

ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

COMMITTEE	Education, Culture and Sport
DATE	16 June 2014
DIRECTOR	Gayle Gorman
TITLE OF REPORT	Statutory Consultation – Consultation Reports for: (i) The proposal to rezone ground at the former BP Headquarters from Stoneywood School to Dyce School and consequently from Bucksburn Academy to Dyce Academy from August 2014. (ii) The proposal to rezone Grandholm Village from Braehead School to Danestone School and consequently from Bridge of Don Academy to Oldmachar Academy from August 2014.
REPORT NUMBER:	ECS\14\36
CHECKLIST:	Yes

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To report to Committee on the outcome of the statutory consultation on the proposals to:

- (i) Rezone ground at the former BP Headquarters from Stoneywood School to Dyce School and consequently from Bucksburn Academy to Dyce Academy from August 2014; and
- (ii) Rezone Grandholm Village from Braehead School to Danestone School and consequently from Bridge of Don Academy to Oldmachar Academy from August 2014.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- (i) To implement proposals (i) and (ii) above and to instruct officers to make the necessary arrangements to ensure successful implementation in time for the start of the academic session 2014/15 in August 2014.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications associated with the recommendation above.

4. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Legal – The public consultations have complied with the requirements of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010. As these proposals refer to rezoning, any decision to implement them by this Committee cannot be called in by Scottish Ministers.

Resources – Officer time and expenditure associated with these consultation exercises has been met from existing service budgets.

Personnel – Implementation of the recommendations will not result in any significant personnel implications.

Property – There are no property implications arising from the implementation of these proposals.

Equipment – There are no equipment implications or risks associated with this report.

Sustainability and environmental – Implementation of these proposals will have minimal impact upon sustainability and environmental issues related to the school estate.

Health and safety – There are no implications or risks related to this report other than the requirement to carry out a School Travel Assessment Report for pupils travelling from the housing development at the former BP Headquarters to Dyce School.

Policy – there are no implications or risks related to this report.

5. BACKGROUND/MAIN ISSUES

5.1 School Reorganisation Proposals

These proposals contribute to a widespread programme to manage the school estate across the city.

Statutory consultation was carried out as result of an instruction from Education, Culture and Sport on 7 February, 2013.

5.2 Educational Implications

The Education Authority has a programme to ensure the provision of an affordable and suitable education service for all its pupils. Implementation of these proposals will assist in the delivery of these objectives.

5.3 Statutory Consultation Feedback

Appendix 1 details the Consultation Report for the Stoneywood / Dyce consultation exercise while Appendix 2 contains the Consultation Report for the Braehead / Danestone consultation exercise. The following sections provide a synopsis of the written submissions, comment from the public consultation meetings and the service's response to these submissions and the reports from Education Scotland.

5.3.1 Stoneywood / Dyce – rezoning of ground at the former BP Headquarters

(a) Methodology

All requirements of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 were met or exceeded.

(b) Feedback from Stakeholders and Education Scotland

Eight responses were received with seven in favour of the rezoning proposals. The other response did not comment on the proposal. Education Scotland also stated that the Council had presented a clear rationale for its proposal.

Responses commented on the need to improve the road crossing to Dyce School from the former BP headquarters. One submission asked the Council to look at methods which would improve the retention of teachers at Dyce School.

The Council's response to these issues are included in the Consultation Report at Appendix 1.

(c) Overall View of the Proposal

The volume of response was very low with the vast majority of responses supporting the proposal.

5.3.2 Braehead / Danestone – rezoning of Grandholm Village

(a) Methodology

The consultation met all the requirements of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010.

(b) Feedback from Stakeholders and Education Scotland

In addition to comments at the public meeting, there were 10 written responses from Parent Councils or individuals. Four responses were against the proposal, three were in favour and two did not provide a view either way. Education Scotland commented that they were uncertain of the

rationale behind the proposal and that deliverable education benefits were unclear.

Those who were opposed to the proposals commented on the additional distance that would be required for secondary aged pupils to walk to Oldmachar Academy, rather than Bridge of Don Academy. Responses also commented on the potential disruption to a child's education if they were required to move school.

Those in favour of the proposal stated that Danestone Primary is closer to Grandholm Village than Braehead School. Others commented that the additional walking distance to Oldmachar Academy was negligible, being 0.2 miles further than the distance to Bridge of Don Academy.

Comments also noted that as both primary schools and both secondaries were under occupied that there would be sufficient room in every establishment to accommodate parental choice.

The Council's response to the issues raised during the consultation are included in the Consultation Report, detailed at Appendix 2 of this report.

(c) Overall View of the Proposal

The level of response was very low, with 4 responses against the proposal and 3 submissions in favour of the proposal.

5.9 Recommendations

It is recommended that the Education, Culture and Sports Committee accepts the proposals to

- (i) proceed with proposal (i) above and to instruct officers to put in place the necessary arrangements; and
- (ii) proceeding with proposal (ii) above and to instruct officers to put in place the necessary arrangements.

