



BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

A REVIEW OF PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN THE KEYNSHAM AREA

**Castle Primary School
Chandag Infant School
Chandag Junior School
Keynsham Primary School
Saltford CofE Primary School
St John's CofE Primary Keynsham
Temple Primary School**

Enquiries to:
Bruce Austen
School Organisation Manager
Education Service
Bath & North East Somerset
P O Box 25
Riverside
KEYNSHAM
BS31 1DN

Tel: 01225 395169 or e-mail:
Bruce_austen@bathnes.gov.uk

September to December 2003

1. WHY ARE WE REVIEWING THIS AREA?

- 1.1 All primary schools in Bath & North East Somerset are to be reviewed over the next four years. Each school will be reviewed alongside its partner schools in a geographical area. At the end of each Area Review elected Councillors may decide that some changes (school closures, new schools, enlarging schools etc.) appear to be necessary and initiate a further consultation process focussing on the school(s) affected. It is equally possible that Councillors may simply acknowledge that the pattern of school provision is working effectively and that no changes are required in the short or medium-term.
- 1.2 The process to be followed when undertaking an Area Review has been the subject of wide and lengthy consultation. It was finally approved by the School Organisation Committee (a body independent of the Council) on 22 July 2003.
- 1.3 A document entitled "The School Review Process" can be found on the Council website at: www.bathnes.gov.uk/Committee_Papers/OandSEYCL/EYCL021202/10SchoolReviewProcess.htm Paper copies are available on request.
- 1.4 The School Organisation Committee also approved the areas for review during the school year 2003/04. These are the areas showing the highest numbers of unfilled (sometimes referred to as surplus) places. The Keynsham area (including Saltford) is amongst these areas.
- 1.5 The schools named below are considered in this Review.

Castle Primary School, Newlands Road
Chandag Infant School, Chandag Road
Chandag Junior School, Chandag Road
Keynsham Primary School, Kelston Road
Saltford CofE Primary School, Bath Road, Saltford
St John's CofE Primary, Charlton Park
Temple Primary School, Bath Hill East (and also at Albert Road)

2. INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 The first stage of the Review has involved the gathering of information on the following:-
- current numbers on roll (September 2003)
 - historical numbers on roll (1997-2002)
 - anticipated numbers on roll (2004 and beyond)
 - levels of recruitment against Standard Number
 - unit cost per pupil
 - pupil teacher ratios
 - home addresses of pupils on roll
 - outstanding planned maintenance
 - suitability for curriculum delivery
 - level of surplus or deficit of places
 - levels of educational achievement
 - levels of educational deprivation and multiple deprivation in the ward in which the school is located (and more detailed information on the level of educational and economic deprivation amongst children at each school).
- 2.2 On 29 September, a draft version of this document was circulated to the Headteacher and Chair of Governors of each school covered by the Review, the Headteacher and Chair of

Governors of the two secondary schools serving Keynsham, senior officers of the Education Service, the Bath & Wells Diocesan Board of Education, the Roman Catholic Diocese of Clifton, Councillors representing wards in Keynsham and Saltford and Keynsham Town Council. The document was also circulated to members of the Education, Youth, Culture & Leisure Overview & Scrutiny Panel in order to prepare the Panel members for their discussion at a meeting on 3 November.

- 2.3 A revised version containing amendments and clarifications of facts was issued to all stakeholders on October 17th.
- 2.4 This paper was published on November 10th. This document is a duplicate of the revised paper issued on October 17th with the crucial addition of initial conclusions drawn by officers. These conclusions and any responses will be discussed by the Council Executive at its meeting on 3rd December. The Executive will then determine what action, if any, should be taken.

3. School Organisation Plan

- 3.1 Each school has been assessed against policies, established through the School Organisation Plan, regarding school size. The School Organisation Plan states that;
- Infant and junior Schools should be at least one form of entry and a maximum of three with a standard number between 30 and 90.
 - No infant school should have 60 or fewer children on roll.
 - No junior school should have 90 or fewer children on roll.
 - Urban/suburban primary schools should be at least one form of entry and a maximum of two with a standard number between 30 and 60.
 - No urban/suburban primary school should have fewer than 180 children on roll.
 - The maximum desirable size for an all through primary school is 420 pupils.
- 3.2 Both infant and junior schools meet the minimum size and admission number criteria. All the primary schools have acceptable admission numbers. At September 2003 two of the primary schools covered by the Review have fewer than 180 children on roll.
- 3.3 The School Organisation Plan agreed on July 22 2003 stated the following in relation to Keynsham “At the time of publication of the original draft Plan significant housing developments were planned for Keynsham. As this Plan reaches final draft stage and approval the planned large-scale housing development for Keynsham has been deleted from the Local Plan. Therefore, there is no prospect of unfilled places in the town being taken up by residents of new housing.” The housing developments that are still identified for the town will add 74 dwellings at Somerdale and at the former Cannocks garage plus an unspecified element of residential development at St John’s Court.
- 3.4 The School Organisation Plan agreed on 17 July 2001 stated that “the LEA’s preferred option for school organisation at Key Stages 1 and 2 is all-through primary schools. This also includes the Foundation Stage in nursery and reception classes.” Of the schools covered by this Review there is one infant school and one junior school. One primary school also operates an LEA nursery class.
- 3.5 Readers will note that two of the seven schools covered by this Review are Church of England schools (both are Voluntary Controlled). Any changes in the area may result in a

change in the proportion of denominational places in Bath & North East Somerset. At present, 47% of primary school places in Bath & North East Somerset are in Church of England schools. In Keynsham this percentage is 33%.

- 3.6 All schools have also been assessed under the Authority's Asset Management Plan (AMP). The AMP is concerned with the Condition, Suitability and Sufficiency of schools. The Key Data sheets at the back of the document show the position at these schools in relation to the AMP headings.

