scheme will be supported. A similar scheme submitted under the previous round of NDS was not supported by the

Government.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

(i) Capital

The estimated total cost of this scheme inclusive of fees, is £475,000. The cost of these improvements will be funded from the Capital Receipts to be released from the sale of the former Letcombe Regis School buildings, and the sale of part of the playing-fields at St Nicolas Primary School. (£475,000).

(ii) Revenue

Running costs and day to day maintenance costs will continue to be met from the school's delegated budget. Structural maintenance will be funded from the central non-delegated maintenance budget.

These arrangements may change as a result of "Fair Funding" proposals, planned to be effective in April 1999.

5. STAFF IMPLICATIONS

There are none arising from this report.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

Although the building work will be carried out in accordance with the planning permission issued by the Council, when environmental and landscape requirements will be taken into account, discussions have already taken place with the Sports Council over the loss of the playing-fields. Their representative initially indicated that the Sports Council are likely to object to this proposal when the planning consent is sought, because of the shortfall in playing-fields for community use in Abingdon. However their opposition will be withdrawn if an alternative playing-field land is identified, or if a commuted sum is paid to the District Council to allow it to acquire additional playing-field land, or if this Council takes steps to ensure that the remaining playing-fields at the school are made accessible to the local community.

7. Although funding has been earmarked within the construction costs to meet the Sports Council's requirements, further discussions are planned with the Sports Council regarding this matter. The headteacher and governors of St Nicolas School have expressed their agreement for the community use of their playing-fields. It is anticipated that a dual use agreement will be drawn up to formalise these arrangements.

8. RECOMMENDATION

The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to declare those playing-fields edged black on the attached plan surplus to the Council's requirements.

G.M. BADMAN
Chief Education Officer

CHRIS GRAY
County Treasurer

DAVID YOUNG
Director of Environmental Services

Contact Officer: Keith Borien - Senior Education Officer Tel: (01865) 815134.

November 1998

AGENDA ITEM EM7

EVALUATION OF FROZEN SCHOOL MEALS PILOT

Division(s) affected: All

Report by the Chief Education Officer, County Treasurer, Director of Environmental Services and Assistant Chief Executive

Introduction

1. As reported to the last meeting of this Sub-Committee, the Delivered Meals System (DMS) has been trialled in a number of primary schools during the first part of the autumn term. This report provides an evaluation of the pilot exercise.
2. Additionally, the report provides details of the outcome of the tender exercise for the new school meals contract, which will commence 1 April 1999.
3. Finally, the DfEE has issued the promised consultation paper under Fair Funding on the delegation of funding for school meals.
4. All three issues are linked and recommendations are made in the light of this in relation to the operation of the school meals service from 1 April 1999.

DMS Pilot

5. Whilst, as previously reported, it had been the intention to trial DMS in 10 schools, in practice the pilot was limited to 7 schools: Barley Hill Thame, Cumnor, Kings Meadow Bicester, Garsington, Hardwick Banbury, Longfields Bicester and Sutton Courtenay. The smaller pilot was decided upon so that the 7 manufacturers which had applied to trial their equipment would each have one site.
6. Included at Annex 1 is an evaluation of the pilot exercise in so far as it has been possible to draw conclusions for the limited period in which the pilot has operated.
7. In summary the following conclusions can be drawn:
 - (a) the 7 schools all report varying degrees of enthusiasm for the DMS operation as a result of better quality food, which is reflected in increased take up;
 - (b) concerns have been expressed about the portion sizes for 10 and 11 year olds by three headteachers (but this is an issue about contract specification rather than the mode of provision and can be addressed separately);
 - (c) the trial has been successful in providing useful information about the equipment of various suppliers. As a result of the trial, two manufacturers have been ruled out on the basis that their equipment was not suitable;
 - (d) various minor teething problems with the installation of equipment were experienced, which was to be expected, and again this experience will assist in planning the introduction of DMS if this decided upon;
 - (e) valuable experience has been gained in operating the pilot.
8. On the basis of the experience of the pilot, there is nothing to suggest that the Council should reconsider its decision to implement DMS in the 50 schools formerly identified to be converted to this mode of provision.
9. Costings assumed in previous reports can be confirmed in terms of equipment purchase and installation, assuming that the remaining 43 sites do not present problems not encountered in the

pilot schools. In this respect, a survey of the 43 sites is now being undertaken, the results of which will be available by the date of the sub committee meeting.