6. IMPACT

6.1 Corporate

Aberdeen the Smarter City

- (i) We will enhance the physical and emotional wellbeing of all our citizens by offering support and activities which promote independence, resilience, confidence and self-esteem.
- (ii) Working with our third, public and private sector partners, we will provide opportunities for lifelong learning which will develop knowledge, skills and

attributes of our citizens to enable them to meet the changing demands of the 21st Century.

- (iii) Again, working with partners, we will create a City of Learning which will empower individuals to fulfil their potential and contribute to the economic, social and cultural wellbeing of our communities.
- (iv) We will aim to have a workforce across the city which has the skills and knowledge to sustain, grow and diversify the city economy.

6.2 Equality and Human Rights implications

A full Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment is attached as Appendix 3 of this report.

6.3 Management of the School Estate

There is no impact on the school estate as there is sufficient capacity in all schools to accommodate the outcome of these proposals.

7. MANAGEMENT OF RISK

There is not expected to be significant operational risk arising from the implementation of the proposals. Having followed all applicable legislation, the Council will be perceived as having taken account of the result of the consultation process.

8. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Appendix 1 Consultation Report on the Proposal to rezone ground at the former BP Headquarters from Stoneywood School to Dyce School and consequently from Bucksburn Academy to Dyce Academy from August 2014.

Appendix 2 Consultation Report on Proposal to rezone Grandholm Village from Braehead School to Danestone School and consequently from Bridge of Don Academy to Oldmachar Academy from August 2014

9. REPORT AUTHOR DETAILS

Euan Couperwhite
Infrastructure and Assets Programme Manager
ecouperwhite@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Tel: (01224) 522073



CONSULTATION REPORT

on the proposal by Aberdeen City Council to rezone ground at the former BP Headquarters from Stoneywood School to Dyce School and consequently from Bucksburn Academy to Dyce Academy from August 2014.

1. METHODOLOGY

This consultation was conducted in accordance with the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act, 2010. All requirements of the legislation were met or exceeded.

2. INVOLVEMENT OF STAKEHOLDERS

(a) Public Events

A public consultation event was held to discuss the re-zoning proposal for Stoneywood and Dyce Schools.

The number of attendees who signed in at the public meeting was:

<i>Date</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Venue</i>	<i>Number of Recorded Attendees</i>
27 January 2014	7-8.30pm	Dyce Academy	4 parents/public plus officers and Elected Members

(b) Further Engagement

Officers from Education, Culture and Sport also provided opportunities to meet separately with staff of both schools and representatives of the schools' Parent Councils.

(c) Comments Received

The following written submissions were received:

<i>Format</i>	<i>Number of submissions</i>
Email	5
Written	0
Comment Cards	3

Paper copies of all submissions were made available in the Members Library and have been circulated to external members of the Education, Culture and Sport Committee. Submissions, anonymised as necessary, were also made available on the Council website.

The public meeting, held at Dyce Academy, was attended by 4 individuals. At the meeting officers were advised that the rezoning proposals were logical. Questions were raised on changes to nursery provision and it was confirmed that the rezoning proposals would have no impact on nursery education. It was noted that parents felt strongly that a road crossing should be provided.

(d) Issues Raised

Parent Councils

Responses were received from the Parent Councils of Bucksburn Academy and Dyce Academy. Both responses were supportive of the Council's re-zoning proposal, commenting on the proximity of the housing development to both Dyce School and Dyce Academy and that Dyce Academy had sufficient capacity to accommodate incoming young people as a result of implementing this proposal.

Individuals

Five responses from individuals were in support, whilst one expressed no comment either way.

The issues raised focused on pupil road safety and the shortage and retention of teaching staff at Dyce School.

Education Scotland Report

An essential element of the statutory consultation process is involvement of Education Scotland whose report is provided as Appendix 1 of this Consultation Report.

Education Scotland confirm that the Council's "presents a clear rationale" for its rezoning proposals. The report also notes the strong support in favour of the proposal.

Education Scotland also comments on the need for the Council to continue to work with stakeholders in relation to the installation of safe road crossing. The report highlights the need to provide reassurance on the identified staffing issues at Dyce School, although it notes that this is not be connected to this consultation exercise.

3. THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED DURING THE CONSULTATION PERIOD AND CONTINUED WITHIN THE EDUCATION SCOTLAND REPORT

The following paragraphs detail the issues raised during the consultation process, and the matters identified by Education Scotland in their report on the Council's proposals. The Council Response to Issues Raised During the Consultation Process

(i) Road Safety

A condition of the planning approval for the housing development at the former BP Headquarters was the installation of two further road crossings. Prior to the proposed rezoning being implemented, officers from Roads will confirm that these road crossings have been put in place across Riverview Drive.

(ii) Staffing at Dyce School

It is recognised that this issue is not related to the proposals upon which comments were sought.

Dyce School receives a teaching allocation in line with established Council procedures; therefore any additional pupils who attend the school as a result of this proposal being implemented would also increase the allocation of teaching staff to the school. It is recognised that there have been difficulties in recruiting and retaining teaching staff for the Council's schools; however, the steps to address such issues and continued monitoring arrangements are in place to assess the effectiveness of these measures.

