



Outcome of the Statutory Consultation on the proposal to relocate Underbank Primary School and re-align the catchment area to incorporate the Carfin Estate development (currently in Braidwood Primary School catchment area)

March 2015

This report has been issued by South Lanarkshire Council in response to the consultation undertaken in terms of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010. This report includes recommendations of the outcome of the consultation which will be presented to the Executive Committee of South Lanarkshire Council.

If you need this information in another language or format, please contact us to discuss how we can best meet your needs.

Phone: 01698 454545 Email: education@southlanarkshire.gov.uk

Contents

- 1. Purpose of the report**
- 2. Recommendations**
- 3. Background**
- 4. Distribution of proposal document and summary of responses**
- 5. Errors and omissions**
- 6. Summary of written responses and Education Resources' responses**
- 7. Pupil comments**
- 8. Summary of issues raised by Education Scotland (formerly HMle) and Education Resources response**
- 9. Review of proposals by South Lanarkshire Council**
- 10. Resource, risk and policy implications**

Appendices

- Distribution of consultation proposals document
- Oral questions and responses at public meeting
- Report by Education Scotland

1. Purpose of the report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to advise all stakeholders on the outcome of the statutory consultation exercise undertaken in respect of the proposal to relocate Underbank Primary School and re-align the catchment area to incorporate the Carfin Estate development (currently in Braidwood Primary School catchment area) with effect from August 2015. This includes a report from Education Scotland on the educational aspects of the proposal and Education Resources' responses to all questions and issues raised during the consultation period.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 It is intended that the consultation report, along with any relevant documentation, will be considered by the Executive Committee of South Lanarkshire Council on 29 April 2015.
- 2.2 It is recommended that the Executive Committee:
- note the contents of the report;
 - agree the proposal to relocate Underbank Primary School and re-align the catchment area to incorporate the Carfin Estate development (currently in Braidwood Primary School catchment area).

3. Background

- 3.1 A consultation proposal document was issued as a result of a decision by the Executive Committee of South Lanarkshire Council on 19 November 2014 to consult on the proposals below:
- relocate Underbank Primary School to the former glasshouse site on Lanark Road;
 - re-align the current catchment area to incorporate the Carfin Estate development (currently in Braidwood Primary School catchment area).
- 3.2 The statutory consultation, in terms of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 was carried out over the period 1 December 2014 to 23 January 2015 which included a public meeting held on 6 January 2015 in Underbank Primary School.
- 3.3 A consultation notice was placed in the Carlisle and Lanark Gazette on 25 November 2014. The notice included a summary of the proposal, information on availability of the proposal document, how written representations could be made and also details of the public meeting.
- 3.4 A document detailing the proposals was issued on 28 November 2014 to the consultees listed in Appendix 1 – a full consultation document was sent to parents of Underbank Primary School and an abridged version, detailing the proposed catchment change plus details on how to access the whole proposal document if required, was provided to parents of children attending Braidwood Primary School. It was published on the Council website and a copy made available from all libraries and Q and As.
- 3.5 A public meeting was held on 6 January 2015 in Underbank Primary School. A summary of the oral representations made at this meeting is included as Appendix 2 in this report.
- 3.6 South Lanarkshire Council sent a copy of the proposal document to Education Scotland (formerly HMIE) on 28 November 2014 in their role as a statutory consultee. In addition, on 30 January 2015, Education Scotland was provided with a summary of all relevant written responses and oral representations made during the consultation period.

3.7 South Lanarkshire Council received a copy of Education Scotland's report on 16 February 2015. A summary of this report and Education Resources' response to the key points is included in Section 7 of this consultation report and a copy of the whole document is included as Appendix 3.

4. Distribution of proposal document and summary of responses

Consultation proposal documents totalling 213 were sent to statutory consultees and other stakeholders (1 document per household) with the document also being available on the council website, within libraries and Council Q and As.

The total number of responses that were received was 8.

Analysis of physical responses received - total 8

In favour of proposal	2	Not in favour of proposal	2
Undecided	4		

Table 1

Response to proposal	Total	Breakdown of responses	Parent / carer of child at Underbank Primary School	Parent / carer of potential future pupil at affected schools	Parent Council	Resident
In favour	2		0	1	0	1
Not in favour	2		1	0	0	1
Undecided	4		3	0	1	0

A summary of the comments received are included in Section 5. These are relatively unedited although any references to names have been removed to preserve anonymity.

For clarification, relevant statutory consultees are

- the Parent Councils of affected schools
- parents of pupils attending each affected school as well as the pupils themselves
- parents of pupils likely to attend an affected school
- staff at each affected school
- any trade union representative of those staff
- any other users whom the authority considers relevant

In this proposal, the affected schools are Underbank Primary School and, in relation to slight catchment re-alignment, Braidwood Primary School.

5. Errors and omissions

- 5.1 An inaccuracy in the Consultation Document (Appendix 1 and 2) was notified to the Council on the 6 January 2015. This inaccuracy is in relation to the precise location of the Carfin Estate that is proposed to be incorporated into the Underbank Primary School catchment area. A corrected plan is shown at the end of this document.
- 5.2 One parent brought this to our attention at the end of the Public Meeting, although it was intimated that this would not have a significant impact on the consultation.
- 5.3 It was not deemed necessary to reissue the consultation document to all parties or to extend the consultation period and the parent who brought this to the Council's attention was notified.

