

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**  
**CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE COMMITTEE**

**4.00pm 15 OCTOBER 2012**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor Shanks (Chair)

**Also in attendance:** Councillor Buckley (Deputy Chair), Duncan, Gilbey, Mac Cafferty, Lepper, Pissaridou, Pidgeon, Simson and Wealls (Opposition Spokesperson)

Non-Voting Co-optees: Chief Superintendent Bartlett, Sussex Police; Eleanor Davies, Parent Forum; Rachel Travers, Amaze/Voluntary and Community Sector; Geraldine Hoban, Clinical and Commissioning Group : Alan Bedford, Local Safeguarding Children Board and Soaad Eldayok, Youth Council

**PART ONE**

**12. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**12(a) Declaration of Substitutes**

12.1 Councillor Duncan was present in substitution for Councillor Powell, Councillor Mac Cafferty was present in substitution for Councillor A Kitcat and Councillor Pidgeon was present in substitution for Councillor Brown.

**12(b) Declarations of Interest**

12.2 There were none.

**12(c) Exclusion of Press and Public**

12.3 In accordance with section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 ('the Act'), the Community Safety Forum considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during an item of business on the grounds that it was likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press or public were present during that item, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information (as defined in section 100A(3) of the Act) or exempt information (as defined in section 100I of the Act).

- 12.4 **RESOLVED** – That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of item 24 on the agenda which was exempt under categories 2 and 3 of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended.

**13. MINUTES**

- 13.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Chair be authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2012 as a correct record.

**14. CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS****Services for Young People; Joint Commissioning Strategy. (JCG)**

- 14.1 The Chair explained that in January 2012, The Children's Member's Committee agreed the Services for Young People's Joint Commissioning Strategy and gave the DCS the mandate to implement the actions. To date the progress had been as follows:

**Joint Commissioning**

- 14.2 The Youth Joint Commissioning Board was now operating and in the process of mapping and reviewing the joint agendas. The Young People's JCG have overseen the youth funding agreement and secured additional funding from Arts work to invest in additional arts and culture activities.

**Youth Work and Youth Delivery**

- 14.3 The Commissioner, In House Youth Service and existing Community and Voluntary providers had finalised and tested the final performance framework and neighbourhood delivery following a co-production approach. In March 2012, the Children's Commissioning team placed the advert for the delivery of youth work and youth provision following a funding agreement process. We had a number of providers who expressed an interest and at the first selection process, two applicants were taken forward. We then entered a negotiation period with each applicants who spent time with the evaluation panel, arts and culture leads and young people.
- 14.4 At the end of September the successful candidate was chosen and the final agreement was signed Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> October. The successful candidate was The Youth Collective, which was led by Impact Initiatives who partners with Sussex Central YMCA, Hangleton and Knoll Project, Tarnerland, Brighton Youth Centre, The Crew Club, the Dean's and the Trust for Developing Communities. A new contract and performance framework had been finalised. and a conditional agreement was in place to increase apprenticeships as part of the contract.

**Participation**

- 14.5 The Youth Council had been part of the funding agreement process and had agreed the Quality assurance framework to be implemented across statutory and voluntary youth provision and was in the process of recruiting a youth mayor.

**Talk Health**

- 14.6 The Chair stated that this very successful event had taken place recently and details about which were available on the Amaze website. Rachel Travers, Amaze stated that her organisation had been pleased at the response from Councillors, the website contained a great of detail as input had been received from around 150 parents and carers

**15. CALL OVER**

15.1 It was agreed that all items would be reserved for discussion.

**16. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

**16a. Petitions**

16.1 There were none.

**16b. Written Questions**

16.2 There were none.

**16c. Deputations**

16.3 There were none.

**17. MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

**17a Petitions**

17.1 There were none.

**17b Written Questions**

17.2 There were none.

**17c Letters**

17.3 There were none.

**17d. Notices of Motion**

17.4 There were none.

**18. ANNUAL REPORT ON BRIGHTON & HOVE MUSIC EDUCATION HUB**

18.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, People informing them of progress and development of the Brighton and Hove Music Education Hub (BHMEH) and to approve the proposed Business Plan.