(iii) Other Comments

Should the Committee approve the recommendations contained within this report, parents would retain the opportunity to make a placing request to any school of their choice.

This proposal supports the Council's obligations to secure best value for the whole school estate, within the context of addressing over-capacity and suitability. The Council would be able to make more efficient and equitable use of its resources to the benefit of all children and young people in all schools across the city.

The educational benefits for pupils attending all schools include a reduction in the likelihood that school rolls will reach or exceed capacity. This will increase the availability of spaces within all schools allowing as wide a range of learning activities to be accommodated. Implementation of the proposal will also place the

council in a better position to plan a more efficient and effective school estate in terms of sufficiency and location of pupil spaces and, in turn, this will allow more appropriate allocation of resources to areas of demand.

4. ALLEGED OMISSIONS OF RELEVANT INFORMATION AND ALLEGED INACCURACIES CONTAINED WITHIN THE PROPOSAL DOCUMENT

No responses asserting allegations of omissions or inaccuracies within the Proposal Document were received during the consultation period.

5. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 9(1) OF THE SCHOOLS (CONSULTATION) (SCOTLAND) ACT 2010 AND CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSALS

Following the conclusion of the consultation period, Section 9(1) of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010, requires the Council to review the relevant proposal, having had regard to the written representations that have been received by it during the consultation period; oral representations made to it at the public meeting held on 27 January 2014 and Education Scotland's report.

In terms of Section 10(2) (e) of the said Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 the Consultation Report requires to contain a statement explaining how the Council complied with its duty under the above Section 9(1) of the Act.

With relation to Section 9(1) of the 2010 Act and having considered all of the information received during the consultation process, officers are satisfied that no comments have been received which would have caused them to review the merits of the proposal to rezone the former BP Headquarters from Stoneywood School to Dyce School and consequently from Bucksburn Academy to Dyce Academy, with effect from August 2014.

6. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Education, Culture and Sport Committee agree:

- (i) To implement the proposed rezoning of ground at the former BP Headquarters from Stoneywood School to Dyce School and consequently from Bucksburn Academy to Dyce Academy, with effect from August 2014.

Gayle Gorman
Director of Education, Culture and Sport
April 2014

REPORT FROM EDUCATION SCOTLAND

Consultation proposal by Aberdeen City Council

Report by Education Scotland, addressing educational aspects of the proposal to rezone the former BP Headquarters part of the Stoneywood School catchment area to Dyce School and consequently from Bucksburn Academy to Dyce Academy.

Context

This report from Education Scotland is required under the terms of the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010*. It has been prepared by HM Inspectors in accordance with the terms of the Act. The purpose of this report is to provide an independent and impartial consideration of the council's consultation proposal. Section 2 of this report sets out the views expressed by consultees during the initial consultation process. Section 3 sets out HM Inspectors' consideration of the educational aspects of the proposal and the 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 it has reviewed the initial proposal, including a summary of points raised during the consultation and the council's response to them. The council has to publish its final consultation report three weeks before it takes its final decision.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Aberdeen City Council proposes to rezone the former BP Headquarters part of the Stoneywood School catchment area to Dyce School and consequently from Bucksburn Academy to Dyce Academy. It is planned that 164 houses will be built on this site. In addition to this development, a further 500 houses will be built in other parts of the Stoneywood catchment area. It is anticipated that Stoneywood School will exceed its capacity by 2014/15.
- 1.2 The report from Education Scotland is required under the terms of the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010*. It has been prepared by HM Inspectors in accordance with the terms of the Act.
- 1.3 HM Inspectors undertook the following activities in considering the educational aspects of the proposal:
 - attendance at the public meeting held on 27 January 2014 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 Stoneywood School, Bucksburn Academy, Dyce School and Dyce Academy including discussion with relevant consultees.

1.4 HM Inspectors considered:

- The likely effects of the proposal for children and young people of the schools; 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
- benefits which the council believes will result from implementation of the proposal, and the council's reasons for coming to these beliefs.

2. Consultation process

- 2.1 Aberdeen City Council undertook the initial consultation on its proposals with reference to the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010*. The consultation process took place between 13 January to 28 February 2014 including a public meeting on 27 January 2014.
- 2.2 Overall, there was strong support for the proposal. It was realised that the proposal formalised what was already happening in the area with children and young people in the relevant part of the Stoneywood catchment area not attending Stoneywood School or Bucksburn Academy but almost all attending Dyce School and Dyce Academy. Other school age children in the area attended other schools in Aberdeen.
- 2.3 It was the view that the proposal made sense as it did start to address, albeit on a small scale, accommodation issues which have been identified for Stoneywood School and in due course Bucksburn Academy. Both Dyce School and Dyce Academy have the extra capacity to accommodate additional children and young people. This was recognised by the Parent Council at Dyce Academy. It was also recognised by stakeholders including community representatives that Dyce School and Dyce Academy would actually be a shorter walking distance for children and young people residing in the area.
- 2.4 Young people who currently attend Dyce Academy and reside in the area referred to in the consultation paper felt the proposal was logical as it was simply reinforcing what was happening already.