6. Summary of written responses and Education Resources' responses

Designation (parent etc.)	Comment / issue raised	Council response / comment
<p>Parent Council – Underbank Undecided on proposal</p>	<p>Location and site</p> <p>Location The Parent Council are aware of the work carried out by the Council to identify a suitable site. The Parent Council was in favour of an alternative site (at Graham Road). The Graham Road site has the benefit of being within Council ownership and is closer to the village centre. It also has the benefit of being away from the main road. We were advised that this site was not pursued due to concerns from the Council's Road Department about the potential backlog of traffic caused by the single track bridge linking the site to the centre of the village. However, we have seen no detailed analysis of this.</p>	<p>The Graham Road site was indeed considered for the new school but was rejected as it raised a number of significant concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Significant engineering works would be required to the 'B' listed bridge across the River Clyde, including the introduction of traffic lights and the raising of bridge parapets. 2. Pupil and other pedestrian road safety concerns, particularly when crossing the bridge. 3. The introduction of traffic lights at the bridge could result in tailbacks across the access to Valley International Park and Tait Walk. Further, it is considered that this would result in regular east bound traffic queues extending back towards the A72 causing potential queues and / or congestion along this road. 4. The Graham Road site could not facilitate the additional parent drop off / pick up facility proposed for this school. If the school was located here this could cause increased congestion in the residential area surrounding the school and lead to objections from existing neighbours.

Designation (parent etc.)	Comment / issue raised	Council response / comment
Parent Council – Underbank (continued)	<p>In terms of the proposed site the following positive aspects are noted as being:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is good size – well beyond the statutory minimum. This will enable a good sized school to be built with good outdoor space and enhanced parking. 2. The site is relatively flat – this will hopefully mean construction is straightforward and will mean the children get a flat playing field / pitch. However it is noted that some levelling of the site will be required as there is a slope towards the river. The flooding report also refers to raising the floor levels. <p>There are however some negatives. These are as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site is further away from the village. We have been told that the site entrance will remain where currently situated which is at the end of the site furthest from Crossford. 2. The site is on the A72 which is a busy main route into Lanark. There are therefore concerns about safe walking / cycling route. The Council should be doing all it can to promote walking / cycling to school so we feel it is essential that they address the safety issues. The speed limit and possible restrictions needs to be properly addressed. An enforceable 20mph limit and extension of the 30mph area needs to be put in place. 3. Parking for parents is currently a major problem. It is hoped that the new site will allow sufficient parking for parents so as to avoid parking on the A72. Given the site is further from Crossford it is important to assess the amount of parking needed for parents. The current location of the entrance to the site (just before a major bend on the road) does raise concerns about anyone needing to park on the A72 if parking is insufficient. 4. Proximity to the River Clyde. The Council will need to assess the risks and put in appropriate safety measures. 	<p>These comments are in support of the proposal.</p> <p>No suitable sites were available within or closer to the village of Crossford.</p> <p>Any appropriate road safety measures, specified by the Council's Roads and Transportation Services, will be undertaken as part of the project. Also, early engagement with the Council's Road Safety Team (specifically School Travel Coordinator) will be set up with the school to investigate all opportunities to enhance safety.</p> <p>The proposed new school site has been identified as a sufficient size to allow a large car parking area to provide both staff and parent parking.</p> <p>Appropriate risk assessments will be undertaken as part of the detailed design process. Also any current risk assessments at the school would be reviewed if the proposal is implemented.</p>

Designation (parent etc.)	Comment / issue raised	Council response / comment
<p>Parent Council – Underbank (continued)</p>	<p>Concerns about flooding have been expressed but we have had access to the report commissioned by the Council and this appears to answer the concerns.</p> <p>Catchment The only comment here is that it is disappointing that the Council did not take the opportunity to consider other changes in the catchment area. There are a large number of placing requests and there are some housing developments near the school where the children all opt for Underbank although they are within different catchment area.</p> <p>It was also always understood that the school would be a 5 classroom school with the option for expansion via a financial contribution from the Carfin Estates development should that development come to fruition. We have now been told that the school will be 5 classrooms but there will be no extension if the Carfin development happens.</p> <p>We have indicated that we are ‘undecided’ about the proposal. We do want a new school as soon as possible but there is still a general feeling that the Graham Road site was dismissed too readily.</p> <p>If the proposal is approved then as parents we would want to be fully involved in discussions about safety (both for pedestrians, cyclists and car users), the site layout including the entrance and proximity to the river. In particular we would want an early opportunity to speak to Council Road Officers.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The accommodation in the new school is determined by forward projections of pupil numbers. A 5 classroom school is sufficient to accommodate projected pupil roll incorporating all new, planned residential developments currently identified within the school catchment area.</p> <p>Parental engagement will be actively encouraged. This will be undertaken throughout the design phase of the new school between the school (including pupils and parents), Education Resources and via the Council’s Road Safety Team.</p>

Designation (parent etc.)	Comment / issue raised	Council response / comment
<p>Parent – Underbank Not in favour of proposal</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed site is not within the natural village border which, as at present, will require children to walk on a quiet unobserved pavement along a busy main road on which motorists routinely speed and accidents occur. • The site itself is narrow and confined which will restrict access routes and opportunities for playing fields or other recreational space within the school boundary, as well as crucially required car parking. • Bordering the river would seem an unadvisable choice of site due to the obvious risk of flooding. • I am concerned that the site has been offered by the landowner as a means of negotiating planning or other council approval for development at the site in the Valley International Park, which would otherwise have been considered inappropriate. If the VIP site is to be developed into further housing, the most obvious location for a new school would be there included in the VIP development plan. • I am pleased to know that the school catchment boundaries will be revised and I hope this will include other areas which naturally orientate towards Crossford but which are within Braidwood Primary catchment, like the homes along the road where I live. 	<p>No suitable sites were available within the village of Crossford. Any appropriate road safety measures, specified by the Council's Roads and Transportation Services, will be undertaken as part of the project.</p> <p>The proposed new site has sufficient space to provide the necessary accommodation and external space for a modern, 21st century school.</p> <p>Flood risk assessment has been undertaken and states '<i>..the proposed school site is not at risk of flooding up to the 200 year plus climate change event.</i>'</p> <p>The site proposed for the new school is in the ownership of more than one party. The adopted South Lanarkshire Local Plan identifies land within the Valley International Park (VIP) as a new housing site and detailed planning consent was granted in August 2011 for the erection of 60 houses on the site. The allocation of the site in the VIP for new housing has also been included in the proposed South Lanarkshire Development Plan and no changes to its extent have been made.</p> <p>This proposal only considers the catchment change of the proposed Carfin Estate development with planning permission.</p>