4. Keynsham – The Context

- 4.1 A map showing the location of the schools is attached.
- 4.2 Keynsham/Saltford has a population of approximately 19,500 of which, at the date of the 2001 National Census, 2860 were between the ages of 0-10.
- 4.3 Data from the Primary Care Trust was received on October 22nd. This shows the position at April 2003.

5 Levels of Educational Achievement

- 5.1 There are various measures of educational performance. Simple examination of headline results may not reveal the success (or otherwise) of a school.
- 5.2 Care must be taken when analysing results of small year groups and making comparisons with schools that are significantly different in size. In small schools one pupil can have a very marked effect on the percentage figures. OFSTED makes the following statement:

Care should be taken when analysing the results of small year groups and small schools. The effect of one additional pupil on, for example, a school percentage measure can be considerable, whereas in larger schools the effect will be less marked. This does not mean that analysing the performance of small cohorts is invalid. Rather it means that the findings from such analyses should be interpreted carefully, and may need to be augmented with other information or considered over more than one year.

6. Levels of Educational and Multiple Deprivation

- 6.1 All wards in England have been assessed under a range of headings in order to determine, not only the overall levels of deprivation in a given community, but to compile an elemental breakdown of the type of deprivation. The headings are Income, Employment, Health, Education, Housing, Geographical Access to Services and Child Poverty. The results of this survey were published by central Government in August 2000.
- 6.2 The measure of educational deprivation is compiled by considering the following data:-
- the number of working age adults with no qualifications
 - the number of children aged 16 and over who are not in full-time education
 - the proportion of 17-19 year olds who have not successfully applied for university
 - KS2 primary school performance data
 - primary school children with English as an additional language for 1998
 - absenteeism (authorised and unauthorised) at primary level for 1998.
- 6.3 8414 wards were assessed. The lower the score the higher the level of educational deprivation. For comparison purposes readers will wish to know that the wards with the

highest and lowest scores in the Bath & North East Somerset area are Peasedown (728) and Combe Down (8015)

- 6.4 In terms of multiple deprivation, the comparison should be made with Twerton which is ranked at 1111. Salford, at 8135, is the least deprived ward in Bath & North East Somerset and is within the 'top' 5% of wards in England.
- 6.5 Information regarding the extent of child poverty is also included as an illustration of the economic deprivation in the area. For comparison purposes, Twerton scores 286 placing it within the 'bottom' 5% of wards in England. The former ward of Chew Valley West scores 8056.
- 6.6 Information has also been gathered showing the numbers and proportion of pupils from each ward attending each school. This is shown on the Key Data Sheet.

7 Timescales

- 7.1 The document was considered by the Overview & Scrutiny Panel (OSP) at its meeting at 5.30 on November 3 2003 at the Guildhall, Bath. The OSP is holding a public session in Keynsham to hear contributions from invited stakeholders. This has been arranged for 4 p.m. on 12th November at Broadlands School.
- 7.2 A meeting for Bath & North East Somerset Councillors representing the wards in Keynsham and Salford took place on October 27th.
- 7.3 The final paper will be considered by the Council Executive which meets at 5.30 on 3 December 2003 at the Guildhall, Bath.

KEY DATA

Numbers on Roll, Forecasts & Surplus Places (Sufficiency 1)

Level of Recruitment against Standard Number

Financial Information

Outstanding Planned Maintenance (Condition)

Site and Building Areas (Sufficiency 2)

Deprivation Data

Educational Standards

Suitability

Numbers on Roll, Forecasts & Surplus Places		PAN Sept 2004	Net Capacity	Sep 97 Actual	Sep 98 Actual	Sep 99 Actual	Sep 00 Actual	Sep 01 Actual	Sep 02 Actual	Surplus Places Sep 02	Average NOR 97-02	Sep 03 Actual	Surplus Places Sep 03	Sep 06 Forecast	Surplus Places Forecast Sept 06
School	Category														
Castle Primary	Community	40	240	224	243	241	231	220	233	7	232	221	19		
Chandag Infants	Community	60	180	161	150	155	171	178	180	0	166	177	3		
Chandag Junior	Community	68	240	256	260	261	271	280	275	-35	267	288	-48		
Keynsham Primary	Community	30	243	246	229	224	206	179	156	87	207	122	121		
Saltford CofE Primary	Controlled	50	350	352	348	353	346	347	344	6	348	335	15		
St.John's CofE Primary, Keynsham	Controlled	30	210	235	235	229	230	229	230	-20	231	227	-17		
Temple Primary	Community	30	210	125	128	127	121	142	148	62	132	170	40		
Totals		308	1,673	1,599	1,593	1,590	1,576	1,575	1,566	162	1,583	1,543	198	1,457	216
Average		N/A	239	228	228	227	225	225	224		226	225			

Notes

PAN means Planned Admission Number. This figure equates to the number of pupils the school must admit if demand exists. PAN has replaced Standard Number for admissions from September 2004.

Net Capacity is the physical capacity of the school and shows the number of places available. It is derived from a DfES formula.

Surplus places means unfilled places. Not all unfilled places are surplus. The calculation of surplus places takes account only of those schools where the number of pupils is fewer than the number of places available. Shortfalls of places in schools are not counted.

The purpose of showing the average number on roll over the five years previous to 2003/04 is to ensure that an unusual variation in admissions in one year does not provide a distorted picture.

Forecast numbers for individual schools are derived by assessing the proportion of the total number of children in Bath & North East Somerset and allocating the same proportion as have historically attended the school. If an area has experienced a disproportionate increase or decrease in the birth rate figures for individual schools will be inaccurate.

