

**BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL**

**CABINET MEMBER AND CHIEF OFFICER**

**FRIDAY, 27 MAY 2022 AT 00:00 HOURS**  
**IN CABINET MEMBERS OFFICE, COUNCIL HOUSE, VICTORIA**  
**SQUARE, BIRMINGHAM, B1 1BB**

**A G E N D A**

- |                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| <b><u>3 - 16</u></b>   | <p>1    <b><u>THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM SCHOOL CAPITAL MAINTENANCE - FULL BUSINESS CASE AND CONTRACT AWARD</u></b></p> <p>Report of Director for Children &amp; Families</p>  |
| <b><u>17 - 102</u></b> | <p>2    <b><u>PROPOSAL TO INCREASE PUPIL NUMBERS AND ENLARGE OSCOTT MANOR SCHOOL ONTO AN ADDITIONAL SITE</u></b></p> <p>Report of Director for Children &amp; Families</p> |



# Birmingham City Council

## Report to Cabinet Members Children, Young People and Families and Finance & Resources

27<sup>th</sup> May 2022



**Subject:** THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM SCHOOL CAPITAL MAINTENANCE – FULL BUSINESS CASE AND CONTRACT AWARD

**Report of:** Sue Harrison, Director of Children and Families

**Relevant Cabinet Member:** Cllr Karen McCarthy – Children, Young People and Families  
Cllr Yvonne Mosquito - Finance and Resources

**Relevant O &S Chair(s):** Cllr Kerry Jenkins - Education & Children's Social Care  
Cllr Akhlaq Ahmed - Resources

**Report author:** Zahid Mahmood,  
Capital Programme Manager,  
Education Infrastructure,  
Telephone No: 0121 464 9855  
Email Address: [zahid.mahmood@birmingham.gov.uk](mailto:zahid.mahmood@birmingham.gov.uk)

Are specific wards affected?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No – All wards affected
If yes, name(s) of ward(s): Sparkhill		
Is this a key decision?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, add Forward Plan Reference:		
Is the decision eligible for call-in?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, state which appendix is exempt, and provide exempt information paragraph number or reason if confidential:		

### 1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 To seek approval for the capital scheme at The City of Birmingham School. The capital costs of the scheme will not exceed £765,996.

## **2 Recommendations**

That the Cabinet Members for Children Young People and Families and for Finance and Resources:

- 2.1 Approve the capital works at The City of Birmingham School at a total project cost of up to £765,996 including Acivico professional fees of £83,876 and Education Infrastructure fees of £22,311.
- 2.2 Approve the Full Business Case appended to this report.
- 2.3 Approve the award of a contract to Graham Asset Management Ltd using Constructing West Midlands 2 (CWM2) Framework, up to the value of £621,309 for the works to commence, and to release contingencies and place further orders for unforeseen work related to the project up to £38,500 if required.
- 2.4 Approve the value of £83,876 to Acivico for professional services and statutory fees.
- 2.5 Authorise the Acting City Solicitor and Monitoring Officer to negotiate, execute and complete all necessary documents to give effect to the above recommendations.

## **3 Background**

- 3.1 The Local Authority has a statutory duty to maintain its schools in order to ensure children have a safe and secure teaching environment.
- 3.2 The City of Birmingham School has 7 teaching sites one of which is currently located at the Marywood Centre. The building at the Marywood Centre site has several condition related issues. Following detailed investigative works, it was discovered that the existing heating distribution pipework is significantly aged and corroded, the boilers are non-operational, and both need to be replaced. The centre is currently heated using temporary heating which is not a viable long-term solution as it is not cost effective and as a temporary system does not provide adequate heating.
- 3.3 The Marywood Centre does not have the capacity for the pupil numbers of 70 required at The City of Birmingham School. Once refurbished the ground floor of the Sparkhill Council House building will provide The City of Birmingham School with the required space for 70 pupils.
- 3.4 The Olive School occupied the ground floor area of the Sparkhill Council House building until May 2021. This building is owned by the Council and this area is currently vacant and ideal for educational use. During the time they occupied the building The Olive School ensured that the maintenance was kept to a good standard including refurbishment. This building is in a much better condition than the Marywood Centre, and it is best to allocate our limited resources here to provide The City of Birmingham School with a much better environment conducive to education, and on completion of the project The City of Birmingham School will relocate to the Sparkhill Council House building.
- 3.5 The cost for identified statutory testing and maintenance items has amounted to £25,000 and approval has been provided by the Head of Education Infrastructure via a form of authority.