Designation (parent etc.)	Comment / issue raised	Council response / comment
Parent – Underbank Undecided on proposal	The only reservation I have is the new site is right next to the river and would agree with new proposals generally. Safety is paramount then flooding is another concern.	<p>All Health and Safety considerations will be addressed as part of the detailed design process.</p> <p>Flooding report has subsequently been published on Underbank Primary School website and is available on request from the Council.</p>
Resident Not in favour of proposal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am concerned about road safety - 2. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The proposed access is on a double bend with dips in the road that limit visibility. b) The walking route to the school is along the very busy A72. Pavement width in places is inadequate. b. It is more than one mile from the north end of the village to the proposed site. c. Re-instatement of the Victorian footbridge would be essential. <p>2. Catchment - Logically all Crossford addresses should be included in catchment area.</p> <p>3. Other sites - Closer to the centre of the village would be more appropriate. I think they should be given further consideration.</p>	<p>Any appropriate road safety measures, specified by the Council's Roads and Transportation Services, will be undertaken as part of the project.</p> <p>Current Council transport policy would apply for all catchment children who reside more than one mile from the new school location.</p> <p>This footbridge is not in Council ownership. However, after this was raised at the Public Meeting, Council Officers undertook a visual inspection of the bridge. It would appear that significant investment would be required.</p> <p>This proposal only considers the catchment change of the proposed Carfin Estate development with planning permission.</p> <p>No suitable sites were available within the village of Crossford.</p>

Designation (parent etc.)	Comment / issue raised	Council response / comment
Parent of child due to attend affected school within 2 years In favour of proposal (continued)	We would encourage that SLC consider maximizing classroom numbers to take account of current Scottish Government aspirations for maximum class sizes of 18 pupils, coupled with the large proportion of placing requests.	Comment noted. Currently, the Council applies primary 1 class sizes of 18 in 20 of its schools with the highest free school meal entitlement levels.
Parent – Underbank Undecided on proposal	I agree with the comments submitted by Underbank Parent Council.	Comment noted.
Parent - Underbank and Resident of Crossford Undecided on proposal Parent - Underbank and Resident of Crossford Undecided on proposal (continued)	<p>Thank you very much for the opportunity to respond to your consultation on the siting of Underbank Primary School. It is quite clear that identifying a new site in Crossford that accords with contemporary guidelines and regulations has not been an easy task.</p> <p>I would like to echo the points made in the letter submitted by the Parent Council. In particular, if building goes ahead on the proposed site, then special care should be paid to the safe exit of pupils and cars, especially if the entrance to the site is to be at the current position of entry, as most cars will be turning right. It would also be helpful if a cycle path could be provided from the village, and the metal footbridge to the Carfin Estate reopened so that children from the other side of the river can walk to school. Finally, I would urge you to ensure that this does not become a precedent that allows any future ribbon housing development between the villages of Crossford and Hazelbank.</p> <p>I look forward to your further engagement with the school and parent community on future plans and designs for the school.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

7. Pupil comments

Underbank Primary School, Lanark Road, Crossford, Carluke



Pupil views collected 20.1.15

Pupils involved and stage:

Pupil 1 P6, Pupil 2 P6, Pupil 3 P6, Pupil 4 P6, Pupil 5 P6, Pupil 6 P6, Pupil 7 P6,
Pupil 8 P5, Pupil 9 P5, Pupil 10 P4, Pupil 11 P4

3.4 The appraisal identified that the former glasshouses site is the most appropriate location for the modernised Underbank Primary. It is approximately 0.88 hectares in size which is more than sufficient to meet the needs of the school building, external play areas and car parking associated with a modernised school.
3.5 The proposed location is 250m from the current location....

Feedback from pupils on re-location proposal

- It's great. We so want a new school. I'm glad it isn't far away.
- We are a bit worried that it will flood and that it is too close to the river.
- The grounds will need big fences to make sure nobody falls in the river.
- We do really need a new school as this one has leaks in the bathrooms and is really old.
- The new school would have more space around it as the site is much bigger.
- A new school would be bigger and warmer with C-Touches in every class, disabled facilities and a better playground.
- We would love a MUGA pitch.
- We should have got it ages ago. It has taken so long to find a bit of land. I think the council will have checked that it is safe.
- The new school will mean that the canteen will be inside the school, which will be much better.
- We would like a bigger sand pit as we only have little ones.
- We would like a lovely garden as we all love helping in the garden and growing seeds. There are nice big trees on the new site.
- There would be more playground space at the new school and the football pitch would be flat!
- I'd like a school which is more colourful inside and outside.
- We wouldn't need to cross the busy road if the school moved across the road.
- What would happen to our Lollipop man? He loves our school and helps us so much. He has been Lollipop man of the year.
- The new site would mean a much bigger car park which would be much better for our parents and for getting rid of the current congestion.
- It would be good to have a classroom right beside the Clyde if that was your topic, as you could watch the river so closely.



Pupil views collected 19.1.15

Pupils involved and stage:

Pupil 12 P7, Pupil 13 P7, Pupil 14 P7, Pupil 15 P6, Pupil 16 P5, Pupil 17 P5

3.6 *It is also proposed to realign the Underbank Primary School catchment area to include an area with planning permission. This area although essentially an extension to the village of Crossford, is technically within the catchment of Braidwood Primary.*

However it is anticipated that any future residents of this housing development would elect to send their child/children to Underbank Primary School. The development is approximately 1.8 miles from Braidwood Primary School and approximately 1 mile from the proposed site of the new Underbank Primary School.