18.2 It was noted that Mr Andrew Comben had been invited to attend the meeting by the Chair in order to speak about music in Brighton and Hove and the work to be delivered by hub from his perspective. The range of partnerships which had been entered into had received positive feedback from the Arts Council England (ACE) and had contributed towards the success of their grant application. Ace had issued a draft relationship framework which had been required from music hubs. At the present time this document

was being reviewed by the DfE Star Chamber Scrutiny Board. It was expected that the final document would be circulated in the near future to all hub leads. The existing service had data collection and evaluation systems in place, however, the draft framework represented a significant shift as the data and written information would need to be collated across hub activity. The strength of Brighton and Hove's bid had been fully recognised by ACE who had especially highlighted the innovative approach to partnership working, our rigorous focus on addressing the needs of children and young people and the range of creative and musical developments that would not have been possible without the dynamic range of partners and clarity of vision.

- 18.3 Councillor Pissaridou welcomed the report and the work which had been undertaken enquiring regarding the levels of subsidy which were available. It was explained that these were comprehensive, high levels of subsidy were available to children of families of children defined as being in "hardship". First access was free to all children at the point of contact. It was explained that work was to be undertaken to look at prioritising subsidies to different groups of children. The challenge was to draw in more children. The range of work to be provided by the hub was wider than service delivery alone and although at an early stage further work would be undertaken as this rolled out.
- 18.4 In answer to questions by Rachel Travers it was explained that as the hub would provide the opportunity for a greater range of activity than in the past, further work would be carried out to seek to identify how support could best be given to SEN children.
- 18.5 Councillor Wealles stated that he hoped that the greater potential opportunities for private sponsorship would be fully utilised. It was explained that it was intended to call upon the fund raising expertise of hub partners in this respect.
- 18.6 Councillor Mac Cafferty explained by virtue of his involvement with Brighton Music Trust he could confirm that the hub's inception had been greeted with a lot of excitement as it was considered it had a great deal of potential.
- 18.7 **RESOLVED** - That the Committee notes the progress and development of the Brighton and Hove Music and Education Hub as outlined in the report and approves the draft Business Plan (Appendix 1) to the report.

## 19. ANNUAL REPORT ON SCHOOL ATTENDANCE, ACCESS AND EXCLUSIONS

- 19.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, People which provided information including data on school attendance, access to education and exclusions for all children and young people in Brighton and Hove
- 19.2 A presentation was given focusing on positive elements and on areas which required further work. All schools now had responsibility for recording, monitoring and addressing nonattendance. Secondary schools including the two academies had employ their own staff who worked directly with pupils, parents, carers and other agencies to support young people to support young people to attend school regularly. The local authority had provided these staff with appropriate training and resources to undertake this work and would continue to provide advice and guidance on all matters relating to school attendance. Primary schools were also working with the local authority to put in place

appropriate strategies to continue to build on the good attendance levels in the city's primary schools.

- 19.3 Councillor Lepper noted the figures for exclusions querying whether unofficial exclusions were illegal. It was confirmed that they were and that if the LEA became aware of instances of this schools were challenged. Officers tried to drill down into the figures to see whether patterns were emerging. Exclusion should not be used as a response to persistent low level disruption or where pupils were struggling in main stream education.
- 19.4 Rachel Travers Amaze/VSO referred to the work carried out by CYPOSC and was pleased to note the work that was being carried forward to seek to avoid permanent exclusions. It would be helpful to receive a more detailed break down of these figures if available. There was a need to be more creative in this respect and to link with the stronger families/ stronger communities work being carried out.
- 19.5 Councillor Wealles referred to the number of persistent absences (20%), that this figure appeared to be high and he enquired regarding measures taken to reduce this figure. It was explained that this figure related to all absences, including sickness, and authorised absences. However schools were encouraged to use a robust approach and to appoint a member of their governing board to take responsibility for leading on this issue.
- 19.6 Councillor Gilbey referred to the work being undertaken in relation to referrals for children missing education. It was clarified that this related to children and families who did not willingly engage with the education system, these were not children who were without a school place. Eleanor Davies, Parent Forum referred to the work which she was aware was being undertaken to address disengagement and truancy in Year 11 pupils.
- 19.7 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee note the information contained in the Annual Report on School Attendance, Access and Exclusions.

