Outcome of the statutory consultation on the proposal to realign catchment areas of both Kirktonholme and Hunter Primary Schools (and Duncanrig Secondary and Calderglen High Schools by association)

May 2016

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: 0303 123 1015 Email: equalities@southlanarkshire.gov.uk.
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 realign the catchment areas of both Kirktonholme and Hunter Primary Schools (and Duncanrig Secondary and Calderglen High Schools by association) with effect from August 2016. 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 8 June 2016.

2.2 It is recommended that the Executive Committee:

- note the contents of the report;
- agree the proposal to realign the catchment areas of both Kirktonholme and Hunter Primary Schools (and Duncanrig Secondary and Calderglen High Schools by association).

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 2 December 2015 to consult on the proposal below:

- realign the catchment areas of both Kirktonholme and Hunter Primary Schools (and Duncanrig Secondary and Calderglen High Schools by association).

3.2 The statutory consultation, in terms of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 was carried out over the period 25 January to 11 March 2016 which included a public meeting held on 16 February 2016 in Kirktonholme Primary School.

3.3 A consultation notice was placed in the East Kilbride News during week commencing 18 January 2016. 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 Notification of the proposal was issued on 22 January 2016 to the consultees listed in Appendix 1. The full consultation proposal document was published on the Council website and a copy made available from all libraries, Q and As and both affected schools.

3.5 A public meeting was held on 16 February 2016 in Kirktonholme 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 22 January 2016 in their role as a statutory consultee. In addition, on 29 March 2016, 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 6 May 2016. 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

Notification of this consultation was sent directly to approximately 600 stakeholders. The total number of responses that were received was 1 (one). This response was from a parent of a child due to attend Primary School who is in favour of the proposal.

The comment received was as follows:

Having recently moved to the Stewartfield area of East Kilbride with my husband and son, I was horrified to discover that despite there being a primary school less than a mile away (Kirktonholme Primary), the school catchment area for this address expects my son to travel 3 and a half miles to Hunter Primary and then on to Calderglen High.

At my address public transport is sparse and I use our only car to leave the house at 7:15am to go to work. Even if a school bus was available, I would not feel comfortable putting a 5 year old on a bus, leaving them to travel to school alone. From the current catchment area map above, it appears that my address is virtually on the boundary line and children who live 20 yards from my house are fortunate enough to attend Kirktonholme Primary. Under the current catchment guidelines my husband will need to travel on 2 buses to take my son to Hunter Primary before getting on a further bus to get to work which is not feasible.

I hope the committee will take this into consideration during the review process and vote in favour of the proposal.

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.
5. **Pupil comments**

Both affected primary school’s Pupil Councils were asked for a representative view on the proposal. Comments are below.

---

**Proposal**

South Lanarkshire Council is seeking views on the following proposal:

- To realign the catchment areas for Hunter Primary and Kirktonholme Primary Schools

Head Teacher consultation with pupil group of 12 pupils from P5-P7

Feedback from the Pupils:

**Positives**

- I think it’s a good idea. We can make new friends.
- We have one of the biggest playgrounds and trim trail and would be good to share it with others. We also have the biggest pitch.
- We can make them welcome.
- It would save them travelling to their school on the bus. Our school would be easier for them to get to.
- They would be able to walk to our school or cycle or use their scooter and it would be healthier for them.
- It would help them get to school on time. They could even get to watch TV in the morning.
- They would get to learn new things.
- They would get to experience new and different things.
- They could share their experiences with us.
- The children would add to the betterness of our school.

**Negatives**

- I am worried they might lose their friends if they come to our school.
- Might mean our car park is busier.
- I am worried that the children don’t want to come.
- We don’t have a lot of space for more people at our assembly.
- There would be more noise.
- We would need more equipment and computers.
- We need to order more food for lunch.
- Our classrooms would be busier.
- It might cost them money to change their uniform.

The Pupil Consultation group agreed unanimously that the proposal is a good idea and they would welcome new pupils.
Proposal
South Lanarkshire Council is seeking views on the following proposal, namely:
- To realign the catchment areas for Hunter and Kirktonholme Primary Schools

Pupil Council Minutes

The Teacher welcomed the pupil council class representatives.

The Teacher asked all the pupils if they knew anything about how Parents/Carers know and decide which school their child/ren should attend. The pupils discussed where their houses were placed and what the term ‘catchment’ meant.