10. In summary, the capital cost of implementing the DMS solution relative to the budget provision voted initially for converting kitchens to serveries is as follows:

	£000
<u>Estimated Capital Costs of DMS</u>	
Redundancy	117
Ovens *	190
Freezers	12
Installation Works	<u>25</u>
	<u>344</u>
 <u>Budget Provision 1998/99</u>	
Redundancy	305
Equipment	<u>240</u>
	<u>545</u>
 Saving	 201

* It is probable that there will be savings on the costings assumed for purchase of ovens as a consequence of tendering for the bulk supply.

Tenders for New School Meals Contract

11. Only two tenders were submitted for the school meals contract, one from the Council's direct service organisation (DSO), the other from a private contractor. Whilst other private contractors had indicated their intention to tender, uncertainty in relation to the future of school meals as a consequence of the government's proposals under Fair Funding resulted in these companies deciding to withdraw.
12. The position is further complicated by the fact that the one external contractor that did tender felt it necessary to qualify its tender by setting out conditions relative to the possibility/probability that government will decide to proceed with delegating funding for school meals (see below). Accordingly, the Solicitor to the Council has ruled, in accordance with the regulations governing CCT, that the external contractor's tender is disqualified.
13. The Assistant Chief Executive has written to the Secretary of State (DETR) seeking his agreement to accept the DSO tender in the light of the disqualification.
14. The DSO tender prices for providing the meals service for both the DMS option and the servery option for 1999/2000 were identical. In comparison with the school meals budget, the tender prices represent an overall increase of 2.75%, which is in line with the County Treasurer's inflation assumptions for 1999/2000.

Fair Funding

15. Assuming that the Secretary of State agrees that the contract may be awarded to the DSO, there will still be a number of other questions in relation to the proposals for delegation of the school meals budget under Fair Funding. A copy of the consultation paper is provided at Annex 2.
16. The DfEE has requested preliminary comments on the allocation issues (Section 3) by 16 November, having issued the paper only on 3 November, with more general comments to be made by 27 November. It was not possible to produce draft comments in time for the deadline for this report. The Chief Education Officer will report orally to the meeting on any response.
17. Should the draft regulations issued by the DfEE under Section 46 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 remain unchanged, then the Council will be required to delegate the school meals budget to all secondary schools with effect from 1 April 2000 and to delegate funding to any

primary or special school that requests it from the same date. However, if there is no binding contract in place on 1 April 1999, then delegation may be required for 1999/2000.

18. Should the Secretary of State agree that the contract may be awarded to the DSO (as referred to above), then the question will be whether this would constitute a binding agreement as defined in the regulations. It may be open to the Council, if it wishes, to delegate funding at least to some schools that wish it from 1 April 1999. Equally it may become a requirement.
19. The consultation paper at Annex 2 highlights the major issues that will need to be considered as part of delegation. There would need to be a full and proper consultation with schools about these issues to decide how delegation would be effected.
20. Assuming that delegation does become a requirement, then this would support the proposal to implement the DMS option for those kitchens which would otherwise be converted to serveries. DMS would make these schools independent of other schools (which would not be the case if converted to serveries) and should they wish to apply for delegation in the future, this would be facilitated more easily.

Financial and Staff Implications

21. The proposal to implement DMS in 50 kitchens would result in a reduced level of redundancies compared with the alternative option of converting these kitchens to serveries. The financial implications are as set out above and in earlier reports. All costs can be met within existing budget provision.