Levels of Recruitment against Standard Number

School	1997			1998			1999			2000			2001			2002			2003			Average % of SN
	SN	Intake	%																			
Castle Primary	38	36	95%	38	40	105%	38	31	82%	38	30	79%	40	23	58%	40	37	93%	40	27	68%	82%
Chandag Infant	60	59	98%	60	38	63%	60	46	77%	60	60	100%	60	58	97%	60	60	100%	60	58	97%	90%
Chandag Junior	75	51	68%	75	56	75%	75	65	87%	75	66	88%	75	57	76%	75	63	84%	75	69	92%	81%
Keynsham Primary	45	35	78%	45	33	73%	45	32	71%	45	18	40%	45	19	42%	45	14	31%	45	4	9%	49%
Salford CofE Primary	50	51	102%	50	35	70%	50	42	84%	50	48	96%	50	49	98%	50	45	90%	50	36	72%	87%
St John's CofE Primary, Keynsham	34	34	100%	34	34	100%	34	31	91%	34	34	100%	34	34	100%	34	32	94%	34	34	100%	98%
Temple Primary	35	14	40%	35	15	43%	35	9	26%	35	15	43%	35	22	63%	35	16	46%	35	24	69%	47%
Totals	337	280	83%	337	251	74%	337	256	76%	337	271	80%	339	262	77%	339	267	79%	339	252	74%	78%

Intake figures are compiled from analysis of the September Pupil Count undertaken by the LEA on the 3rd Thursday of each September

Notes

Levels of recruitment are shown as percentages as changes to Standard Number were implemented at several schools over the period September 1997 to September 2002. This was often as a result of the infant class size legislation.

Financial Information

School	Category	Formula Allocation	CPN (FTE)	Formula Allocation per FTE Pupil	OTHER FUNDING			Other Funding Total	Other funding per FTE pupil	Total Funding	Total Funding per FTE pupil
					Standards Fund	Standards Grant	Devolved Capital				
Castle Primary	Community	457,824	228	2,008	20,895	30,000	21,730	72,625	319	530,449	2,327
Chandag Infants	Community	367,693	180	2,043	14,593	18,000	19,017	51,610	287	419,303	2,330
Chandag Junior	Community	501,439	274	1,830	17,927	30,000	23,002	70,929	259	572,368	2,089
Keynsham Primary	Community	466,712	169	2,762	22,170	18,000	19,250	59,420	352	526,132	3,114
Saltford CofE Primary	Controlled	642,718	338	1,902	19,318	30,000	26,394	75,712	224	718,430	2,126
St.John's CofE Primary, Keynsham	Controlled	462,419	232	1,993	14,479	30,000	21,052	65,531	282	527,950	2,275
Temple Primary	Community	352,871	157	2,248	18,909	18,000	18,508	55,417	353	408,288	2,601
Totals		3,251,676	1,578		128,291	174,000	148,953	451,244		3,657,920	
Average		464,525	225	2,112	18,327	24,857	21,279	64,463	296	2,318	2,351

Notes

CPN means Composite Pupil Number. This is the number of pupils for which a school receives funding. It is based on 5/12 of actual number on roll at January each year plus 7/12 from the estimated September number on roll.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE ABOVE FIGURES WILL BE SUBJECT TO ADJUSTMENT IN LIGHT OF ACTUAL NUMBERS ON ROLL AT SEPTEMBER 2003.

Outstanding Planned Maintenance

School	Category	Outstanding Planned Maintenance (OPM)	OPM per head Based on average NOR 97-02
Castle Primary	Community	13,000	56.03
Chandag Infants	Community	90,000	542.16
Chandag Junior	Community	209,500	784.64
Keynsham Primary	Community	7,500	36.23
Saltford CofE Primary	Controlled	26,350	75.72
St.John's CofE Primary, Keynsham	Controlled	97,000	419.91
Temple Primary	Community	276,000	2090.91
Totals		719,350	454.42

Notes

The figures showing the total costs of outstanding planned maintenance show only those works which are regarded as Urgent or Essential.

DfES and Property Services define Urgent as 'Work that will prevent immediate closure of premises, and/or address an immediate high risk to the health and safety of occupants and/or remedy a serious breach of legislation'

Essential is defined as 'work required within two years that will prevent serious deterioration of the fabric or services and/or address a medium risk to the health and safety of occupants and/or remedy a less serious breach of legislation.

Site & Building Areas		Proportion of required site area	Proportion of required building area
School	Category		
Castle Primary	Community	85%	105%
Chandag Infants	Community	43%	92%
Chandag Junior	Community	56%	121%
Keynsham Primary	Community	172%	202%
Saltford CofE Primary	Controlled	156%	117%
St.John's CofE Primary, Keynsham	Controlled	101%	125%
Temple Primary	Community	31%	101%

Totals			
---------------	--	--	--

Notes

An assessment of these areas forms part of the Sufficiency element of the Asset Management Plan.

Building Bulletin 82 (BB82) 'Area Guidelines for Schools' is a DfES guidance document which indicates total site and building areas required. Figures take account of the size of school and the age range covered. BB82 is in the process of being revised.

A site or building which is too small will make management of the school more problematic. A site or building that is oversized will require more resources in order to maintain it. Such resources will come from the school budget and thus leave less to allocate to direct delivery of the curriculum.

Levels of Educational and Social Deprivation

School	Category	Ward	Ward Score Educational Deprivation	Educational Deprivation Proportion of pupils from lowest quartile	Ward Score Child Poverty	Child Poverty Proportion of pupils from Lowest quartile
Castle Primary	Community	Keynsham South	2214	96.4%	4242	21.3%
Chandag Infants	Community	Keynsham East	7743	19.5%	6643	6.7%
Chandag Junior	Community	Keynsham East	7743	16.5%	6643	3.9%
Keynsham Primary	Community	Keynsham North	1783	92.5%	3429	42.2%
Saltford CofE Primary	Controlled	Saltford	7447	4.0%	7617	0.9%
St.John's CofE Primary, Keynsham	Controlled	Keynsham South	2214	90.1%	4242	19.3%
Temple Primary	Community	Keynsham North	1783	92.5%	3429	15.5%

Notes

These figures are taken from the Indices of Multiple Deprivation published by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister in 2000.