- 2.5 It was recognised by all who responded to the consultation, and at the Public Meeting, that pedestrian crossing lights would be essential on Riverview Drive to ensure a safe walking route to Dyce School and Dyce Academy from the area concerned.
- 2.6 A few responses expressed concern about staffing in Dyce School being able to accommodate this. This comment was also related to the nursery. It was commented upon that no figures for nursery children were stated in the proposal.
- 2.7 Comment was also made in one written response about the need for Aberdeen City Council to take a greater overview of house building in the area, the available school places and the school places that will be necessary in the future. The need for a more strategic plan to address the future accommodation issues for schools in the area was expressed verbally by several consultees.

3. Educational aspects of the proposal

- 3.1 Implementation of the proposal states that the proposal would formalise Aberdeen City Council's current zoning arrangements which reflect current parental choice for children/young people living in the area of the proposal. It would formalise arrangements to ensure a coherent, continuous three to 18 education for children/young people in that part of the current Stoneywood catchment area. This would also formalise quality transition arrangements between Primary and Secondary Schools for children living in the area.
- 3.2 The proposal would have educational benefits for other children/young people in the area as there would be a small reduction in potential pupil numbers at Stoneywood School and Bucksburn Academy. Aberdeen City Council is aware that this would provide minor alleviation for the potential of the school rolls, in particular at Stoneywood, reaching capacity. It is acknowledged that further future proposals would be necessary to address the pressure on places at Stoneywood School and other schools in the area.
- 3.3 The enrolments of pupils currently attending any of the schools would not be effected by this proposal. Children and young people who are due to attend the two schools within two years of the publication of the proposal paper would experience the same benefits as those currently attending.

4. Summary

- 4.1 Aberdeen City Council presents a clear rationale to rezone the former BP Headquarters part of the Stoneywood School catchment area to Dyce School and consequently from Bucksburn Academy to Dyce Academy. As this will formalise what is already happening in the area through parental placing requests, there are clear educational benefits within this proposal in

reinforcing a continuum in learning experiences for pupils from three to 18 who live in the area. This benefit will be similar for children/young people attending Dyce School and Dyce Academy now and for those who will be in attendance in two years from the date of this proposal. There will also be some benefits for children/young people attending Stoneywood School and Bucksburn Academy as this proposal will have some impact on not increasing pupil numbers in both schools in the short term.

- 4.2 Overall, there was strong support in favour of the proposal and consultees saw the proposal as making sense and the most suitable option available at this time. In taking forward the proposal, Aberdeen City Council needs to continue to liaise closely with all stakeholders to address the few operational concerns which surround this proposal. In particular Aberdeen City Council should continue to consult with stakeholders in the Dyce / Stoneywood community, including young people who are attending Dyce Academy, as to the exact location(s) for the installation of crossing lights on Riverview Drive. In so doing, Aberdeen City Council should reassure the community about a timescale for this. Reassurances should also be given about concerns raised about staffing issues at Dyce School, particularly within the nursery, which may not be directly associated with this proposal.
- 4.3 Aberdeen City Council is aware that, as part of its estates strategy, it should continue with plans to give a strategic overview to the increasing pupil numbers, including nursery children, in the area and how they will be accommodated. Specific attention should be given to the implications for Stoneywood School, in the first instance, to ensure that the educational benefits coming from this proposal are not negated.

**HM Inspectors
Education Scotland
March 2014**



CONSULTATION REPORT

on the proposal by Aberdeen City Council to rezone Grandholm Village from Braehead School to Danestone School and consequently from Bridge of Don Academy to Oldmachar Academy from August 2014.

3. METHODOLOGY

This consultation was conducted in accordance with the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act, 2010. All requirements of the legislation were met or exceeded.

4. INVOLVEMENT OF STAKEHOLDERS

(a) Public Events

A public consultation event was held to discuss the re-zoning proposal for Braehead and Danestone Schools.

The number of attendees who signed in at the public meeting was:

<i>Date</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Venue</i>	<i>Number of Recorded Attendees</i>
28 January 2014	7-8.30pm	Danestone School	10 parents/public plus officers and Elected Members

(b) Further Engagement

Officers from Education, Culture and Sport also provided opportunities to meet separately with staff of both schools and representatives of the schools' Parent Councils.

(c) Comments Received

The following written submissions were received:

<i>Format</i>	<i>Number of submissions</i>
Email	10
Written	0
Comment Cards	0

Paper copies of all submissions were made available in the Members Library and have been circulated to external members of the Education, Culture and Sport Committee. Submissions, anonymised as necessary, were also made available on the Council website.