- 3.6 The proposed works are to carry out a refurbishment of the ground floor area of the Sparkhill Council House building, including works to the grounds to create the required play area and car parking for The City of Birmingham School.
- 3.7 The works are scheduled (subject to approval) to commence in June 2022 and are anticipated to be completed by September 2022.

#### **4 Options considered and Recommended Proposal**

- 4.1 Doing nothing would mean the City Council would fail to meet its statutory obligation to maintain the school and provide a safe, secure and warm environment for the pupils at The City of Birmingham School.
- 4.2 Resources could be allocated to the Marywood Centre, however this is not the most effective use of our limited resources, and the ground floor of the Sparkhill Council House building is in much better condition and has the space required for 70 pupils required by the City of Birmingham School.
- 4.3 The recommended option is to refurbish, the ground floor area of Sparkhill Council House, previously occupied by the Olive School for use by The City of Birmingham School which will ensure the school will have a newly refurbished school in which to provide education. Once refurbished the area should provide a life span of more than 10 years and ensure educational continuity for the school, while minimising potential disruptions caused by building related issues.

#### **5 Consultation**

- 5.1 The Head teacher and governors at The City of Birmingham School have been consulted and are fully supportive of the scheme including the proposed relocation.
- 5.2 Local Ward Members for Sparkhill have been consulted and are supportive of the proposals proceeding to an executive decision.

#### **6 Risk Management**

- 6.1 Risks have been considered as part of the design process. A contingency sum has been allocated to the project as referenced in section 2.2.
- 6.2 Availability of materials and labour, with the impact of Brexit, Covid-19 and the situation in Eastern Europe, there is a risk of shortage of materials and labour. As a result, cost increases from materials and delay to programme could occur. Project meetings are held to ensure that all parties are informed of progress and that any issues and concerns are picked up at the earliest opportunity and resolution is sought to ensure the project meets the required timescales.
- 6.3 Working in a live site ensuring Health & Safety is maintained. As the designated project manager, Acivico have many years' experience at delivering large scale refurbishments of this nature and will safely co-ordinate the works in consultation with the school and EDI.

## **7 Compliance Issues:**

### **7.1 How are the recommended decisions consistent with the City Council's priorities, plans and strategies?**

- 7.1.1 These works are to ensure that all pupils are provided with a safe and secure teaching environment. The spending priorities proposed are in accordance with the Schools' Capital Maintenance Programme approved by Cabinet on 26th April 2022, and the Council's Vision and Forward Plan priorities for Children.
- 7.1.2 The value of the proposed contract is below the threshold of £4.45m ExVAT for works, and there is not the requirement for a BBC4SR action plan to be produced. However, the payment of the Real Living Wage will be a mandatory requirement for contractors.

## **8 Legal Implications**

- 8.1.1 Section 19(1) of the Education Act 1996 requires the Council to make arrangements for the provision of suitable education at school or otherwise than at school for those children of compulsory school age who, by reason of illness, exclusion from school or otherwise, may not for any period receive suitable education unless such arrangements are made for them. A school established and maintained by a local authority in England which is specially organised to provide education for such children, and is not a community or foundation school, a community or foundation special school, or a maintained nursery school, shall be known as a "pupil referral unit".
- 8.1.2 The Local Authority has a statutory duty, by virtue of section 542 of the Education Act 1996 and the School Premises (England) Regulations 2012, to ensure that maintained school buildings are maintained to a standard such that, so far as is reasonably practicable, the health, safety and welfare of pupils are ensured. This duty applies to Pupil Referral Units.
- 8.1.3 The arrangements set out in this report comply with the powers of general competence as set out in Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 and they are within the boundaries and limits of the general power of competence set out in Section 2 and 4 of the Localism Act 2011.

### **8.2 Financial Implications**

- 8.2.1 The works totalling up to £765,996 will be funded from the Schools' Capital Maintenance allocation.
- 8.2.2 Consequential revenue costs arising, including the need for additional staffing and any on-going day-to-day repair and maintenance of the asset, will be the responsibility of The City of Birmingham School and funded from the school's delegated budget.