Environmental Implications and Implications for People Living in Poverty

22. There are no direct implications arising from this report for people living in poverty, although future delegation of school meals may have implications for both the type and quality of meals supplied to pupils whose parents are on income support or job seeker's allowance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

23. **The Sub Committee are RECOMMENDED to:**
 - (a) **agree to implement the delivered meals system in the 50 schools previously agreed, as set out in the tender specification;**
 - (b) **agree to award the school meals contract to Commercial Services, subject to the approval of the Secretary of State; and**
 - (c) **determine the response to be submitted to the DfEE on the consultation paper on delegation of school meals.**

G.M. BADMAN
Chief Education Officer

DAVID YOUNG
Director of Environmental Services

STEPHEN CAPALDI
Assistant Chief Executive

Background Papers: Nil

Contact Officer: Roy Smith, Deputy Chief Education Officer Tel. 01865 815457

November 1998

AGENDA ITEM EM7

EVALUATION OF FROZEN SCHOOL MEALS PILOT

Division(s) affected: All

ANNEX 1 DMS Site Evaluation Report

DMS SITE EVALUATION REPORT

Phase 1

School 1 Manufacturer 1

The trolley supplied by the manufacturer was the only trolley which was not blown air. The method of heating inside the trolley was by electric conductive plates. This meant that the temperature inside the trolley was not distributed effectively. Food on the top shelf was cooked properly, but food on the other shelves took longer to cook and did not brown. To enable food being served to look appetising, conventional ovens had to be used. Both headteacher and children were very unhappy with the appearance and cooked quality of the food.

Although the help and support given by the manufacturer could not be faulted, it was agreed that their trolley was not suitable, and that the trial would cease.

School 1 Manufacturer 2

The first manufacturer's trolley was replaced with that of the second manufacturer. There have been no more problems following the installation of the new trolley. The manufacturer has supported the site and staff well.

The headteacher is happy with the system and feels that food quality has improved. The children are happy too and have clear favourite meals, with reservations on a few. The head is happy to promote DMS, but fears that the staff are rather negative.

School 2 Manufacturer 3

Few teething problems here, trial has been running well.

The headteacher very pleased with the quality of the food and the improved presentation, and feels meal uptake has increased. Governors and parents have visited the site to view DMS and all were impressed with the system.

The head has reservations over portion sizes for 10 and 11 year olds.

School 3 Manufacturer 4

The trial at this site was severely hampered by the late completion of building works and was delayed by 2 weeks. For the first two weeks of term, sandwiches were brought in to feed the school and this led to a loss in meal numbers. There have also been problems with the wrong steriliser being installed. It has therefore been very difficult to gauge a proper response for this trial for these reasons.

Despite the fact that the manufacturer was delayed from starting the trial alongside other manufacturers, they have remained very positive and supportive at this site. There have been very few problems with the trolley itself.

The headteacher is pleased with the system, felt that it is easy to operate and that food quality has improved. Meal numbers have dropped due to the building works at the start of term, but they are picking up. The head is concerned over the height of the hatch installed, which may need to be altered. There is also the issue

with "favourite food days" which cause problems with the increase in collecting cash. The head also has concern over the portion sizes for older children.

School 4 Manufacturer 5

There were concerns over this supplier from the very beginning of the trial. A number of issues which were discussed prior to the installation of their equipment were not followed through satisfactorily and although there were concerns over communication problems within the company, they were given the same opportunities as all other manufacturers.

From the beginning of the trial there were problems with the trolley coming up to temperature, which resulted in the food taking twice as long as it should have done to cook. The company had also provided an additional table top oven to cope with extra volumes on "favourite food days" and it was this oven which was being used to cook, and not the trolley as required.

Although the company did make visits to the site, they did not communicate their findings, and did little to alleviate the problems or support the cook on site. They were given every opportunity to rectify the problems on site, but did not feel that their equipment would need our requirements, and requested to remove their equipment from the site and cease the trial.