The public meeting, held at Danestone School, was attended by 10 individuals. Attendees commented that the new River Don crossing would significantly reduce the travel distance to Danestone. Parents were advised that if they had a child currently attending Braehead School then it would be possible for a younger sibling to also attend the school. In response to a question from a parent, officers also advised that there was a large housing development in Grandholm village which could potentially require a new secondary school and new primary schools. Comments were received which outlined concern about the timing of the decision, as it was noted that Committee would only make a final determination at their meeting in June 2014, which would leave little time for enrolment and ordering school uniforms. Officers were asked how parents could find information to determine which school was best for their children, responding that Education Scotland reports, School Standard and Quality reports and visits would provide this information.

(d) Issues Raised

Parent Councils

One response was received from the Parent Councils of Bridge of Don Academy. The response commented on a perceived unease that the Council may have a long term plan to “chip away” at the pupil roll for the school. The Parent Council noted the rezoning proposal from a primary perspective but commented on the increased distance pupils from Grandholm would require to walk to attend Oldmachar Academy. The response also commented on the need to clarify potential transport costs which could arise through the implementation of the proposal and questioned whether it would deliver the stated educational benefits.

Individuals

Of the nine responses from individuals, four were against the proposals, three were in favour and two expressed no comment either way.

Those opposed to the proposal commented on the additional distance pupils would have to travel to attend Oldmachar Academy rather than Bridge of Don Academy. Submissions also commented on the disturbance to children's education if they were taken out of Braehead School and zoned to Danestone School.

Those in favour of the proposal commented that Danestone School was closer than Braehead School, and the additional distance to Oldmachar Academy was negligible, being only 0.2 miles further than the distance to Bridge of Don Academy. It was also commented that parents would still have the right to access to choose which school they sent their children to, as all schools had surplus capacity.

Some respondents commented on the timescale for final Committee consideration of the proposal, noting that a decision on 12 June 2014 did not provide a great deal of time to enrol their children in the relevant school. One response focused on the existing issues found on the walking route from Grandholm village to Danestone School and commented that should these be addressed by the Council it would become a "quiet walk and a great idea".

Education Scotland Report

Education Scotland's report expressed uncertainty on the rationale behind the proposal, further commenting that the Council has not clearly defined the education benefits which would be derived from the proposal's implementation.

Education Scotland also ask the Council to clarify the timeline for the proposal's implementation with stakeholders and also to consult and communicate with all interested stakeholders, particularly those parents of children attending nursery or Primary 1 after the summer break.

3. THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED DURING THE CONSULTATION PERIOD AND CONTAINED WITHIN THE EDUCATION SCOTLAND REPORT

The following paragraphs detail the issues identified by Education Scotland in their report on the Council's proposals and the Council's response.

(i) Road Safety and Distance

Most respondents were clear that the distance from Grandholm village to Danestone Primary was shorter than that between Grandholm village and Braehead School.

It is accepted that the current distance from Grandholm village to Oldmachar Academy is greater than that between the village and Bridge of Don Academy. However, the construction of the new River Don crossing and the new trunk road will provide easier access to Oldmachar Academy. Should pupils wish to attend Bridge of Don Academy they would be required to cross the new trunk road to get to school.

(ii) **Available Spaces**

It is noted that all of the schools affected by this proposal have surplus capacity. This should reduce the chance of any parent not having their choice of school accepted. Based on the current pupil roll projections it would appear that Braehead School's roll is approximately 90-100 pupils below the school's maximum capacity, with the figures for Danestone School being 120-200 pupils below its maximum capacity.

(iii) **Educational Benefits of Implementing the Proposal**

Should this proposal be implemented it would, as stated within the Proposal Document, formalise the practice which takes place. The majority of parents from Grandholm village have enrolled their children into Danestone School. Access to the school by car will be improved with the construction of new roads in the area.

The proposal will also ensure that pupils attending Danestone School are educated alongside their peers from the local community. Adding pupils to the school roll of Danestone will also enrich the educational environment for all young people who attend as the increased pupil cohort will result in greater ability to attract resources, in terms of both staffing and the school's delegated budget, providing additional flexibility for the Head Teacher to better meet the needs of all pupils.

A larger group of pupils will also enrich formal and informal learning as pupils will learn from and interact with a greater number of other pupils from different backgrounds, thereby increasing their knowledge and understanding to a greater extent. An example of this would be the increased ability to work with a greater number of peers and also in different cohorts.

For those pupils already attending either Braehead School or Bridge of Don Academy, the current Council policy is that their siblings would be given priority to attend the same schools through the placing request process, provided there is sufficient spare capacity within the school.

(iv) **Continued Consultation and Communication**

The Council is committed to continue effective dialogue with the parents affected by this proposal. Should Committee approve the recommendation set out in Section 6 of this report, officers will contact both schools and correspond with parents who have enrolled their children into Primary 1 of either Braehead School or Danestone School to confirm the rezoning arrangements.

(v) **Other Comments**

Should the Committee approve the recommendations contained within this report, parents would retain the opportunity to make a placing request to any school of their choice.

This proposal supports the Council's obligations to secure best value for the whole school estate, within the context of addressing over-capacity and suitability. The Council would be able to make more efficient and equitable use of its resources to the benefit of all children and young people in schools across the city.