The extent of educational deprivation in a ward is assessed by considering the following;

The number of working age adults with no qualifications

The number of children aged 16 and over who are not in full-time education

The proportion of 17-19 year olds who have not successfully applied for Higher Education

KS2 primary school performance data

Primary school children with English as an additional language for 1998

Absenteeism (authorised and unauthorised) at primary level for 1998

Educational Standards 2002

School	Category	KS1 % of children Level 2c+			Key Stage 1 Comparison with other similar Schools nationally			Key Stage 2			Key Stage 2 Comparison with other similar Schools nationally		
		Reading	Writing	Maths	Reading	Writing	Maths	% Level 4+			English	Maths	Science
								English	Maths	Science			
Castle Primary	Community	71	66	74	well below E	very low E*	very low E*	70	77	80	below D	in line C	well below E
Chandag Infants	Community	98	100	97	well above A	very high A*	in line C	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Chandag Junior	Community	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	93	92	99	well above A	well above A	above B
Keynsham Primary	Community	81	63	70	in line C	well below E	very low E*	77	73	85	above B	above B	in line C
Saltford CofE Primary	Controlled	94	90	98	in line C	below D	in line C	98	98	100	well above A	well above A	very high A*
St.John's CofE Primary, Keynsham	Controlled	100	100	100	Very high A*	very high A*	very high A*	87	94	94	in line C	well above A	in line C
Temple Primary	Community	79	79	79	well below E	well below E	well below E	72	88	100	below D	well above A	very high A*
LEA Average		88	86	93				78	78	89			

KEY

A* - E* grades are based on Ofsted comparison with similar schools.

A* = Top 5% to E* = Bottom 5%

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENTS

In conjunction with sufficiency and condition assessments, suitability assessments help in the targeting of resources where they can have the greatest effect in raising standards and maximising value for money. The assessments help in identifying any need for additional accommodation and for improvements to, or removal of, existing accommodation.

The definitions below will assist readers in assessing the scale of the suitability problems faced by the schools within this Review.

All data is based on assessments undertaken during the Autumn Term 2002-2003

Category A - Unable to teach curriculum.

This is most likely to be associated with numbers and types of teaching spaces available. There should be enough appropriate spaces to accommodate all pupils for the whole of the curriculum

Category B - Teaching methods inhibited. Unsuitability of spaces may mean that schools' preferred teaching methods are inhibited. This may be associated with numbers and types of teaching spaces, or with the size and other aspects of spaces

Category C - Management or organisation of school affected adversely.

Unsuitability of spaces and/or the way they relate to each other may affect the organisation or management of the school

Category D - Pupil or staff morale or pupil behaviour affected adversely.

Unsuitability of spaces may affect pupil or staff morale or pupil behaviour.

School name CASTLE PRIMARY

LEA / School No. 800 / 2260

Assessment date 7.11.02

Space classification	Spaces					Direct impacts on education				H&S / Security			Comments
	Existing	Optimum	Surplus	Shortfall	Impact	A	B	C	D	High	Medium	Low	
1 General teaching	8	8					4						Undersized
2 Science													
3 IT	1	1					1						Undersized
4 Art													
5 Technology													
6 Music													
7 Drama													
8 PE													
9 SEN			1		1	C			1				
10 Private study													
11 Hall	1	1											
12 Library		1		1	B		1						
13 Resource areas	1			1									
14 Common room													
15 Practical (Other)	1			1									
16 Group (Other)		1		1	C			1					
17 Miscellaneous (Other)													

18 **Teaching spaces** 12 13 2 3 6 2

	Spaces			Direct impacts on education				H&S / Security			Comments
	Surplus	Shortfall	Impact	A	B	C	D	High	Medium	Low	
19 Staff and admin spaces							5				Staffrm/offices/undersized/inadeq vent in toi
20 Pupil changing / toilets							1				Inadequate ventilation & light
21 Teaching storage		2	C			2					No PE /chair storage
22 Kitchen / dining							1			1	Poor floor/open trough drains
23 Ancillary / circulation							1	1		1	Scissor action window closers throughout school/MI under/no security system on bldg

24 **Non-teaching spaces** 2 2 8 1 2

25 Playing fields							1				Playing field floods in winter
26 Hard surfaced play areas										3	Storm drains/uneven paving/concrete bases/hazards
27 Soft landscaped areas											
28 Access roads and paths										1	Storm drain trip hazard
29 Car parking									1		No segregation between car park & Infant pl

30 **External areas** 1 1 4

31 **Provision for disabilities and special educational needs**

School name CHANDAG INFANT

LEA / School No. **800 / 2258**

Assessment date **9.09.02**

Space classification	Spaces					Direct impacts on education				H&S / Security			Comments
	Existing	Optimum	Surplus	Shortfall	Impact	A	B	C	D	High	Medium	Low	
1 General teaching	6	6							1				Classrooms overheat in summer
2 Science													
3 IT		1		1	B		1						
4 Art													
5 Technology													
6 Music													
7 Drama													
8 PE													
9 SEN	1	1											
10 Private study													
11 Hall	1	1											
12 Library		1		1	B		1						
13 Resource areas													
14 Common room													
15 Practical (Other)													
16 Group (Other)		1		1	C			1					
17 Miscellaneous (Other)													
18 Teaching spaces	8	11		3		2	1	1					

	Spaces			Direct impacts on education				H&S / Security			Comments
	Surplus	Shortfall	Impact	A	B	C	D	High	Medium	Low	
19 Staff and admin spaces							3				Overheat in summer
20 Pupil changing / toilets											
21 Teaching storage						1					Inadequate hall storage
22 Kitchen / dining											
23 Ancillary / circulation		1	C			1				1	No MI room/no entry system on main door
24 Non-teaching spaces		1			2	3				1	
25 Playing fields										1	Site boundary not secure
26 Hard surfaced play areas											
27 Soft landscaped areas											
28 Access roads and paths											
29 Car parking											
30 External areas										1	
31 Provision for disabilities and special educational needs											