The Teacher then shared the consultation proposal document issued by SLC and provided a summary. The implications that it may have for Hunter were discussed.

Feedback from pupils on the catchment re-alignment proposal:

- “Hunter would lose pupils” (P7)
- “It does make sense but the children in Stewartfield should still get to go to Hunter” (P6)
- “Yes, it does make sense but 2022 seems too far away” (P7)
- “I think the 6 years is well thought out. All the children from Stewartfield would go to Kirktonholme and wouldn’t know any different. However, Hunter would lose pupils” (P7)
- “It does make sense but Hunter would lose pupils and we could lose friends” (P7)
- “I think the children (from Stewartfield) should go to Kirktonholme, then they can walk to school” (P4)
6. Summary of issues raised by Education Scotland (formerly HMie) and Education Resources’ responses

6.1 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.

6.2 Education Scotland recognised that the proposal not only will assist the Council to achieve best value by managing the school estate efficiently and effectively but will provide educational benefits for children residing in the area of Stewartfield affected by the proposal.

6.3 Education Scotland found, from its own discussions with stakeholders, that the proposal was received favourably, was thought to be a common sense solution to a historic anomaly, and recognised that the arrangements for the transitional period (siblings’ right to continue to attend Hunter Primary School and Calderglen High School) were appropriate and welcomed.

6.4 In summary, Education Scotland acknowledged that there was a sound rationale for the proposal, education benefits for children have been appropriately considered and demonstrated, and it will allow the Council to make the most efficient and effective use of its educational accommodation.

6.5 Response

South Lanarkshire Council welcomes the very positive report.

7. Review of proposals by South Lanarkshire Council

7.1 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.

7.2 A positive report from Education Scotland corroborates the educational benefits of the proposal and feedback received by the communities of affected schools was favourable.

7.3 After review, the proposal to realign the catchment areas of both Kirktonholme and Hunter Primary Schools (and Duncanrig Secondary and Calderglen High Schools by association) with effect from August 2016 is recommended.
8. Resource, risk and policy implications

8.1 Resource implications

8.1.1 Property costs
As this proposal aims to maximise the use of existing accommodation it represents best value and demonstrates the effective and efficient use of Council resources.

8.1.2 Staffing costs
In terms of employee resources, this will continue to be provided in each school by means of existing process e.g. annual class configuration protocols and agreed management allocations.

8.2 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 school would be reviewed if the proposal is implemented.

8.3 Policy implications

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

8.3.2 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 proposal is approved.
Appendix 1 Distribution of consultation proposals document

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

Notification of the proposal 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.
- The pupils at the affected schools and the 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 East Kilbride News.
- The proposal document was also published on the South Lanarkshire Council website: www.southlanarkshire.gov.uk.
- If you need this information in another language or format, please contact us to discuss how we can best meet your needs. Phone: 0303 123 1015 Email: equalities@southlanarkshire.gov.uk.
- The proposal document was also available at the following locations:
  a. Council Offices, Education Resources, Almada Street, Hamilton, ML3 0AA; Phone 0303 123 1023.
  b. All libraries in South Lanarkshire
  c. All South Lanarkshire Council Q and A Offices
  d. The schools affected by the proposal
Appendix 2  Oral questions and responses at public meeting

Note of Public Meeting held on 16 February 2016 at Kirktonholme Primary School at 6pm

Panel Members

VS  Vance Sinclair (Chair)  Partnership Development Manager
DH  David Hinshelwood  Support Services Manager
LK  Lisa Kirkwood   Project Coordinator

VS opened the meeting at 6.10pm.  4 parents, a representative from Education Scotland and 1 MSP were in attendance

VS outlined the proposal as per the information circulated to stakeholders with regards to the detached part of Hunter Primary School's catchment area that sits within the Stewartfield area of East Kilbride and the proposal to realign this to Kirktonholme Primary School.  He referred to the statutory nature of this consultation and the prescribed elements of the actions involved.  He passed to LK to summarise the key stages of the process including indicative timescales.

LK confirmed the consultation period commenced on Monday 25th January 2016 and will close on Friday 11th March 2016.  This consultation was also advertised in the East Kilbride News complete with the date and venue of this public meeting.  Part of the statutory process included the holding of this public meeting which gives stakeholders the opportunity to hear more about the proposal, ask any questions and make their views known.  Interested parties were urged to submit formal responses to the Council using the consultation response form.  A note of tonight’s meeting would also be taken.