School 4 Manufacturer 4

The equipment was replaced with that of another manufacturer. There have been no more problems following the installation of the new trolley. The manufacturer has supported site and staff well.

The headteacher is happy with the system and feels that the food is much better. Both pupils and adults have commented positively on the food being served. The cook is happy with the system too. The head would back this system 100% but has reservations about the portion size for older children.

School 5 Manufacturer 2

Only minor teething problems have been experienced on this site. The site and staff have been supported very well.

The headteacher is supportive and pleased with most menu items. Some items are not so popular, the pupils do not like cheese and broccoli quiche. The head has concerns over the temperature of the food as it is sometimes very, very hot. Service has also slowed down as one servery assistant has been removed.

School 6 Manufacturer 6

In addition to the usual teething problems, there has been an issue with the power at the site, with the electricity supply to the kitchen constantly tripping and cutting out. This has caused problems for the cook, and has affected the cooking times and results of the trial.

The manufacturer does not currently have a double oven trolley, and for trial purposes has provided two separate single oven trolleys. Upon further investigation of the power problems, the manufacturer conceded that it was probably due to a fault with one of their single oven trolleys. This has been removed over the recent half term. The fault should now be rectified.

Despite the problems with the power, the head is very pleased with the trial. Food quality has improved and so has menu choice and there is increased take up.

Phase 2

Following the removal of two manufacturers' equipment from the sites detailed, and the subsequent need for

replacements, the same opportunity needed to be extended to those manufacturers remaining.

It was deemed necessary to invite the manufacturers left in the trial to extend to two trial sites.

School 7 Manufacturer 3

As this was the second site for this manufacturer, there were very few problems.

Although the trial has been running only a few weeks, there is already a marked improvement in food quality, as the site had been converted to a servery earlier in the year and food has been transported.

Meal numbers are already starting to increase.

As previously stated, Manufacturer 6 does not currently supply a double oven trolley. However, a "prototype" has been developed which will be ready by mid November. Once the new trolley is ready, it will be trialled as their second machine.

NORTHFIELD SPECIAL SCHOOL - RELOCATION

Report by the Chief Education Officer and Director of Environmental Services

Division(s) affected: All

Introduction

1. At its meeting on 13 May 1998, the Sub-Committee instructed officers to investigate as a matter of urgency further options for the relocation of Northfield School. The specific requirements of the Sub-Committee were that the study should include a review of County Council owned property - in particular any properties planned for disposal; land held by other Local Authorities; other land held by such bodies as the Health Authority, MoD, the Universities; any schools in the independent sector and properties on the market. The Sub-Committee also asked officers to look at the split site option again in case there are smaller properties that may be suitable: one to serve the North of the County and another the South.
2. WS Atkins were subsequently commissioned to undertake the study and at its meeting on the 9 September 1998 members were advised that the review was continuing and that a report would be presented to the November meeting. This report describes the outcome of that search.
3. Members will be aware of the considerable investment of time and energy that has gone into the search for a new site for Northfield school. A significant and critical feature of the search has been the inherent conflict between the wish of the Head and Governors of the school for a greenfield location away from existing development, and the County's planning policies that seek to locate new development (including schools) within existing settlements and to take account of the constraints of the Green Belt and other environmental policies.
4. Given these circumstances it is necessary for officers to ensure that any site must seek to satisfy, as far as is possible, the planning criteria and the operational criteria.

The Site Search Criteria

5. Fundamental to the review is the selection of criteria by which to assess any site. The previous preferred option (the site at Oxford Road roundabout at Eynsham) illustrated the problem of choosing an operationally acceptable site that ultimately was seen to conflict with planning policy. A review of the criteria was needed to clarify the site requirements. The revised criteria require that the replacement school site:
 - (a) is within a 12 mile radius of Oxford;
 - (b) is a minimum of 1 hectare;
 - (c) complies with planning policies;
 - (d) is adjacent to compatible uses;
 - (e) is in a rural/semi rural location; and
 - (f) is financially viable.
6. A full explanation of each of these criteria is at ANNEXA, together with a list of the original criteria and the reasons for the changes.
7. Particular attention was given to planning policies in the revised site search. Sites that are contrary to the development plan are likely to be refused planning permission, or 'called-in' by the Secretary of State and be the subject of a Public Inquiry (thereby incurring substantial additional costs and a significant delay).