School name **CHANDAG JUNIOR**

LEA / School No. **800** / **2242**

Assessment date **9.09.02**

Space classification	Spaces					Direct impacts on education				H&S / Security			Comments
	Existing	Optimum	Surplus	Shortfall	Impact	A	B	C	D	High	Medium	Low	
1 General teaching	8	9		1	A	1							
2 Science													
3 IT	1	1										1	In temporary classroom. H&S (fire) and security issues.
4 Art													
5 Technology													
6 Music	1		1									1	In temporary classroom. H&S (fire) and security issues.
7 Drama													
8 PE													
9 SEN		1		1	C			1					
10 Private study													
11 Hall	1	1											
12 Library	1	1					1						Undersized and poor location on circulation route
13 Resource areas													
14 Common room													
15 Practical (Other)													
16 Group (Other)		1		1	C			1					
17 Miscellaneous (Other)	1		1										Kiln room

18 Teaching spaces	13	14	2	3	1	1	2					2
---------------------------	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	--	--	--	--	---

	Spaces			Direct impacts on education				H&S / Security			Comments		
	Surplus	Shortfall	Impact	A	B	C	D	High	Medium	Low			
19 Staff and admin spaces						2							Secretary's office undersized
20 Pupil changing / toilets		1	C			1					1		Basins outside pupil WCs (8 classrooms). No pupil changing rooms.
21 Teaching storage		1	C			2							PE equipment/chair store inadequate. Central storage inadequate.
22 Kitchen / dining													
23 Ancillary / circulation													

24 Non-teaching spaces		2				5					1
-------------------------------	--	---	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	---

25 Playing fields											2		Site perimeter not secure. Playingfield detached (emergency procedure)
26 Hard surfaced play areas													
27 Soft landscaped areas													
28 Access roads and paths													
29 Car parking							1						Inadequate carparking

30 External areas							1				2
--------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	---

31 Provision for disabilities and special educational needs													
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

School name

KEYNSHAM PRIMARY

LEA / School No.

800 / 2241

Assessment date

8.11.02

Space classification	Spaces					Direct impacts on education				H&S / Security			Comments
	Existing	Optimum	Surplus	Shortfall	Impact	A	B	C	D	High	Medium	Low	
1 General teaching	9	6	3						3			1	Poor environment/fire doors do not operate efficiently
2 Science													
3 IT	1	1											
4 Art													
5 Technology													
6 Music													
7 Drama													
8 PE													
9 SEN		1		1	C			1					GT Space 52 used as SEN
10 Private study													
11 Hall	1	1											
12 Library	1	1											
13 Resource areas	1		1										
14 Common room													
15 Practical (Other)	2		2										
16 Group (Other)	1	1											
17 Miscellaneous (Other)													GT Space 25 used as Special Therapeutic Facility

18 Teaching spaces	16	11	6	1			1	3				1
--------------------	----	----	---	---	--	--	---	---	--	--	--	---

	Spaces			Direct impacts on education				H&S / Security			Comments		
	Surplus	Shortfall	Impact	A	B	C	D	High	Medium	Low			
19 Staff and admin spaces							4						Offices/toilet undersized/lack of privacy toilet
20 Pupil changing / toilets													
21 Teaching storage		2	C			2							No PE/chair stores in hall
22 Kitchen / dining							2				1		Open drain in kitchen/damp in kitchen/toilet
23 Ancillary / circulation						1	1				1		MI remote location/entrance lobby/ poor environment/mat well trip hazard

24 Non-teaching spaces		2				3	7				2
------------------------	--	---	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	--	---

25 Playing fields						1							Playing field floods in winter/hard in summer
26 Hard surfaced play areas													
27 Soft landscaped areas													
28 Access roads and paths											1		Cracked step in Reception play area/hazard
29 Car parking										1			No pupil/vehicular segregation

30 External areas						1					1	1
-------------------	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	---	---

31 Provision for disabilities and special educational needs												
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

School name

ST JOHN'S CE PRIMARY, KEYNSHAM

LEA / School No.

800 / 3094

Assessment date

4.10.02

Space classification	Spaces					Direct impacts on education				H&S / Security			Comments
	Existing	Optimum	Surplus	Shortfall	Impact	A	B	C	D	High	Medium	Low	
1 General teaching	8	8											
2 Science													
3 IT		1		1	B		1						
4 Art													
5 Technology													
6 Music													
7 Drama													
8 PE													
9 SEN		1		1	C			1					
10 Private study													
11 Hall	1	1											
12 Library		1		1	B		1						
13 Resource areas													
14 Common room													
15 Practical (Other)													
16 Group (Other)		1		1	C			1					
17 Miscellaneous (Other)													

18 Teaching spaces

9	13		4	2	2			
---	----	--	---	---	---	--	--	--

	Spaces			Direct impacts on education				H&S / Security			Comments
	Surplus	Shortfall	Impact	A	B	C	D	High	Medium	Low	
19 Staff and admin spaces							3				Undersized
20 Pupil changing / toilets							7			5	Poor environment/no ventilated lobbies
21 Teaching storage						1					Inadequate storage
22 Kitchen / dining											
23 Ancillary / circulation							5			4	Location of drink fountains/poor environment

24 Non-teaching spaces

		1	15			9
--	--	---	----	--	--	---

25 Playing fields								1			Site boundary not secure
26 Hard surfaced play areas								1	3		Manholes,,no handrails to steps/play area/m posts
27 Soft landscaped areas								1			Reception access grass area unprotected from car park
28 Access roads and paths								1	1		Steps next to boiler house/height of paths from grass
29 Car parking											

30 External areas

					3	5
--	--	--	--	--	---	---

31 Provision for disabilities and special educational needs

--	--	--	--	--

School name

SALTFORD PRIMARY

LEA / School No.