At the end of the consultation period, all feedback received, which will include any written responses, the note of tonight’s meeting and any pupil views, will be collated and sent to Education Scotland, formerly Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Education.  Education Scotland will then independently verify the views of stakeholders by carrying out its own dialogue with affected schools, pupils, parents and the wider school community.  Education Scotland will then make a formal response to the Council with its findings.

Once the report from Education Scotland is received by the Council, a final Consultation Report will be produced.  This report will be published for at least three weeks before being considered by the Council’s Executive Committee.  It was anticipated that this proposal would be considered by the Executive Committee in June 2016.

If those attending this meeting left a contact email address, a copy of this report would be emailed directly when published (anticipated May 2016).

VS opened to the floor for questions.

Parent 1, parent of nursery pupil, advised he had not received the document until today.

LK responded that it had only been brought to her attention the day before that the impending consultation had not been brought to the attention of those parents registering their child for primary 1 during registration week in January and apologised on behalf of the school.  The information had been circulated via all affected schools and local authority nurseries.  Parent 1 asked about the summary document which listed some but not all addresses and did not include his address although he knew it was in the affected area.

LK replied that it was a not a definitive list of all addresses, the document referred to ‘streets in this area include...’ and gave an abbreviated list.  The list was not exhaustive but included a map of the affected area and it was felt that those residing in the area would know all the streets and smaller roads involved.
Parent 1 was looking for assurances that he would not need to submit a placing request for Calderglen.

LK confirmed that current pupils at Hunter Primary School could attend Calderglen without the need for a placing request.

Parent 1 advised he has a child at Hunter. He said the mention of dates in the document, i.e. 2020, had been confusing. LK confirmed that the various dates in the document referred to the end dates where by siblings of pupils already attending Hunter or Calderglen would have the option to attend the same school as their sibling.

DH replied that any child currently attending Hunter, or registered for P1 in August 2016, would have the right to attend Calderglen High School. DH also confirmed that if there was no older sibling currently attending Hunter Primary School, pupils in the rezoned area would not have the right to attend Hunter in August 2016.

LK conceded that this could have been clearer in the consultation information and agreed to address this by making this more explicit in the consultation report. LK also asked if the parent’s older child had not received notification of the consultation via pupil post?

Parent 2 commented that it may still be in school bag.

DH confirmed that in the event of the proposal being approved, the council would send a letter to each family affected by the proposal to let them know what their options were based on current address.

Parent 3 commented that she had been unsure about the options for her child but that DH’s response had clarified the position and allayed her fears.

Parent 1 asked for assurances about the school bus. Would his children continue to get free school transport to Hunter Primary School and Calderglen High School?

DH confirmed that the current council policy for primary age children was the provision of free transport for those pupils living 1 mile or more from their catchment primary school by the shortest safe walking route. Under these criteria, Parent 1’s children would continue to receive school transport.

Parent 4, a parent of pupils currently attending Blacklaw, said he had moved to the Stewartfield area affected by the proposal and had checked the address was in the Calderglen catchment. He explained he had lived at an address in St Leonards before moving to Stewartfield.

DH clarified that the children were attending Blacklaw on what is referred to as ‘a request to remain’ and would have the option to attend Calderglen High School.

Parent 1 asked about documentation which predicted future trends that might put pressure on spaces at Hunter Primary School. Why weren’t those projections taken into account when building the new school?

VS replied that the process of forecasting and predicting future pupil numbers was not an exact science.
Parent 1 asked why a school had not been built in Stewartfield? He commented that Hunter and Maxwellton Primary Schools were almost next door to each other yet there was no school serving the Stewartfield area.

VS replied that decisions had been made historically about school sites. He also reflected that back when Stewartfield was being built, there would have been sufficient capacity across other neighbouring schools so would have been the best value option to align to schools where there was capacity at the time.

Parent 1 commented that the new schools seemed to be bursting at the seams and asked why extra capacity hadn’t been built in.

VS referred to the projections of numbers available at the time and the length of time a new school is in planning. Things can change. He commented that schools weren’t built with substantial additional capacity as financially this would have not have been best value to provide – given the size of the primary school estate this could have extended into several millions of pounds worth of extra accommodation that may or may not have been required. He confirmed, however, that Hunter had been built with one additional class. He described how trend analysis and predictions of capacity can be challenging. He said that there were often ‘spikes’ in the numbers of children coming from new housing which then often tailed off.