4. ALLEGED OMISSIONS OF RELEVANT INFORMATION AND ALLEGED INACCURACIES CONTAINED WITHIN THE PROPOSAL DOCUMENT

No responses asserting allegations of omissions or inaccuracies within the Proposal Document were received during the consultation period.

5. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 9(1) OF THE SCHOOLS (CONSULTATION) (SCOTLAND) ACT 2010 AND CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSALS

Following the conclusion of the consultation period, Section 9(1) of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010, requires the Council to review the relevant proposal, having had regard to the written representations that have been received by it during the consultation period; oral representations made to it at the public meeting held on 27 January 2014 and Education Scotland's report.

In terms of Section 10(2) (e) of the said Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 the Consultation Report requires to contain a statement explaining how the Council complied with its duty under the above Section 9(1) of the Act.

With relation to Section 9(1) of the 2010 Act and having considered all of the information received during the consultation process, officers are satisfied that no comments have been received which would have caused them to review the merits of the proposal to rezone Grandholm village from Braehead School to Danestone School and consequently from Bridge of Don Academy to Oldmachar Academy, with effect from August 2014.

6. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Education, Culture and Sport Committee agree:

- (ii) To implement the proposed rezoning of Grandholm village from Braehead School to Danestone School and consequently from Bridge of Don Academy to Oldmachar Academy, with effect from August 2014.

Gayle Gorman
Director of Education, Culture and Sport
April 2014

REPORT FROM EDUCATION SCOTLAND**Consultation proposal by Aberdeen City Council
Report by Education Scotland, addressing educational aspects of the
proposal to re-zone the Grandholm Village area from Braehead School to
Danestone School and consequently from Bridge of Don Academy to
Oldmachar Academy with implementation from August 2014.****Context**

This report from Education Scotland is required under the terms of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010. It has been prepared by HM Inspectors in accordance with the terms of the Act. The purpose of this report is to provide an independent and impartial consideration of the council's consultation proposal. Section 2 of this report sets out the views expressed by consultees during the initial consultation process. Section 3 sets out HM Inspectors' consideration of the educational aspects of the proposal and the 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 it has reviewed the initial proposal, including a summary of points raised during the consultation and the council's response to them. The council has to publish its final consultation report three weeks before it takes its final decision.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Aberdeen City Council proposes to re-zone the Grandholm Village area from Braehead School to Danestone School and consequently from Bridge of Don Academy to Oldmachar Academy with implementation from August 2014.
- 1.2 The report from Education Scotland is required under the terms of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010. It has been prepared by HM Inspectors in accordance with the terms of the Act.
- 1.3 HM Inspectors undertook the following activities in considering the educational aspects of the proposal:
 - attendance at the public meeting held on 28 January 2014 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;
 - consideration of further information on all schools affected; and
 - visits to the site of Braehead School, Bridge of Don Academy, Danestone School and Oldmachar Academy, including discussion with relevant consultees.

- 1.4 HM Inspectors considered:
- the likely effects of the proposal for children and young people of the schools; 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
 - benefits which the council believes will result from implementation of the proposal, and the council's reasons for coming to these beliefs.

2. Consultation process

- 2.1 Aberdeen City Council undertook the initial consultation on its proposals with reference to the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010.
- 2.2 Children and young people at all four schools did not have strong views either way on the proposal.
- 2.3 Parents and staff had mixed views about the proposal. In general those at Danestone Primary School and Oldmachar Academy were broadly supportive of the proposal.
- 2.4 Parents of children and young people who live in Grandholm Village and currently attend Braehead Primary School had mixed views about the proposal. A few were supportive of the proposal and a few were against the proposal, particularly those that have children currently in school and younger siblings who are not yet attending nursery or school.
- 2.5 Parents at Bridge of Don Academy could understand the proposal for the primary school re-zoning with Danestone School being physically closer to Grandholm Village. However, regarding the secondary they were unsure as to the benefits of the proposal, stating that Bridge of Don Academy is closer to Grandholm Village than Oldmachar Academy. There is no mention of distance to schools in the consultation paper.
- 2.6 Staff at Braehead Primary School and Bridge of Don Academy were unsure of the rationale behind the proposal and the evidence regarding the educational benefits. Although they understand that Danestone School is physically closer to Grandholm Village than Braehead Primary School, particularly by foot, both schools have capacity, and they were concerned at the longer term effect of losing pupils from their school rolls.

3. Educational aspects of the proposal

- 3.1 Aberdeen City Council states that implementation of the proposal would ensure a coherent, continuous three to 18 education for children/young people in the Grandholm Village area and that it would also improve the quality of transition arrangements between primary and secondary schools for children living in the area. However, the overall educational benefits set

out in the proposal are not fully evidenced. In taking forward the proposal, the council needs to set out more detailed benefits for the children that will accrue from implementation of the proposal.