800 / 3102

Assessment date

25.10.02

Space classification	Spaces					Direct impacts on education				H&S / Security			Comments
	Existing	Optimum	Surplus	Shortfall	Impact	A	B	C	D	High	Medium	Low	
1 General teaching	12	12					3		2				Undersized/temperature control
2 Science													
3 IT		1		1	B		1						
4 Art													
5 Technology													
6 Music	1		1										
7 Drama													
8 PE													
9 SEN	1	1											
10 Private study													
11 Hall	1	1											
12 Library	1	1					1						Undersized
13 Resource areas													
14 Common room													
15 Practical (Other)		1		1	C			1					
16 Group (Other)	1	1											
17 Miscellaneous (Other)	1		1										

18 Teaching spaces

18	18	2	2		5	1	2			
----	----	---	---	--	---	---	---	--	--	--

	Spaces			Direct impacts on education				H&S / Security			Comments
	Surplus	Shortfall	Impact	A	B	C	D	High	Medium	Low	
19 Staff and admin spaces		1	C			1	6			2	No st wrksp/admin & st undersz/no vent lob tlts
20 Pupil changing / toilets							9				Poor environment
21 Teaching storage		1	C			2					Inadequate gen storage/no PE store
22 Kitchen / dining							1			1	Poor flooring
23 Ancillary / circulation		1	C			2				1	No MI room/narrow corridor

24 Non-teaching spaces

	3			5	16			4
--	---	--	--	---	----	--	--	---

25 Playing fields									2	No security entry syst on bldg/bound not sec
26 Hard surfaced play areas					1				1	Inadequate hpa/trip hazards grass to hpa
27 Soft landscaped areas										
28 Access roads and paths									1	Uneven paving/trip hazards
29 Car parking										

30 External areas

		1					4
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	---

31 Provision for disabilities and special educational needs

--	--	--	--

School name **TEMPLE PRIMARY**

LEA / School No. **800 / 2253**

Assessment date **16.09.02**

Space classification	Spaces					Direct impacts on education				H&S / Security			Comments
	Existing	Optimum	Surplus	Shortfall	Impact	A	B	C	D	High	Medium	Low	
1 General teaching	8	6	2				2		2			1	Undersized/temperature control/trailing lead
2 Science													
3 IT		1		1	B		1						
4 Art													
5 Technology													
6 Music													
7 Drama													
8 PE													
9 SEN	2	1	1										School is split site
10 Private study													
11 Hall	1	1					1						School is split site/GT Space 59 used as 2nd Hall
12 Library	2	1	1										School is split site
13 Resource areas													
14 Common room													
15 Practical (Other)													
16 Group (Other)		1		1	C			1					GT Space 42 used as Group/After School R
17 Miscellaneous (Other)													

18 **Teaching spaces** 13 11 4 2 4 1 2 1

	Spaces			Direct impacts on education				H&S / Security			Comments
	Surplus	Shortfall	Impact	A	B	C	D	High	Medium	Low	
19 Staff and admin spaces							9				No ventilation/heating/no ventilated lobbies
20 Pupil changing / toilets											
21 Teaching storage						1					Lack of PE storage on Junior Site
22 Kitchen / dining											
23 Ancillary / circulation		2	C			2			1		Split school -no MI room on either site

24 **Non-teaching spaces** 2 3 9 1

25 Playing fields					1					2	No PFL/grass/front bound hazardous/side insecure
26 Hard surfaced play areas										1	Steps trip hazard to mobile on Junior site
27 Soft landscaped areas										1	Pond not fenced
28 Access roads and paths											
29 Car parking							1				No car parking on either site

30 **External areas** 1 1 4

31 **Provision for disabilities and special educational needs** 4

CORRECTIONS REQUESTED AND LEA RESPONSE

Following queries from a small number of stakeholders the LEA revisited the data regarding levels of recruitment against Standard Number. A revised sheet is now included.

Following an exchange of e-mails as a test of the revised data the following was received from Temple Primary School.

'I have looked at the figures on the new spreadsheet and they appear to be correct for Temple except that our 2003 SN should be 30 not 35 which makes our (level of recruitment) 80%.

The LEA is grateful for the assistance of this particular school in checking revised data at short notice. However, the Standard Number for the school in 2003 remains at 35 and not 30 as stated.

Castle Primary

Please note actual number on roll 224 with another pupil due to start next Monday 13th October. Please amend data accordingly with no other amendments recommended.

Noted. No change made to data. Numbers on roll for all schools are taken from the September Pupil Count undertaken on 17th September.

Chandag Junior

Numbers on Roll

Sept 06 – we predict we will have **279** on roll, made up of Y3 68 Y4 68 Y5 68 Y6 75 (Still under the old PAN)
Surplus places therefore **-39**

Levels of recruitment

These % are based on our old number of 75, we usually had places in Y3 Y4 and always had 75 in Y5 Y6. Now that we have taken this into account and reduced our PAN to 68 we anticipate, because of our popularity and that of the Wellsway catchment area, that we will always fill our 68 places in every year group. The % will therefore be 100 % from 04 onwards. This won't be in your predicted numbers as many people move into the estate during KS2 and you can't predict that. On our past experience we feel that by reducing our schools pupil number from 300 to 272 the school will always be full. NB We are 288 at present.

Both comments noted. No change made. These are probably reasonable predictions but not (yet) facts.

Planned maintenance

£209,500 obviously looks a great deal and I hope people looking at this will be encouraged to visit the schools and see for themselves the high quality of accommodation provided, because on paper you might judge our school as being in a poor state of repair, which is not true.

Noted. No change requested or made.

Site & Building Areas

Was our joint ownership of the Wellsway sports field taken into consideration here? We do have access to fantastic sports areas and this is a real plus point for our school.

Use of areas at other schools is not taken into account. No change made.