Review of the Previous Site Search

8. All of the sites previously considered in earlier searches were reviewed and re-examined in the light

of the new criteria: particular attention was given to sites (1) to (10) in ANNEX C (EXEMPT). Of these ten sites, two were the subject of more detailed consideration.

9. The first of these two sites, at Grandpont, was given more detailed consideration because its development would be likely to be acceptable in planning policy terms. The site is of sufficient size and is being used as a car park but the site has been contaminated by a former gasworks. However, the site was rejected on operational grounds because it is in an urban location, close to the City Centre and adjacent to an existing school.
10. The second of these sites, the existing hostel, is the subject of further investigation. This site was investigated during the original search but was dismissed because it was too small.

Search of Other Land within the Ownership of OCC

11. The relocation of the school to a site owned by the County Council is preferable to avoid the need for potentially lengthy and complicated negotiations with other landowners and the need to compulsorily acquire land (which would incur a lengthy Public Inquiry the outcome of which would be uncertain). A thorough review of land in the County Council's ownership has therefore been completed as follows:
 - (a) a search of the County's map based land records to identify any potential sites. In completing this search, particular attention was paid to land within and on the edge of existing settlements; and
 - (b) a review of all existing and potential property disposals.
12. This search revealed only two possible sites that would be likely to comply with planning policies, (see ANNEX C, sites (11) and (12)) but these sites were rejected on operational grounds. No other sites were identified in this part of the search.

Search of Land in Private Ownership

13. This part of the search was carried out in two distinct parts. A variety of organisations and land owning bodies were consulted and these are listed in ANNEX B. However, this part of the search did not reveal any sites that were worthy of further consideration.
14. The second part of the search focused on:
 - (a) Land on the edge of settlements because such sites are most likely to have fewer neighbours and a rural outlook;
 - (b) Employment land because such sites are likely to be less expensive than land allocated for housing and because the construction of a school on such sites would not conflict with planning policies that seek to protect the countryside; and
 - (c) Sites within settlements because such sites are most likely to comply with planning policies.
15. A total of 16 sites (see sites (13) to (28) in ANNEX C) were identified by this search but none were found suitable, although three sites (20, 21 and 22 in Annex C) are still being investigated.

A Split Site Option

16. The search did not reveal any suitable sites for such an option. The disadvantages of such an option in terms of cost (the need for two playing fields, two play areas etc.) and operational difficulties mean that this should only be considered as a last resort.

Conclusion

17. Despite a very thorough search that has involved WS Atkins, officers from the Education and Environmental Services Departments, and staff and Governors of the school, officers are unable to put before the committee, at this time, a solution to the Northfield School relocation.

18. The study continues to highlight the problem of finding a site that meets the operational requirements of the Head and Governors and planning policy constraints.
19. The proposal that has emerged from the study is the possible relocation of the school to the hostel site and further work will be undertaken in relation to this option. As far as new sites are concerned, three are still being investigated, but these sites are in private ownership and their availability is unknown (see (20), (21) and (22) in ANNEX C). Members are recommended to await the feasibility study into the possibility of relocating the school to the hostel site and to instruct officers to continue the search.

Financial Implications

20. These will be assessed as part of the revised project appraisal for the relocation of the school to a new site. Members should however be aware that the study has cost a lot in fees incurred by WS Atkins for their involvement in the exercise. A further lengthy search will incur more timecharge fees.

Staff Implications

21. Additional work will be required to consider any suitable sites that become available. Possible sites need to be assessed by a Working Party of officers from the County Council, the Head, school Governors and staff from WS Atkins.