## **20. OPTIONS FOR PROVIDING ADDITIONAL SCHOOL PLACES BETWEEN SEPTEMBER 2013 AND SEPTEMBER 2016**

- 20.1 The Committee considered a report of Interim Director of Children's Services setting out options for providing additional school places between September 2013 and September 2016. It was noted that a revised copy of the report had been circulated as a supplement and it was to this report which members needed to refer.
- 20.2 The Strategic Commissioner Planning and Contracts explained that extra classes were being added to many schools across the Country in order to cope with a rapid rise in the birth rate particularly in the South East. Official figures showed that an extra 450,000 places would be needed in primary schools in England by 2015. Brighton and Hove had identified a similar trend to other authorities and had been working in recent years to expand schools.
- 20.3 Current and projected pupil numbers for the city as a whole showed that there continued to be a need for additional permanent primary places in the city, particularly in the south central Hove and on the Brighton/Hove border. Current and projected pupil numbers for

the city as a whole showed that by 2016 secondary numbers would begin to exceed existing capacity. To meet the projected future growth in primary numbers the LEA needed to be looking to provide a minimum of 120 places by 2015 in Hove, and a further 30 places in the south of Brighton by 2014. To meet the projected future growth in secondary pupil numbers the authority should be looking to provide a minimum of 150 places by 2017. The report set out the options available to meet the increase in demand for pupil places in the city and asked the Committee for permission to formally consult on the following permanent expansions at :

### 2013

- The Connaught Building, West Hove Infants (from 3 FE to 4 FE)
- Stanford Infants (from 3 FE to 4FE);

### 2014

- St Mark's C.C. Primary (from 1 FE to 2 FE)
- Aldrington C.E. Primary (from 1 FE TO 2FE)

20.4 The Strategic Commissioner Planning and Contracts explained that the LEA were also keen to expand a number of other faith primary schools and intended to continue its discussions with both the Anglican and Catholic Diocese. The report also recommended that should these consultations go ahead that consultations also take place with the linked Junior Schools

- Stanford Junior School (from September 2016)
- Connaught Junior School (from September 2017)

20.5 The final recommendations in the report asked for agreement to continue to explore other potential opportunities with the DfE including possibilities for new primary and secondary schools and for the Committee to recommend to Full Council the publication of the updated School Organisation Plan and consultation document. All proposals would be dependent on capital funding being made available.

20.6 In answer to questions it was explained that the option of converting Hove Police Station into a school was still being actively pursued a were potential sponsorships e.g., Whitehawk Academy by City College. The Head of Capital Strategy and Development Planning explained that at present there was a shortfall of £5m, works could commence and provided full capital funding was achieved proper architect designed permanent extensions/ buildings would be provided. It was not intended to provide temporary "portacabin" style structures.

20.7 Councillor Simson referred to the requirement placed on voluntary aided schools to provide 10% of the costs of works enquiring regarding arrangements made if schools were unable to meet that. The Head of Capital Strategy and Development explained that the LA did not require voluntary sided schools to provide this sum citing the works carried out at St Nicholas School, Portslade as an example.