Suitability Assessments

Improvements made since this was written:

- Additional secretarial office made, this is shared with the Deputy Head Teacher
- New resources room created out of an old first aid room
- Disabled toilet area is now a well equipped first aid and medical room
- New car park has been made, which now offers ample car spaces, including disabled parking and a segregated pedestrian pathway.

Noted. No changes made to the Suitability Assessment included in the document but these changes MUST be taken into account during the review process.

In addition I would also like to state that by reducing our School pupil number from a possible **300 to 272** (when the full PAN comes into effect) I feel we have already helped to reduce surplus places without damaging the special nature of our school.

Noted. No change requested or made.

Keynsham Primary

A change inserted by the LEA. The site size has been reduced by 2950m² as a result of the construction of the Neighbourhood Nursery on this site.

Temple Primary

Comment from Councillor Charles Gerrish

On the page headed **Levels of Educational and Social Deprivation** Temple Primary School is shown in Keynsham East. It is, in fact in Keynsham North.

Noted. Change made following reference to Office of National Statistics website. Council website shows that main school site is in Keynsham East.

Page 3.

3.3 There is still some building planned at Cadburys, Cannocks and St. Johns Court which will have housing incorporated.

Noted. A clarification has been inserted in this section.

NUMBERS ON ROLL, FORECAST AND SURPLUS PLACES – The corrections to Actual places Sep 03 and Surplus places Sep 03 have been made, but no alterations have been made to the Sep 06 forecast. The figures in this column must be wrong as they are based on a historical average which will be altered by the changes to the Sep 03 actual.

Correct. Reference to individual school forecasts has been deleted from the document.

OUTSTANDING PLANNED MAINTENANCE

£43,000 has been allocated for roof replacement. This year much work has been carried out to make the roof good and I would question the need to class it as either Urgent or Essential.

£1,000 has been allocated to remove a chimney. The chimney is clearly not dangerous or it would have been removed and as it has stood on the skyline quite happily for at least a hundred years.

£11,000 has been allocated for replacement windows and doors at the junior site. The school has paid to replace the worst doors and so I would set the figure for the remaining window repair at £3,000.

£130,000 has been determined for boiler replacement (intriguing that this figure was £50,000 the year before). Work has commenced on one boiler so I assuming this figure can be halved.

£44,000 has been allocated for circuit replacement. This work has been started and will be completed by Christmas.

This brings the OPM down to £115,000 and the amount per head to £871.21

Noted. At present, the Revenue Services Manager in Property & Legal Services has stated "I have looked at Adrienne's comment and my observations are as follows:

1) Numerous defects to the roof at Bath Hill are identified in the Condition report and it appears in a poor state. We have dealt with repeated calls to attend leaks and while I am pleased that these appear successful for the time being my recommendation is that it remains an essential item in the programme.

2) Removing the chimney is not based on H&S considerations but removing possible sources of rainwater penetration into the building. If approved it would be incorporated with the roofing works above.

3) I am not aware of the windows replaced by the school at the Junior site to determine the impact on the identified budget

4) The £130K is to replace boilers at both sites as they are at the end of their design life. There are no programme works proceeding on boilers at present but I am investigating to see if any emergency repairs/renewals have been ordered.

5) Rewiring works are proceeding at the Infant Annexe but I do not believe that funding is sufficient to also address the needs for Bath Hill.

A structured visit was carried out at the school in June and no changes were proposed to the list of outstanding and planned maintenance at that time. Because of the specific points raised I suggest a surveyor visits the sites during the half-term break to confirm the general condition of the roof and reassess the number of windows and doors to be replaced. I will then write to you and confirm my comments".

Further analysis will be undertaken if further action is approved.

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENTS

- General Teaching – 7 classes is optimum not 6, additional class is used as a hall because of split-site. The temperature control and trailing leads issues will be resolved this term, work has already started.

Suitability Assessments for each school were sent to the Headteacher.

- IT – upgrading of facilities is taking place

Noted.

- SEN/LIBRARY – we need these spaces, it is not surplus. I imagine if floor space were taken into account our two SEN spaces and LIBRARY spaces would equal other schools SEN/LIBRARY spaces.

Suitability Assessments for each school were sent to the Headteacher.

- PLAYING FIELD – we use the park adjacent to school.

Noted. No change made.

- PLAY AREAS – trip hazard removed

Noted. As with the suitability improvements made by Chandag Junior (see above) all changes that address suitability issues must be taken into account as part of the Review.

Opinions on the advantages or disadvantages of using a public park as a school playing field, the requirement or otherwise for a number of classrooms in excess of that suggested by the number on roll play no part at this stage of the Review.

COMMUNITY USE

- The infant department let facilities to the Kookaburra Kids Club which is an after-school and holiday club facility. The school gains approximately £2,500 per annum in letting fees.
- The junior department is used for occasional lettings.

Noted

OTHER COMMENTS

Page 4

5.2 We agree and therefore feel that the chart entitled 'Educational Standards' should be "augmented with other information" such as the data on NO OF STATEMENTS/ SEN / EAL. The DfES do this in their performance tables and so the data is readily available at www.dfes.gov.uk/cgi-bin/performanceables

Noted. Development of the presentation of this data will be considered if further action is approved.

Site and Building Area

New neighbourhood nursery will have an impact on Keynsham Primary's figures.

Agreed. See note regarding Keynsham Primary above

The review makes no reference to the community use of buildings and yet this obviously influences best value. The financial tables do not take account of income raised by schools through letting of premises etc.

This is correct. It was not the intention of this document to incorporate this data. The precise extent and nature of community use at each school should be incorporated in Version 2 providing such information is passed to the LEA.

The review makes no attempt to examine the unique character of each school. Parents choose schools for particular reasons and not just because one is closest to where they live. This needs to be explored. It is important that any action taken does not restrict parental choice in Keynsham.

This is correct. It was not the intention at this stage of the process to examine the character of each school. The first stage of the Review is an information-gathering and fact-checking exercise only.