Feedback from pupils on the current catchment re-alignment proposal

- It makes sense being so close to us.
- It is unfair for pupils to travel a greater distance than is needed.
- If the footbridge was open then the distance would be even less.
- During bad weather the pupils would be able to get home far easier as they could walk.
- We think this would increase our numbers when the houses are sold. We do have space in our school.
- When moving onto High School pupils would be able to use public transport when needed. There is no public transport directly to Carluke.
- We don't think Braidwood would mind!
- Pupils think there are other areas that should be included in our catchment and gave an example of a child who has a garden in our catchment but not her house so she is a placing request.

8. Summary of issues raised by Education Scotland (formerly HMle) and Education Resources' responses

- 8.1 As part of the statutory consultation process, Education Scotland prepared a report on the consultation proposal by South Lanarkshire Council, addressing educational aspects of the proposal. This report is attached as appendix 3.
- 8.2 Education Scotland reported that the proposal for a modern, fit-for-purpose school on an appropriately sized site would provide an attractive and motivating environment for children's learning. It was also identified that the larger site offered the potential for a much safer drop-off zone for children.
- 8.3 It was recognised that although the new location had the benefit of reducing the amount of children required to cross the A72, safer walking and cycle routes was a priority for parents to be factored in to any new build proposals.
- 8.4 Education Scotland found, from its own discussions with stakeholders and the feedback provided by the Council, that the proposal has the overall support of stakeholders although safe travel arrangements remain a concern for a few parents.
- 8.5 The proposal to re-align the Carfin estate development to the new school was recorded as being sensible given the close proximity.

8.6 Response

South Lanarkshire Council welcomes the very positive report and the recognition of the sound educational benefits for children arising from the proposal.

Although the improvements offered by the new site for safer drop off / pick up and off-street parking was recognised in Education Scotland's report, it is agreed that ongoing involvement of and participation by parents and the wider community will be invaluable in helping further develop plans for safer travel arrangements. This will be undertaken throughout the design phase of the new school between the school (including pupils and parents), Education Resources and via the Council's Road Safety Team.

We will share plans of the new school, including all details of suggested road safety measures, with the wider community at a Parent / Resident roadshow that will be held in the future. Usually it is only local residents directly affected by the build of a new school that are specifically invited, but on this occasion, the Council will ensure that this event is suitably publicised locally in Crossford Village to widen community engagement and participation. All interested parties will also have the opportunity to put forward suggestions and opinions through the formal planning process.

9. Review of proposals by South Lanarkshire Council

- 9.1 The Council has reviewed the proposals having regard (in particular) to any relevant written representations received by the Council during the consultation, and representations made at the public meeting, and Education Scotland's report.
- 9.2 It should be noted that consideration was given a number of sites however the proposed site for a variety of reasons was deemed the most suitable. This was explained at the public meeting and further information provided in this report.
- 9.3 Feedback indicates that this proposal to relocate Underbank Primary School is generally acceptable, however there is recognition that several concerns were expressed on road safety. The Council will give further due consideration to road safety arrangements as part of the design process of the school and will engage with relevant stakeholders.
- 9.4 A positive report from Education Scotland corroborates the educational benefits of the proposal.
- 9.5 After review, the proposal to relocate Underbank Primary School and re-align the catchment area to incorporate the Carfin Estate development (currently in Braidwood Primary School catchment area) is recommended.

10. Resource, risk and policy implications

10.1 Resource implications

Costs associated with the new Underbank Primary School modernisation project and proposed land purchase for new site would be met from the Schools Modernisation Programme budget.

10.2 Risk implications

The Council has a duty to conduct risk assessments under the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulation 1999. Any current risk assessments at the schools would be reviewed if the proposal is implemented.

10.3 Policy implications

10.3.1 Strategy

This report supports Education Resources' priorities for raising educational achievement and attainment and achieving efficient and effective use of resources.

10.3.2 Consultation

This report describes the outcome of the statutory consultation process with all key stakeholders. Further consultation with pupils, staff, parents, Trade Unions and other stakeholders would continue if the proposals are approved.

Appendix 1 Distribution of consultation proposals document

Distribution list and how to access a copy of the proposal document

A copy of this proposal document was provided to the following consultees:

- The Parent Council of the affected schools
- The parents of the pupils at the affected schools
- Parents who have children who are expected to attend the affected schools within 2 years of the publication of this proposal document. To achieve this, a copy of the proposal was provided to Early Years Establishments in the local area.
- The pupils at the affected schools and their pupil committees and councils
- All South Lanarkshire Council employees at the affected schools
- Trade union representatives
- Community Councils within the affected locality
- Local churches
- All relevant users of the affected schools
- South Lanarkshire Community Planning Partners

A copy of this proposal document was also made available to:

- All Elected Members of South Lanarkshire Council
- South Lanarkshire Youth Council
- Education Scotland (formerly Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education, HMIE)
- The Constituency MSP of the affected schools
- List MSP for the area of the affected schools
- The MP of the affected schools
- Police Commander for Lanarkshire Division of Police Scotland
- Chief Executive, NHS Lanarkshire
- Chief Executive, Strathclyde Partnership for Transport
- Area Commander, Scottish Fire and Rescue Services
- Care Inspectorate

The steps listed below were also taken to ensure that the proposal document was widely available.