- 3.2 The rationale for the proposal is not fully clear. It states that this would formalise Aberdeen City Council's current zoning arrangements which reflect current parental choice for children/young people living in the area of the proposal. However, the number of pupils involved who attend the schools are split relatively evenly between the two primary schools and two secondary schools, all of which are operating under capacity. This is particularly the case for staff of Braehead School and Bridge of Don Academy, or for families who have children currently in either of these schools.
- 3.3 The council has stated that this proposal is one element of a coordinated approach to manage the pupil numbers at Braehead and Danestone Schools and other schools across the city. Given that both primary schools in the proposal are operating under capacity and the proposal states that there are no major housing developments planned for either of the catchment areas for the primary schools, it is not sufficiently clear how the coordinated approach to manage pupil numbers has any significance.
- 3.4 The proposal states that enrolments of pupils currently attending any of the schools would not be effected by this proposal. Parents at Braehead School reported that the proposal does not provide clarity or certainty for their children currently in the nursery or primary classes at Braehead School, particularly regarding which secondary school they would attend and potential disruption to friendship groups. Families with pre-nursery aged children and those who have children currently in nursery, primary and secondary could be particularly challenged if the proposal is implemented and their children are placed across different catchment areas. Children likely to become pupils within two years of the date of publication of the proposal paper may be affected as above where they have siblings at either of the primary or secondary schools. However, those who do not have siblings at either school will not be affected in the future. The council needs to be clear and provide reassurance for parents as to how their children will be affected if the proposal is implemented.
- 3.5 Parents of pre-school and primary aged children at the schools are very concerned about the timing for the proposal. With the decision on the proposal not being made until mid-June, and a planned implementation of the proposal in August, the council has set a challenging timescale to take forward the proposal. Parents are particularly concerned about appointment of places for nursery-aged children and the potential for having children in either two or three schools at the one time. In taking forward the proposal, the council needs to clarify the timeline for implementation of the proposal.
- 3.6 Parents at Bridge of Don Academy understandably reported their concern that this is the second proposal for re-zoning of part of their catchment area in a very short space of time which is causing a feeling of unease in Bridge

of Don Academy. They are anxious that, although in the short-term and with small numbers, there is no significant impact in the school from this proposal, the longer-term effect has a potentially negative impact on their school roll.

- 3.7 Parents who live in Grandholm Village reported many issues and concerns relating to the current plans for the creation of a bridge adjacent to Grandholm Village which may make it longer or shorter to get to school. They had uncertainties with regard to the plans and the impact of the new bridge on journeys to any of the four schools mentioned in the proposal. There is no reference to the journey time to school or to the bridge in the proposal. However, in order to assist parents the council needs to share relevant information regarding any changes to school journeys as a result of the impact of the new bridge.

4. Summary

- 4.1 The number of pupils involved who attend the schools are split relatively evenly between the two primary schools and two secondary schools, all of which are operating under capacity, and the proposal states that there are no major housing developments planned for either of the catchment areas for the primary schools, therefore the rationale for the proposal is not fully clear.
- 4.2 It is not sufficiently clear how implementation of the proposal will bring clear educational benefit to children and young people. In taking forward the proposal, the council needs to set out more detailed benefits for the children that will accrue from implementation of the proposal.
- 4.3 In taking forward the proposal, the council will need to clarify the current timeline for implementation to ensure it provides sufficient time for effective consultation and communication with parents, staff and children to alleviate their concerns. This is particularly important for children currently in nursery or primary or pre-nursery aged siblings, who are directly affected by this proposal. In taking forward the proposal, the council needs to ensure that it provides sufficient time to consult and communicate effectively with parents, staff and children to alleviate these concerns.

**HM Inspectors
Education Scotland
March 2014**



Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment - the Form

There are separate guidance notes to accompany this form – “Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment – the Guide.” Please use these guidance notes as you complete this form. Throughout the form, **proposal** should be understood broadly to include the full range of our activities and could refer to a decision, policy, strategy, plan, procedure, report or business case, embracing a range of different actions such as setting budgets, developing high level strategies and organisational practices such as internal restructuring. Essentially everything we do!

STEP 1: Identify essential information

1. Committee Report No.

ECS\14\36

2. Name of proposal.

Statutory Consultation – Consultation Reports for:

- (i) The proposal to rezone ground at the former BP Headquarters from Stoneywood School to Dyce School and consequently from Bucksburn Academy to Dyce Academy from August 2014.
- (ii) The proposal to rezone Grandholm Village from Braehead School to Danestone School and consequently from Bridge of Don Academy to Oldmachar Academy from August 2014.

3. Officer(s) completing this form.

Name	Designation	Service	Directorate
Euan Couperwhite	Infrastructure and Assets Programme Manager	Educational Development, Policy and Performance	Education, Culture and Sport

4. Date of Impact Assessment.

5. When is the proposal next due for review?

6. Committee Name.

7. Date the Committee is due to meet.

8. Identify the Lead Council Service and who else is involved in delivering this proposal (for example other Council services or partner agencies).