DH also added that due to parental choice, placing requests can impact on school capacity. This is not something that can be easily predicted.

LK asked the parents to leave details of their email addresses to allow a copy of the Consultation Report to be emailed directly to them. This report will include a note of tonight’s meeting.

As there were no further questions, VS thanked those who had attended and closed the meeting at 6.35pm.

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.
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 realign catchment areas of both Kirktonholme and Hunter Primary Schools (and Duncanrig Secondary and Calderglen High School by association). 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. Where a council is proposing to close a school, it needs to follow all legislative obligations set out in the 2010 Act, including notifying Ministers within six working days of making its final decision and explaining to consultees the opportunity they have to make representations to Ministers.

1.2 HM Inspectors considered:

- the likely effects of the proposal for children and young people of the schools; 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.

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

- attendance at the public meeting held on 16 February 2016 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; and

- visits to the site of Kirktonholme and Hunter Primary Schools; Duncanrig Secondary; and Calderglen High School, including discussion with relevant consultees.
2. **Consultation Process**

2.1 South Lanarkshire Council undertook the consultation on its proposal(s) 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 ran from 25 January 2016 until 11 March 2016. The council posted the proposal document on its website and lodged copies in the schools concerned and in council offices. In addition, it announced the consultation in the local press. The council held a public meeting in Kirktonholme Primary School on 16 February 2016 and four stakeholders attended. The council received one written response to the proposal. Appropriate arrangements were put in place to ensure that the views of children and young people affected by the proposal were heard and taken into account.

3. **Educational Aspects of Proposal**

3.1 South Lanarkshire Council has set out a sound rationale for its proposal to realign catchment areas of both Kirktonholme and Hunter Primary Schools (and Duncannrig Secondary and Calderglen High School by association). The current catchment area map shows clearly that Hunter Primary School has part of its catchment area isolated from the rest. This isolated area is adjacent to Kirktonholme Primary School and all streets affected are within the Stewartfield area. This is a historical anomaly resulting from previous capacity pressures within Kirktonholme Primary School during the development of housing within the Stewartfield area. Currently there are 16 pupils from this area attending Hunter Primary School and 34 attending Calderglen High School.

3.2 There is now sufficient capacity within Kirktonholme Primary School to accommodate those pupils from Stewartfield currently zoned for Hunter Primary School. In addition there are potential pressures on the accommodation available at Hunter Primary School, due to proposed housing development near to the school. Commendably the council is planning ahead by proposing that the area in Stewartfield currently zoned for Hunter Primary School be re-aligned to Kirktonholme Primary School. By association, this will impact on the catchment areas for Calderglen High School and Duncannrig Secondary School.

3.3 The council cites a number of benefits that it believes will result, should the proposal go ahead. These include a reduction in travelling time between home and school, increased opportunities for socialising out of school and strengthening of the local community as a consequence of children from the affected area having the right to attend a more local school. HM Inspectors are of the view that the council’s assertions are reasonable and that the proposal will assist it to achieve best value by managing its school estate efficiently and effectively.

3.4 Should the council decide to go ahead with the proposal; the arrangements will be implemented in August 2016. The council has made appropriate provision for families with children from the affected area with siblings already attending Hunter Primary School to have the option to enrol there without a placing request. This option is available until August 2022. Similarly, siblings of pupils from the affected area who currently attend Calderglen High School will have the option of attending Calderglen High School without a placing request. This option is available until August 2020.

3.5 A small number of parents, children and staff of the school communities met with HM Inspectors. Overall, they were in favour of the proposal, regarding it as a common sense way to address a historical anomaly with the catchment areas for the two primary schools. They were positive about the provision made by the council for siblings of children from the affected area who already attend Hunter Primary School and Calderglen High School.
4. **Summary**

The proposal has the potential to deliver educational benefits for children from the affected area of Stewartfield. It will eliminate uncertainty in response to projected occupancy rates for local school buildings resulting from local housing development. It will also assist the council to realise best value through efficient and effective management of its school estate. The council has proactively made appropriate provision for children with siblings already attending Hunter Primary or Calderglen High School to be educated together without the need for placing requests.

**HM Inspectors**  
*Education Scotland*  
*Aplril 2016*