- Notice of the proposals and of publication of the proposal document was placed within the Carlisle and Lanark Gazette.
- The proposal document was also published on the South Lanarkshire Council website: www.southlanarkshire.gov.uk.
- This document could be made available in alternative forms or translated by contacting Education Resources on 01698 454102 or at: education@southlanarkshire.gov.uk
- The proposal document was also available at the following locations:
 - a. Council Offices, Education Resources, Almada Street, Hamilton, ML3 0AA. Phone 01698 454102
 - b. All libraries in South Lanarkshire
 - c. All South Lanarkshire Council Q and A Offices
 - d. The schools affected by the proposals

Appendix 2 Oral questions and responses at Public Meeting, held at Underbank Primary School on Tuesday 6 January 2015.

The following is a summary note of the above meeting that took views on the proposal to relocate Underbank Primary School and re-align the catchment area to incorporate the Carfin Estate development (currently in Braidwood Primary School catchment area).

Lynn Sherry [LS] opened the meeting at 6.04pm, introduced the panel and summarised the reason for the meeting and background to the proposal as stated in the Consultation Proposal Document issued to all interested parties and made available via the Council's website, the School office, local libraries and Q and As. A note of tonight's meeting will be taken and will be published as part of a larger consultation report.

Panel members

LS	Lynn Sherry (Chair)	Head of Education (Schools Modernisation, Finance and Personnel)
DH	David Hinshelwood	Support Services Manager
JM	Janey Mauchline	Quality Improvement Officer
VS	Vance Sinclair	Partnership Development Manager
LK	Lisa Kirkwood	Schools Modernisation Coordinator
RM	Rae McNally	Support Services Coordinator

The proposal forms two parts – the relocation of Underbank Primary School and the incorporation of a proposed new housing development into the Underbank catchment area. Many people didn't realise that this site lay within the Braidwood Primary School catchment.

The main reasons for the need to consider an alternative site for Underbank Primary School are:

- existing site size does not meet the legislative requirements of the School Premises Regulations
- existing site is insufficient to allow a school to be built to the South Lanarkshire Council specification and standard expected for a 21st century school
- outside space for play and learning
- lack of parking or safe drop off
- Education Scotland have highlighted the lack of external space

LS handed over to Vance Sinclair, Partnership Development Manager, to give more details on the assessments carried out to date to arrive at the preferred option contained in the proposal document.

VS. During previous discussions with the Parent Council, it was highlighted that the biggest concern over building the new school on the proposed site was surrounding flooding possibilities. We had a Flood Risk Assessment undertaken by an external consultant. This report has now been received and has been reviewed and agreed by our internal Flood Prevention Team. This report identified no flood risk in the proposed site and the only stipulation contained was to have the floor level of the building one metre above ground level. This is already the South Lanarkshire Council standard specification.

Initial site investigations via desktop surveys have been undertaken that have shown no impediment to building on this area. Our colleagues within roads have also given approval in principle; however more detailed and invasive surveys will take place over the next few weeks.

LS. The other aspect to this consultation is the proposal to re-align the development site at the Carfin estate from the Braidwood Primary catchment area to Underbank Primary School. Given its location, it was thought to be sensible to take this opportunity whilst consulting on the relocation of Underbank Primary School to gather views on this proposal.

LS opened to the floor for questions.

Resident comment – the area of the new housing development has always been in the Underbank catchment.

DH answer – the historic catchment boundaries inherited by the Council back in 1996 identify this area as being part of the Braidwood catchment. Perhaps due to a lack of suitable maps and other information, this has gone unknown or unnoticed before and pupils would have been accepted in the school (Underbank). Our information is more sophisticated now and this can be viewed on the Council website via the Locate It section and members of the public can view this and zoom into the area clearly.

Resident question – The new development with 60 houses may mean that there may not be the capacity within Underbank PS as this will lead to a fair number of additional pupils. Will this mean that another classroom will be built? There is a commitment from the developer to add another classroom. Under an agreement I believe there was £100k for this?

DH answer – In terms of the pupil numbers our predictions from the formulae we use are that 8 primary pupils could potentially be generated from this new housing.

VS answer – the £100k is not specified for an additional classroom, but for additional accommodation within the school as required by the Education Resources.

Parent and Resident comment – According to the documents on the planning website, the agreement* requires to be re-negotiated.

[* Section 75 – signed agreement that is a condition for the planning being granted that includes a developer contribution commitment.]

VS answer – We will discuss this with our colleagues in the planning department.

Parent comment - The bridge is a disgrace. There would need to be a new access to the new school from this estate for all those children.

Resident comment – I wrote to Councillor Logan regarding the safety of this bridge. The A72 is phenomenally busy and I am concerned about safety. The bridge should be brought into public ownership so it could be upgraded – the local community would be willing to get involved in this. It could then be an access to the Clyde walkway and a safe route for children. I believe it is under administration at the moment.

DH answer – Thank you for this feedback. One of the reasons for tonight is to take on board the comments of the community. Any routes to school however that are deemed unsafe we would then apply the normal Council school transport policy and provide this to children who qualify for transport.

Parent Comment – Try walking with children along that road. This is our highest priority.

Parent question - Safe walking routes are very important. Could traffic calming be put in place? Cars parking on the road have an impact. Hopefully this will be improved at the new school.

VS answer – We work with the Roads department very closely on projects to identify all necessary measures and possible improvements. Roads are fully supportive of us providing more off road parking and drop off. The proposed site offers suitable space for this. As the A72 is a trunk road, it is highly unlikely that traffic calming would be introduced, but there could be other possible measures such as barrier fencing for instance.

Same Parent comment – Access could be an issue going in and back out on to such a busy road.

Parent comment – there have been several fatalities on that stretch of the road.

Parent and Resident comment – I used to park on the other side of the footbridge and walk across but can't do that now. The parking has been blocked off. I don't know why – this would help.

Various residents' comments – this area was blocked off because of anti social behaviour, illegal dumping and fire raising in this area.