- 20.8 Councillor Pissaridou sought clarification that the buildings provided would be permanent extensions rather than temporary extensions/buildings. The Head of Capital Strategy and Development reiterated that dependent on the availability of funding all buildings would be architect permanent structures. There were no concrete plans as to design or siting at present but buildings were always designed as a coherent and complimentary extension to the existing, although precisely how they would be configured on site had yet to be determined.
- 20.9 Councillor Duncan enquired regarding the accuracy of the predictions given and whether they could be impacted by Government Policy in relating to funding to set up for free schools
- 20.10 The Strategic Commissioner, Planning and Contracts explained that whilst making projections was not a precise science the data collected to date was very accurate and whilst the number of places required would reduce if further free schools/academies were created, arrangements needed to put in place to ensure that a sufficient numbers of places was created in the city. The LEA was ahead in its planning, but had a responsibility to plan for 5 years ahead in the knowledge that a significant number of school places would need to be created overall and in particular in those areas of the city where they were most needed.
- 20.11 Councillor Wealles enquired regarding the level of preliminary consultation which had taken place with schools, the level of further detailed consultation which would take place and whether there was a maximum size for a primary school. Councillor Wealles also referred to sites indicated in the School Organisation Plan e.g., Patcham Court Farm enquiring whether all of the sites identified represented realistic options. The Strategic Commissioner explained that whilst initial consultations had taken place the breadth of consultation required by school organisation legislation was wide and included schools, parents and a number of others. There was no maximum proscribed size for a primary school although there were concerns regarding quality of delivery of education if they became too large. It was possible that the creation of additional free schools could change the focus of where parents wished to send their children to school. The potential sites identified represented a "wish list" and further exploration as to feasibility would be undertaken. Ultimately, some of them would be deliverable and some would not.
- 20.12 Rachel Travers, Amaze/Voluntary and Community Sector stated that parents were very concerned regarding the pressure on existing school places referring to that fact that many schools were unable to hold whole school assemblies and had to have staggered lunchtimes, this could be daunting for very young children first entering school, she stated that design solutions used, for instance, separate school entrances could be effective in making schools more welcoming. Ms Travers also enquired regarding how the needs of children with special educational needs (SEN) would be factored in to future provision. The Strategic Commissioner, Planning and Contracts explained that the amount of dining/outdoor amenity space to be provided had recently been reduced downwards by government and all school lunch periods/assemblies could not be required, the area of play space to be provided per child had also been reduced recently. The provision of places at Special schools was sensitive and needed to be given careful thought. The Lead Commissioner, Schools, Skills and Learning explained

that SEN provision was assessed annually on a needs basis to ensure that effective use was made of available provision.

- 20.13 Eleanor Davies, Parent Forum asked whether the Forum would receive information and be involved in the consultation process if agreed and it was confirmed that they would.
- 20.14 Councillor Gilbey enquired whether the proposed King's school site in Portslade High Street would be 4 or 5 form entry, as information available about this matter appeared to be conflicting. The Strategic Commissioner Planning and Contracts stated information circulated (all arrangements in relation to the school yet to be confirmed and finalised), indicated that the school would admit 125 children in September 2013 with that figure rising to 150 by 2015.
- 20.15 Councillor Lepper enquired regarding the proposed architectural design arrangements and it was explained that the Council's in-house team had an established track record of designing and managing school building projects which were cost effective and resulted in schemes which were fit for purpose and complemented the existing buildings on site; the recent works at Goldstone Primary School being an example of this.
- 20.16 Councillor Pissaridou enquired regarding the potential costs involved in rebuilding as opposed to extending on an existing site referring specifically to the Hove Police Station site. It appeared that it would be cheaper to build a new school than to carry out some of the works proposed on existing sites. The Head of Capital Strategy and Development Planning explained that if site was acquired by the LEA investigations carried out had shown that the existing building could be converted for use as a school.
- 20.17 **RESOLVED** – (1) That the Committee notes the possible options for providing additional pupil places within the City and recognises that all proposals will be dependent on capital funding being made available;
- (2) That the Committee agrees that Officers will consult with schools and their communities on the proposal to permanently expand the following primary schools from September 2013 by one form of entry (FE) each;
- The Connaught Building, West Hove Infants (from 3 FE to 4 FE)
  - Stanford Infants (from 3 FE to 4 FE)
- (3) That the Committee agrees that Officers will consult the school, their community and the Anglican diocese on the proposal to permanently expand the following primary school from September 2014 by one FE
- St Mark's C.E. Primary (from 1 FE to 2 FE)
- (4) That the Committee agrees that Officers will consult with schools, their community and the Anglican diocese on the proposal to permanently expand the following primary school from September 2014 by one FE
- Aldrington CE Primary (from 1 FE to 2 FE)



(5) That the Committee agrees that Officers will consult with schools and their communities on the proposal to permanently expand the following junior schools, should their relevant infant school be expanded as proposed above by one FE each

- Stanford Junior School (from September 2016)
- “Connaught” Junior School (from September 2017)

(6) That the Committee agrees Officers will consult with schools and their communities on the proposal to expand places at Hove Park School;

(7) That The Committee recognizes that Kings School Free School (5 FE) is planned to open in September 2013 and that officers will assist the proposers in their search for a permanent site;

(8) That the Committee agrees that Officers will continue to explore other potential opportunities for primary and secondary schools. This will require engagement with the Department for Education with regards to the future provision of new schools; and

(9) **RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL** – That the Committee Recommends to Council the publication of the updated School Organisation Plan 2012 to 2016 and Consultation Document by the end of October 2012.