Environmental Implications

22. There are none arising directly from this report. The selection of a site will require a feasibility study that will assess the impact of any development on the environment and in due course, any proposal will be the subject of a planning submission which will consider the environmental implications.

Implications for People Living In Poverty

23. There are none arising from this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

24. **The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to:**

- (a) **agree the site criteria listed in paragraph 5 and described in Annex A;**
- (b) **authorise officers to investigate the suitability of relocating the school to the hostel site at Sandy Lane West, Oxford, and report back the results of the study to the next meeting; and**
- (c) **authorise officers to continue the search for any further sites and report back the outcome to the next meeting.**

G.M. BADMAN
Chief Education Officer

DAVID YOUNG
Director of Environmental Services

Background papers:

Contact Officer :

Keith Borien, Tel : Oxford 815134

13 November 1998

NORTHFIELD SPECIAL SCHOOL - RELOCATION

ANNEX A The Revised Criteria for Site Search for Relocating Northfield School

The Revised Criteria for Site Search for Relocating Northfield School

The 12 mile radius from the Centre of Oxford

1. Although this distance remains unchanged, a more careful analysis was undertaken to establish the actual distance of sites from the centre of Oxford along 'A' roads.
2. The 12 mile radius was based on the absolute maximum acceptable travel time for children attending the school: children would potentially face a journey of about 40 miles in the rush hour if travelling from the Banbury area to a site 12 miles to the south of the City. The 12 mile radius also ensured that a suitable range of sites could be examined that are not in the Green Belt (see below).
3. Some consideration was given to sites beyond the 12 mile radius where road links were particularly good e.g. Bicester (M40, A34/A41), Witney (A40) and Thame (M40, A418). However, it was considered that this should be avoided if possible because the extension of the search area would result in increased journey distances that would not be in the interests of the children and would not meet the Government's and Structure Plan's requirement for more sustainable development.

Size

4. Following a more detailed analysis of the school's actual space requirements, it has been estimated that the school could be accommodated on a site of 1 hectare (2.47 acres). A junior sports pitch of 40 metres by 60 metres, together with a 200m running track and 100m straight running track would be the minimum playing field requirement. The school itself would have a gross floor area of approximately 2500 m² (based on the floor area of the existing school and hostel) and part of this could be provided in the form of a two storey building.

Planning Policies

5. There are planning policies that seek to ensure that new development:-
 - (a) is accessible by a variety of transport modes and not only by car;
 - (b) is restricted in open countryside; and
 - (c) relates well to existing settlements.
6. The site search has therefore concentrated on sites within or on the edge of existing settlements, including land allocated for employment uses.
7. The site search has also eliminated sites within the Green Belt. In such areas, there is a 'presumption against inappropriate development' unless very special circumstances exist. The development of a school such as Northfield would be 'inappropriate' development in the Green Belt.
8. Other detailed planning issues such as access, landscaping, drainage etc. were not included in the site search criteria. Any sites that appear to be suitable on planning policy grounds will need to be given further consideration to ensure that they meet normal development control requirements.
9. Although there are policies which allocate land for residential and employment development, there are no specific planning policies within the search area which seek to allocate sites or provide for special needs schools, such as Northfield, which serve the whole of the County, rather than a particular settlement. Sites allocated for other types of development have therefore been considered as part of the search.

10. The implications of selecting a site which is contrary to planning policies are that the County and district councils may raise strong objections and the proposal could be called in by the Secretary of State.

Financial Constraints/Lack of Hope Value

11. In this search, sites with full development value were eliminated on grounds of cost. The school building would only take up a small part of a replacement site and it would not be prudent to pay full development value when much of that land would be used as outdoor playing space.

Compatibility with Adjacent Uses

12. A site away from adjacent uses is most operationally desirable. However, it is likely that development on such a site would be contrary to planning policies. Therefore, potential adjacent uses have been ranked in order of their acceptability:

- (1) Offices;
- (2) Industry - workshops/warehousing;
- (3) Housing; and
- (4) Schools.