Parent comment – For selfish reasons, I would suggest that the catchment area boundary be reviewed on all the edges to include houses in walking distance to the school.

LS answer – We would urge anyone with specific suggestions to respond through the response form but we have noted this.

Resident question – What will happen to the old school? My grandfather gifted the land to the Council.

VS answer – The normal process with surplus land is that the Council's Estates department check internally with other Council Resources to see if there are any other council requirements for the vacant building / ground. If there is no requirement, it could be marketed and sold for other purposes. Obviously in this case, given your comment, checks on the legal status of the land would be necessary. Our Estates and Legal departments will do this and we would also expect that you will be making contact if you have relevant documentation.

Parent and Resident question – You looked at other sites. Can you tell us where they are and why they were unsuitable?

VS answer – Our first priority was to investigate available Council owned sites. 1. Park at Crossford behind the Hall. As this would take away the whole park and the local community would lose a public amenity, this was deemed unsuitable. 2. Graham Road – we had a worked up proposal for this site. However, our colleagues in Roads and Transportation had issues concerning the single access/one-way across the bridge. There was a concern that this would lead to a back up of traffic onto the A72. After Council owned sites were exhausted, we investigated other possible land available in the catchment area. As there were personal discussions with private land owners, I cannot go into too much detail for confidentiality reasons. Parent and Resident comment – I am surprised that a development of 60 houses with potentially 120 cars was agreed to and Roads had no issues with it.

VS answer – 9am and 3pm are the concentrated traffic congestion periods around schools whereas in housing developments, residents move around at various times of the day, not at concentrated periods.

Resident comment – If the school was in the village, more people would walk. You are moving it further away. It makes more sense for the school to be in the village.

Resident comment – It is too dangerous for my daughter to walk to school. It makes perfect sense to have the school in the village. There aren't even any traffic lights.

Resident question – Given the extra traffic that will come from the new development in the Carfin Estate, when will a new access road or bridge be put in place?

VS answer – There are no plans within the scope of the new build Underbank Primary School for this and no funding available for such access.

Same Resident follow up question – What if it was funded by the developer?

VS answer – The developer has planning consent already and is under no obligation to provide such access. I am not an engineer but I would suggest a bridge would cost millions of pounds and wouldn't be financially viable for them.

LS question – In other words, it would make it prohibitive for the development to go ahead?

VS answer – Yes.

Resident and Parent question – I did not find it clear in the proposal document what the argument on transport reasons for the realignment of the new development site to Underbank Primary School. If any children from here were to go to Braidwood, traffic would not be an issue. This didn't make sense. What is the advantage of them being in Underbank?

Resident and Parent comment – Traffic management of the bridge needs to be looked at.

DH answer – The catchment area was looked at and it seemed sensible that this area, given its proximity to the school, was realigned to Underbank Primary School. Transport was not the main reason although a consideration – it was school transport that was referred to in the proposal document. Parents who live there in the future, we anticipated, could and would choose to make placing requests– there is parental choice. The 8 children predicted to be generated from the new development would more than likely attend Underbank Primary School anyway.

Resident and Parent comment – Your formula is a joke.

Resident comment – The new houses at the far end of the village have more than 8 children and there's less than 60 houses.

VS answer – We have had similar issues in other areas – some areas have higher numbers of children per household than others. But as an average, this formula is the most accurate method of calculating.

Resident comment – you should analyse how many houses are in the village of Crossford and how many children live here.

Parent comment - 5 classes is preposterous.

LS answer – This is a good time to review information we have on pupil numbers.

DH answer – We have analysed the average intake over the last 3 years including placing requests. Birth rates and nursery information is used to make predictions. We also consider the denominational and non-denominational split. For the secondary school sector it is easier as we can consider seven years of data. For the primary sector we can only reasonably forecast three years. The added factor is that by the time we get census data it is already one year out of date. Parents have different reasons for sending pupils to schools that is not their catchment school. For example last year there were 6 children in Primary 1: 3 catchment and 3 placing requests.

Resident and Parent comment – perhaps parents are thinking ‘we don’t know when new school will be built – we will send our children elsewhere.’

DH answer - It is predicted that by 2017, the roll is likely to be 104, which would equate to 5 classes given that the maximum number of pupils in a composite class are 25.

Parent question – what will happen the year after (2018)?

Parent question – what will happen in 20 years?

DH answer – By 2018, the roll is predicted to fall to 97, and this would mean we would be looking at 4 classes in the school. SLC have made a decision to have capacity for 5 classes, even when the following year the roll is projected to be 92. We can only go on the most up-to-date information we have and make the best decision for Underbank PS.

LS answer – We are moving forward with a 5 classroom school.

Resident comment – When my kids were here, there were 125 pupils and 5 classrooms and they had to use converted toilets for extra space.

LS answer – The school’s roll has fallen over the years.

DH answer – Our new schools have more space such as break out areas and more flexible space.

JM answer – Development in Curriculum for Excellence has seen the process of learning and teaching change considerably and this has impacted on the use of space for learning and teaching – ICT, outdoor learning. Using the outside to learn about real life situations. Cross age working – P7s reading to P1s, ECO groups, Junior Road Safety Officer groups and the like means there is a need for other, break out areas. The new schools have fantastic facilities and areas for learning to take place. It has been transformational.

Resident and parent question – Will we have these facilities in a school on the new site?

JM answer – Yes. New schools benefit from improved technology such as interactive whiteboards and have fantastic grounds.

Resident and parent comment – You do not need to sell us a new school. It is the size and location that is important. It is bonkers to build a school beside a busy road and a fast flowing river.

Resident question – What safety measures will be in place to make sure children are safe?

VS answer – There could be barriers. The MUGA (multi use games area) will be built away from the river.