9. Please summarise this Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment (EHRIA). This must include any practical actions you intend to take or have taken to reduce, justify or remove any adverse negative impacts. This must also include a summary of how this proposal complies with the public sector equality duty for people with protected characteristics - see Step 2. **Please return to this question after completing the EHRIA.**

10. Where will you publish the results of the Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment? Tick which applies.

- Para 9 of EHRIA will be published in committee report in Section 6 "Impact"
- Full EHRIA will be attached to the committee report as an appendix
- Copied to Equalities Team to publish on the Council website

STEP 2: Outline the aims of the proposal

11. What are the main aims of the proposal?

12. Who will benefit most from the proposal?

13. You should assess the impact of your proposal on equality groups and tell us how implementing this proposal will impact on the needs of the public sector equality duty to: eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation; advance equality of opportunity; and foster good relations.

The rezoning proposals will have a positive impact on young people attending the affected schools. It will have no impact on the public sector equality duties.

STEP 3: Gather and consider evidence

15. What **evidence** is there to identify any potential positive or negative impacts in terms of involvement, consultation, research, officer knowledge and experience, equality monitoring data, user feedback and other? You must consider relevant evidence, including evidence from equality groups.

A full public consultation has been undertaken with stakeholders. All responses are then reviewed by officers to determine if there any aspects of the proposal which should be re-assessed. This is in full compliance with the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010.

STEP 4: Assess likely impacts on people with Protected Characteristics

16. Which, if any, people with protected characteristics and others could be affected positively or negatively by this proposal? Place the symbol in the relevant box. Be aware of cross-cutting issues, such as older women with a disability experiencing poverty and isolation.

(Positive +, neutral 0, - negative)

Protected Characteristics					
Age - Younger	+	Disability	0	Gender Reassignment*	0
Older	0				
Marriage or Civil Partnership	0	Pregnancy and Maternity	0	Race**	0
Religion or Belief	0	Sex (gender)***	0	Sexual orientation****	0
Others e.g. poverty	0				

Notes:

* Gender Reassignment includes Transsexual

** Race includes Gypsy/Travellers

*** Sex (gender) i.e. men, women

**** Sexual orientation includes LGB: Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual

17. Please detail the potential positive and/or negative impacts on those with protected characteristics you have highlighted above.

In making the assessment you must consider relevant evidence, including evidence received from individuals and equality groups. Having considered all of these elements, you must take account of the results of such assessments. This requires you to consider taking action to address any issues identified, such as removing or mitigating any negative impacts, where possible, and exploiting any potential for positive impact. If any adverse impact amounts to **unlawful discrimination**, the policy must be amended to avert this. Detail the impacts and describe those affected.

Positive impacts (describe protected characteristics affected)	Negative Impacts (describe protected characteristics affected)
Age Younger – the rezoning proposals will ensure that young people attending the affected primary schools can be taught in schools which have clearly defined school catchment areas and which serve their local communities.	

STEP 5: Human Rights - Apply the three key assessment tests for compliance assurance

18. Does this proposal/policy/procedure have the potential to interfere with an individual's rights as set out in the Human Rights Act 1998? State which rights might be affected by ticking the appropriate box(es) and saying how. **If you answer "no", go straight to question 22.**

NO

- Article 3 – Right not to be subjected to torture, inhumane or degrading treatment or punishment
- Article 6 – Right to a fair and public hearing
- Article 8 – Right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence
- Article 10 – freedom of expression
- Other article not listed above

How?

Legality

19. Where there is a potential negative impact is there a legal basis in the relevant domestic law?

Legitimate aim

20. Is the aim of the policy identified in Steps 1 and 2 a legitimate aim being served in terms of the relevant equality legislation or the Human Rights Act?

Proportionality

21. Is the impact of the policy proportionate to the legitimate aim being pursued? Is it the minimum necessary interference to achieve the legitimate aim?

STEP 6: Monitor and review

22. How will you monitor the implementation of the proposal? (For example, customer satisfaction questionnaires)

Full public consultations on the Council’s rezoning proposals have been completed. These allow stakeholders to submit comments and views, which under the requirements of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 and the Children and Young People’s Act 2014 must be reported to the Council in the follow up Consultation Report which provides a summary of the issues raised and the Council’s response to those issues.

23. How will the results of this impact assessment and any further monitoring be used to develop the proposal?

This impact assessment ensures that public consultations comply with legislation and that the positive Educational Benefits of the proposal can be demonstrated.

STEP 7 SIGN OFF

The final stage of the EHRIA is formally to sign off the document as being a complete, rigorous and robust assessment.

Person(s) completing the impact assessment.

Name	Date	Signature
Euan Couperwhite	13 May 2014	

Quality check: document has been checked by

Name	Date	Signature
Andrew Jones	13 May 2014	

Head of Service (Sign-off)

Name	Date	Signature
David Anderson	13 May 2014	

Now –

Please send an electronic copy of your completed EHRIA - without signatures - together with the proposal to:

Equalities Team
Customer Service and Performance
Corporate Governance
Aberdeen City Council
Business Hub 13
Second Floor North
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1AB

Telephone 01224 523039 Email sandrab@aberdeencity.gov.uk