A REVIEW OF PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN THE KEYNSHAM AREA

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Aims and Objectives

The aims of the Review are to:

- Maintain and improve educational standards
- Maximise the use of existing resources (land, buildings and funding)
- Minimise management costs
- Increase access to high quality facilities for children, staff and the community
- Make the choice of a local school the natural and easy choice for parents

1578 children attend the seven schools covered by this Review. 38 of these pupils are part-time nursery pupils. The full-time equivalent is therefore 1559.

Of these 1578 children over 95% live within Keynsham or Saltford. A small number of pupils come from Bath and from surrounding villages. There is some cross-border movement but this is not materially significant in this context.

It is reasonable to conclude that the population trends in Keynsham and Saltford will be the key determining factor when looking at future education needs.

Population Trends

The birth rate in the wards of Keynsham East, North and South and Saltford show a sharp fall. Data obtained from the Primary Care Trust (PCT) and valid at April 2003 shows the following:

Ages at April 2003	Year of Entry	Numbers of Children
Aged 4	2003	198
Aged 3	2004	170
Aged 2	2005	191
Aged 1	2006	165
Under 1	2007	126

A breakdown of these figures shows that Saltford is experiencing the most dramatic fall in numbers and at April 2003 had 16 children aged under 1 within the ward. This should be compared with the 42 four year olds in the ward at April 2003 and shows a fall of over 60%.

Making an allowance of 5% for pupils outside these wards, a further allowance of 5% for the maximum desirable flexibility within schools, and including an allowance for the building of perhaps 100 new houses in Keynsham between now and the end of the decade leads to a figure of 144 children per year requiring a school place.

The organisational impact of the decline in pupil numbers

A form of entry is 30 so we could proceed on the basis of 5 forms of entry ($5 \times 30 = 150$) in the area. At present we offer 240 places for new entrants to school per year or the equivalent of eight forms of entry.

There are seven primary year groups and thus by 2007, providing the data from the PCT is robust, we should have 1050 (7 x 150 = 1050) school places. We currently have 1673 places and therefore 623 school places could be removed.

Removal of such a large number of places cannot be achieved by simply removing unnecessary temporary buildings, mothballing buildings or through an attempt to manage declining pupil numbers at all the existing schools.

In order to ensure a closer match between numbers and places, three forms of entry could be removed through the closure and resizing of schools.

Castle Primary School has a relatively stable intake, generally fills over 80% of its places each year, presents no fundamental condition or suitability problems and is located on a site which, whilst undersized, is generally acceptable in terms of the ability of the school to deliver the whole curriculum. By 2007 as numbers decline the capacity of Castle Primary could be reduced to 210 from its current level of 240. This removes 30 places and may provide the opportunity to address certain suitability issues. However, the place of the school in the 'bigger picture' needs to be carefully considered.

Chandag Infant School / Chandag Junior School share a site albeit in separate buildings. At present, the combined number on roll of the schools is in excess of the maximum desirable size for an all-through primary school. As the decline in pupil numbers begins to have its effect it could be an opportunity to amalgamate these schools. This will minimise management costs and release resources for direct delivery. There is no reason to believe that there would be a negative effect on standards through implementation of this proposal. The potential for creating this new primary school in a new building on the Chandag Infant site merits further investigation.

Keynsham Primary School has experienced a dramatic fall in pupil numbers. Numbers at September 2003 are just 44% of those at September 1997. The school is located on a site large enough to accommodate a school twice the planned size. The costs per head are well above the average for the area and for the Authority as a whole.

In the interests of ensuring that resources are used as effectively as possible it is sensible to maintain and extend the use of this site. An additional factor supporting this is that a new Neighbourhood Nursery is to be built on land immediately adjacent to the existing school. The level of unfilled places at the school will rise if present trends and admission patterns continue and this is unsustainable. However, the place of the school in the 'bigger picture' needs to be carefully considered and the potential for locating a larger (up to two form entry) school on this site could be considered.

St John's CE Primary School is located on an adequate site in buildings which are slightly larger than is desirable but this does not present a significant drain on resources. Unit costs and levels of achievement are considered to be satisfactory or better. The suitability problems at the school can be resolved through the normal process of assessment for inclusion in the Capital Programme. The planned decline in admission levels, following the implementation of a new planned admission number in September 2004, is sustainable in the medium and longer term. There appears to be no reason to propose any changes at this school.

Salford CE Primary School is located on a very large site. This represents a drain on resources and consideration should be given to rationalising the site. The buildings are a little oversized but not to such an extent as to cause unmanageable problems. The school presents no significant suitability problems. The decline in pupil numbers in Salford needs to be monitored carefully and a planned reduction in capacity should be considered over the medium term.

Temple Primary School is located on two sites separated by a main road. Neither site is particularly suitable and, overall, the sites are grossly undersized. There is no school playing field and there are a number of other suitability problems which are difficult to resolve on the existing site and in the existing buildings. Consideration could be given to relocating this school as part of an amalgamation and school renewal scheme. Once again, the place of the school in the 'bigger picture' needs to be carefully considered.

ACTION REQUIRED

Prepare detailed forecasts of pupil numbers for this area are prepared using PCT data as a base.

Examine the location of existing pupils and pre-school children in order to predict more accurately the likely areas of need.

Consider whether it is defensible or reasonable to make no changes to provision in Keynsham and Salford.

Consider the costs and benefits of a major exercise which removes the absolute maximum number of surplus places.

Consider whether a combination option can be developed which adheres to the following principles:

- a) Acceptance by all stakeholders that some schools will close.
- b) Acceptance by all stakeholders that some surplus capacity will remain untouched in the medium to long term.
- c) Acceptance by all stakeholders that further action may be required, in the form of closure(s) in the medium to long term if the decline in numbers continues at the present rate.
- d) A recognition that some existing sites and buildings are fundamentally unsuited to modern day school provision.
- e) A clear understanding of the fact that the Review may allow us the chance to improve facilities and opportunities for all.