Resident question – What, near the road?

VS answer – Yes nearer the road to allow public access out of school hours but the MUGA would have a 5 metre fence around it. We could also consider netting over the pitch if this was required to stop balls escaping. All Health and Safety considerations will be addressed as part of the detailed design process.

Resident comment - We want an appropriately sized and suitable school.

VS answer – Suitability of the school will be determined by the site and this is why we are here. We are not however consulting on the size of the new school. A 0.8 hectare site is more than sufficient to cope with a larger school if required.

Resident comment – what size is the current site of the school?

VS answer – 0.32 hectares.

Resident comment – Graham Road should still be considered.

Resident and parent comment – Someone from the Roads department should be here to back up their decision to say why that site was unsuitable.

Resident comment – you didn't finish telling us about the other sites that were considered.

VS answer – Apologies. There were discussions with private landowners in the area. I cannot give too much detail as it is personal and confidential but discussions took place and considerations over practicality of sites and involved liaison with planning and roads departments. The proposed site is the one that had the most benefits.

Resident comment – Tell us the benefits of the new site because we haven't heard any.

VS answer – the proposed site is flat and the access to it is agreed in principle with the Roads department. The alternative site was tied in with a potential housing development being built at the same time and there were issues with drainage on the site.

Resident question – would an outdoor learning area not be boggy all the time?

VS answer – We do provide substantial drainage in outdoor areas. However, we do have Scottish weather! Each school has different ideas, requirements and aspirations for their outdoor spaces.

Same resident comment – there have been areas around that bridge and car park that have been underwater / waterlogged.

VS answer – We can make the flood report available via the school website and this will show the areas that are affected.

Parent and Resident question – what was the criteria? 1 in 100 year flood risk?

VS answer – 1 in 200 year +.

Parent question – How much consideration has been given to flattening this site or building into the land? Or the site behind the village hall at McFarlane's that is being demolished, similar to what was carried out at Kirkfieldbank?

VS answer – The current school site does not meet legislative requirements under the Schools Premises Act. We would require dispensation from the Scottish Government to proceed with a rebuild on this site. However, experience has shown that the Scottish Government would have to be satisfied that all available options had been exhausted. As for your second suggestion, this would remove a village amenity (play park) and unlikely that this would be acceptable from a planning perspective.

Resident question – how does this site fail the legislation?

VS answer – Mainly on the site size. It is 0.32 hectares and the minimum, legislative requirement is 0.4 hectares. We also need substantial, extra parking. Access is not great and the slope of the site prohibits delivering a decent design.

Resident comment – this (current school site) is the straightest bit of the A72. Further down the road it is more winding and more dangerous.

VS answer – we could ask the Roads department to consider TRO (Traffic Regulation Orders such as double yellow lines).

Resident comment – more will drive to the new location which will make things worse.

Resident comment – you are taking it to a more dangerous site and away from the village

Resident question – how much disruption would there be to the A72 by building on the new site?

VS answer – We would work very closely with Roads and the contractor to phase work at the best time to minimise disruption.

JM answer – Recently Carstairs Junction was rebuilt in tandem to the old building. This was in an area that was very busy with traffic and right next to houses but the school was built with minimum disruption, the old building demolished and the new MUGA pitch built and the whole project went very well.

Parent question – There is definitely a parking issue at this school, regardless of the eventual location. I don't think Crossford is unique. Cars could be done away with if there was a school bus. I can't say the new site is any worse than anywhere else – I am not against the new site. Get rid of cars – it would be safer with buses.

DH answer – we are at the mercy of parental behaviour. The Council do have school travel coordinators that work within Road Safety who work with schools to develop a school travel plan. Car sharing is encouraged. In some schools, parents have arranged their own bus travel as a group but this relies on parental participation – it is not easy. We would always try to assist schools in any way possible.

Same parent comment – I agree that walking along the A72 is dangerous. There must be a way forward in trying to improve the walking route to get to school. The safety issue is the cars that are our (parents') cars – we are arguing with ourselves.

DH answer – we will take these points on board. The views expressed are welcomed and have been noted.

Parent comment - That new development would need a different access point. Something has to be done.

Resident question – My son went to another Primary School that is situated on a busy road that is deemed unsafe because of the volume of lorries that go down it. Would the stretch of A72 outside Underbank Primary School be deemed unsafe given the increase in lorries during the construction of the new school?

VS answer – appropriate arrangements would be put in place to restrict access to construction traffic between certain times (beginning and end of school day).

Parent comment – I have worked on several school projects where this type of restriction was in place and it has worked well.

Parent and Resident question – Has the search for a suitable site been exhausted? Will funding be pulled if the new site is not acceptable? Are we stuck with the glasshouse site?

VS answer – We would need to review again and perhaps revisit some of the other options previously discounted.

Same Parent and Resident question – I know of another local authority where funding was in place to build a new school but as the parents and community could not decide on a suitable location, the funding was pulled and the school placed at the end of the queue for rebuild. Could this happen here?

LS answer – this is not the way it would be in this case. Funding has been identified and allocated to the modernisation project for Underbank Primary School.

Resident question – Do you have agreement in place to purchase the required land for the proposed new location?

VS answer – Yes, in principle.

LS thanked everyone for attending and urged interested parties to put their views, and any other questions or thoughts after tonight's meeting in writing via the consultation response form made available. Meeting closed 7.17pm.

Summary of those attending

38	Total
25	Parents
3	Parent and Resident
6	Resident
3	Members of school staff
1	Representative of Education Scotland

The contents of this note of the public meeting are not direct quotations but are as close a representation of what was said as the scribes were able to achieve while taking hand written notes during the meeting. These should be regarded as paraphrased comments and they have been included to indicate the feelings and expressions of contributors as closely as possible.