Rural or semi rural location

13. This is desirable to provide a secure, peaceful and tranquil environment. It will also enable the school to offer an extended curriculum including market gardening, horticulture and rural science.

Original site search criteria

14. For information, the criteria used as part of the earlier search are as follows:

1. Within a 12 mile radius of Oxford;
2. Minimum size of site to be 1.5 hectares;
3. Compliance with planning policies;
4. Outside the Green Belt;
5. Non recreation land;
6. Access;
7. Adjacent to compatible uses;
8. Away from existing dwellings;
9. Away from existing schools;
10. Away from existing recreational areas;
11. In a rural or semi rural location;
12. Degree of separation from built up area;
13. Lack of hope value;

NORTHFIELD SPECIAL SCHOOL - RELOCATION

ANNEX B Names of Agents/Contacts

Names of Agents/Contacts

MoD;
Culham Research Centre;
NHS Trusts;
Oxford University;
Oxford Brookes University;
Private educational establishments in the area;
Oxford City Council;
District Councils within the search area;
All local agents including Savills, Chestertons, Adkins;
The Blenheim Estate;
Berkeley Homes;
Southern Electric; and
The Oxford Diocesan Board of Education.

DETAILED PROJECT APPRAISAL

APPRAISAL NO. ED 463/1

Bicester Community College

affected: Bicester North

Division(s)

DETAILED PROJECT APPRAISAL

APPRAISAL NO. ED 463/1

NAME OF SCHEME: BICESTER COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Replacement Buildings

COMMITTEE(S): Education
Start Year: 1999/2000

BASIS OF ESTIMATE: W S Atkins Estimate based on agreed sketch scheme

1. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

At their meeting on 9 September 1998 the Sub-Committee gave approval to the outline submission for the construction of a 22 class two-storey general teaching block to replace the aluminium buildings destroyed in the fire on 12 July 1997 and the majority of the remaining aluminium buildings for which grant was obtained from the Government under The New Deal for Schools (Round 2) Initiative.

2. JUSTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF NEED

The justification remains unaltered from the outline project submission. Detailed discussions with the school staff and governors has confirmed the need to replace the old aluminium buildings by a two-storey 22 classroom teaching block and the sketch scheme has been developed on this basis. The design of the block and its proposed location on the site has been planned in such a way so that it is an integral part of the larger plan to upgrade and expand the school accommodation to meet the projected expansion of pupils in Bicester.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

(i) Capital

The scheme is already included in the Capital Programme. The cost of constructing the two-storey block is constrained by the level of the insurance settlement for the buildings lost in the fire and the grant from the Government under NDS(3). The balance in funding is being met from the Annual Capital Guideline credit approval and an attempt will be made to recover these costs by a bid under NDS(3).

A summary of the capital available to the scheme is as follows:

(b)	Insurance Settlement	£665,000
(c)	NDS(2) Grant	£1,171,000
(d)	ACG Credit Approval	£449,000
		<u>£2,285,000</u>

(ii) Revenue

Revenue costs and everyday non-structural maintenance costs will continue to be funded from the school's delegated budget. Structural maintenance will continue to be met from the central non-delegated maintenance budget. The provision of more durable and robust buildings should make a major impact in reducing running costs.

These arrangements may change as a result of proposals under 'The Fair Funding of Schools' initiative by the Government planned to be implemented in April 1999

4. STAFF IMPLICATIONS

There are none arising from this report.

5. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

The environmental implications of the new buildings will be part of the normal planning process. The replacement of the aluminium buildings and their replacement by modern buildings are expected to significantly improve the aesthetic outlook of the site.

G.M. BADMAN
Chief Education Officer

CHRIS GRAY
County Treasurer

DAVID YOUNG
Director of Environmental Services

Contact Officer: David Brown, Principal Premises Development Officer Tel: (01865) 815134.

November 1998