## 21. CHILDREN IN NEED POLICY AND CARE PLANNING FORUM

- 21.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place detailing the forum operation process for children in need policy and early care planning.
- 21.2 The Head of the Operational Social Work Service explained that children in need were defined in law as those “whose health or development could be significantly impaired without the provision of services by a local authority.” Section 17 of the Children Act 1989, as well as providing this legal definition also set a duty for local authorities both to “safeguard and promote welfare of children in need and also wherever safe and possible to promote the upbringing of children within their families”. All disabled children were by virtue of their disability, children in need and those duties applied.
- 21.3 It was further explained that this was the specific operational policy and guidance for all social working with children in need under a child in need plan. The policy was designed to sit alongside the child protection procedures.
- 21.4 Councillor Pissaridou stated that the percentage of children in need in the city, even though lower than the national average was distressingly high and measures that could be undertaken to address this were to be welcomed.
- 21.5 Councillor Gilbey referred to the guidance set out in the Public Law Outline and to the fact that it was intended that target times for proceedings appeared to have changed following amendments made to the Children Act.
- 21.6 Rachel Travers stated that it would be helpful if a charter could be written in parent friendly language similar to that used in the Amaze Parent Consultation and Charter.

21.7 **RESOLVED** - (1) That the Committee agree the Child in Need Policy can be taken to Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) and incorporated into the child protection procedures for staff; and

(2) That the Committee notes the new Care Planning Forum Process.

## 22. **NEW REFERRAL PROCESS FOR CHILDREN IN NEED TO CHILDREN'S SOCIAL WORK**

22.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, People outlining proposals to change the process of professional referral to ACAS the front door Social Work Service in Brighton and Hove. The proposal was that all professional referrals for Children in Need should in future require a family CAF process in place prior to referral being accepted. This would not apply to child protection referrals.

22.2 It was explained that the Working Together to Safeguard Children new guidance had been out for consultation until September 2012. It outlined the framework for safeguarding children and young people across the whole pathway including early help services. Brighton and Hove had signed up and committed to a whole family process of supporting families, recognising that this approach was likely to be most effective, time efficient and ultimately result in better outcomes for both children and families.

22.3 Councillor Pissaridou sought clarification regarding the mechanisms for identifying the needs of children and their families and how and by whom support could be initiated. It was explained that this could be instigated by a number of agencies, health visitors, schools, SENCO's and sometimes by families themselves.

22.4 Rachel Travers Amaze/VSA stated that she was concerned regarding the level of resource intensive work required of the voluntary sector without the levels of support being in place for them to do so. It was explained that collaboration between agencies was fostered to facilitate input by others as well as lead professionals. This was totally separate however from child protection referrals. Head teachers had indicated that they wished to be instrumental in driving this forward and to be included in a multi-agency approach to planning and integration.

22.5 Alan Bedford, Chair of the Safeguarding Children Board commended the work carried out by the Council in this respect.

28.6 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee accept the proposal that, if Family CAF numbers do not reach target levels by the end of October 2012, all professional referrals for Children in Need to Children's Social Work from 1 January 2013 would require a Family CAF process in place prior to referral being accepted. The timescale has been extended from 1 November to enable maximum consultation and discussion with partner agencies over the next three months.

## 23. **ITEMS REFERRED FOR COUNCIL**

23.1 It was agreed that item 20, "Options for Providing Additional School Places Between September 2013 and September 2016", should go forward for consideration at the

meeting of Council to be held on 25 October 2012 for approval of recommendation(9) as set out in Paragraph 2 of the report.

**24. FAMILY GROUP CONFERENCE: PROJECT REVIEW PROPOSALS**

24.1 As detailed in the Part 2 minute

The meeting concluded at 6.35pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of