Appendix 3 Report by Education Scotland

Report by Education Scotland addressing educational aspects of the proposal by South Lanarkshire Council to relocate Underbank Primary School from its current site to the former glasshouse site on Lanark Road and to re-align its catchment area to incorporate the Carfin estate development.

1. Introduction

1.1 This report from Education Scotland has been prepared by HM Inspectors in accordance with the terms of the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010* and the amendments contained in the *Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014*. The purpose of the report is to provide an independent and impartial consideration of South Lanarkshire Council's proposal to relocate Underbank Primary School from its current site to the former glasshouse site on Lanark Road and to re-align its catchment area to incorporate the Carfin Estate development. Section 2 of the report sets out brief details of the consultation process. Section 3 of the report sets out HM Inspectors' consideration of the educational aspects of the proposal, including significant views expressed by consultees. Section 4 summarises HM Inspectors' overall view of the proposal. Upon receipt of this report, the Act requires the council to consider it and then prepare its final consultation report. The council's final consultation report should include a copy of this report and must contain an explanation of how, in finalising the proposal, it has reviewed the initial proposal, including a summary of points raised during the consultation process and the council's response to them. The council has to publish its final consultation report three weeks before it takes its final decision.

HM Inspectors considered:

- the likely effects of the proposal for children and young people of the school; any other users; children likely to become pupils within two years of the date of publication of the proposal paper; and other children and young people in the council area;
- any other likely effects of the proposal;
- how the council intends to minimise or avoid any adverse effects that may arise from the proposal; and
- the educational benefits the council believes will result from implementation of the proposal, and the council's reasons for coming to these beliefs.

1.2 In preparing this report, HM Inspectors undertook the following activities:

- attendance at the public meeting held on 6 January 2015 in connection with the council's proposals;
- consideration of all relevant documentation provided by the council in relation to the proposal, specifically the educational benefits statement and related consultation documents, written and oral submissions from parents and others;
- visits to both the current and proposed site of Underbank Primary School, including discussion with relevant consultees; and
- walking of the routes to and from the proposed site from the village of Crossford.

2. Consultation Process

- 2.1 South Lanarkshire Council undertook the consultation on its proposal with reference to the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010* and the amendments in the *Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014*.
- 2.2 The consultation period lasted from Monday 1 December 2014 until Friday 23 January 2015. A public meeting to explain and further discuss the proposal with stakeholders was held in Underbank Primary School on Tuesday 6 January 2015. Pupil views were gathered during school visits on the 19 and 20 January 2015. Two hundred and thirteen consultation proposal documents were issued. A total of eight responses were received, including a response from the Parent Council. Two responses were in favour of the proposal. Two responses were not in favour of the proposal and four responses were undecided.

3. Educational Aspects of Proposal

- 3.1 The council's proposal identifies a number of educational benefits for children, should it go ahead. These, in the main, relate to the provision of a new purpose-built modern school. The new building will provide accommodation which is more modern and flexible, thus better supporting the facilitation of high-quality learning experiences through Curriculum for Excellence. A purpose-built school will provide an attractive and motivating environment for learning and children will benefit from more modern facilities, including better and more equitable access to digital technology and given the much larger site, safer and greater space for outdoor learning and play. The new build school also has the potential to be more energy efficient ensuring better use of existing resources and lower running costs. Links with existing sports and after school clubs and the community have the potential to be further strengthened and encouraged through the provision of improved indoor and outdoor activity spaces. Significantly, a new build school will also help to address the numerous current shortcomings with the existing accommodation such as very poor access and parking arrangements; a lack of internal flexible space; limited storage; poor heating and ventilation; unreliable electrics; leaking roofs and restricted dining space. It will further make the school more accessible for those with limited mobility and improve reception arrangements. The much larger proposed site has the potential to provide a much safer drop-off zone for children arriving by car and bus and safer and more clearly defined parking.
- 3.2 All parents, staff and children, who met with HM Inspectors, were in favour of the proposal. They appreciated the planned investment and the opportunity to have a new school in their community which will provide enhanced facilities and opportunities for all children. They were pleased about the additional space the identified site would provide particularly for outdoor learning, play and for safer dropping off, pick-up and off street parking. A few parents in response to the consultation thought that there would be a need for safer walking and cycle routes and a much better and safer access and exit point to the proposed site. It was recognised that helpfully, fewer children would have to cross the very busy A72. A few parents sought further clarity about potential flooding of the site; and the situation regarding the footbridge that crosses the Clyde, which if upgraded had the potential to provide a much safer route for children to and from the proposed site. Parents were keen to ensure that the council and architects maximised the rich potential of the very attractive location and aspect of the proposed site for the new school in both the design and build phases of the project. All stakeholders considered the proposal to re-align the Carfin estate development to the new school was eminently sensible given its close proximity. In its final consultation report the council needs to address concerns about traffic management and safe routes to school.
- 3.3 During the consultation period a consultee notified the council of an inaccuracy in the proposal to do with the location of the proposed site of the new school on the consultation pack maps. The council has already taken steps to address the inaccuracy identified.

4. Summary

The proposal to build a new Underbank Primary School and to re-align the school's catchment area to incorporate the Carfin estate development and to provide education in a new purpose-built facility provides a number of significant educational benefits for all children, staff and the community they serve. The proposal has the overall support of stakeholders, including all staff and children and the majority of parents. A few parents raised concerns about the proposal. In taking forward the proposal the council needs to ensure it addresses the reasonable concerns raised in relation to safe travel arrangements for children walking or cycling to and from the new school and improved and safer access to the proposed site. In doing so, the council should continue to consult and communicate effectively with staff, children, parents and the wider community in engaging them fully in the future planning and design stages of the proposal to ensure the potential of the identified site is fully capitalised.

**HM Inspectors
Education Scotland
February 2015**