- 8.2.3 The Marywood Centre will be declared surplus and the costs met via the surplus properties' revenue budget held by Education Infrastructure.

### **8.3 Procurement Implications (if required)**

- 8.3.1 The procurement of this contract has been undertaken and managed by Acivico Ltd.
- 8.3.2 The procurement route for delivery of this scheme was via Acivico's CWM2 Framework, Repairs & Maintenance Contract and with a mini tender exercise. Only one tender was returned within the tender time frame, this was reviewed and scrutinised by Acivico's Quantity Surveyor, Value for Money was assessed by checking rates on projects of a similar nature, current price books and BCIS rates. A Value for Money report was produced, and Acivico's Quantity Surveyor was satisfied that the tender return offered Value for Money. The contractor recommended for award is Graham Asset Management Ltd and they will work with Acivico who are acting as Project Manager.

### **8.4 Public Sector Equality Duty**

- 8.4.1 A Full Equality Analysis EQUA650 was carried out in 2021 for Education Infrastructure's Schools' Capital Programme 2021-22. The outcomes from consultation demonstrate that proposed capital developments support positive outcomes for children, young people, their families and carers. No negative impact on people with Protected Characteristics was identified. It was concluded that sufficiency of educational places and opportunities for all children and young people contributes to providing positive life chances, and supports a positive approach to Safeguarding in Birmingham: actively reducing the number of children and young people out of school helps to mitigate risk to their safety and wellbeing. We have assessed the content and can confirm that it still remains relevant to the proposed works referred to in this report by having a positive impact.

## **9 Appendices**

- 9.1 The City of Birmingham School Full Business Case.

## **10 Background Documents**

- 10.1 Schools' Capital Programme - School Condition Allocation 2022-23.





## APPENDIX

## FULL BUSINESS CASE (FBC)

## A. GENERAL INFORMATION

## A1. General

<b>Project Title</b> (as per Voyager)	<b>CITY OF BIRMINGHAM SCHOOL CAPITAL MAINTENANCE – FULL BUSINESS CASE</b>		
<b>Voyager code</b>	TBC		
<b>Portfolio /Committee</b>	Children, Young People and Families	<b>Directorate</b>	Children and Families
<b>Approved by Project Sponsor</b>	Jaswinder Didially	<b>Approved by Finance Business Partner</b>	Clare Sandland

## A2. Outline Business Case approval (Date and approving body)

Schools capital programme – School Condition Allocation, Basic Need Allocation 2022-23 Future Years Cabinet Report was approved by Cabinet on 26<sup>th</sup> April 2022.

## A3. Project Description

The project involves the refurbishment of the currently vacant ground floor area of Sparkhill Council House, previously occupied by the Olive School for use by The City of Birmingham School (COBS). COBS are currently located at the Marywood Centre and on completion of the refurbishment will relocate to the Sparkhill Council House Building.

The refurbishment will include remodelling to the requirements of the COBS, to include installation of partitions, decoration, installation of secondary glazing, the upgrade of security and electronic locks, all works associated with the fire risk assessment and statutory compliance, and the removal of asbestos and required roofing works. Works to the external areas including improvements to the boundary walls and providing the required play space and car parking.

## A4. Scope

The scope of works includes the following:

Removal of asbestos as report, carried out by Birmingham City Laboratories.

Remodelling including installation of partitions.

Decoration.

Installation of secondary glazing.

Upgrade of security and electronic locks.

All works associated with the fire risk assessment including ensuring that the fire alarm and emergency lighting are fully compliant and the required upgrade to the fire escape.

All works associated with statutory compliance including the required works to the boiler and electrical systems.

Works to external areas including providing the required play space and car parking.

Roofing works.

## A5. Scope exclusions

No works outside this scope will be undertaken

## B. STRATEGIC CASE

*This sets out the case for change and the project's fit to the Council Plan objectives*

## B1. Project objectives and outcomes

*The case for change including the contribution to Council Plan objectives and outcomes*

- Birmingham is an aspirational city to grow up in
- Birmingham is a great city to live in
- Birmingham is an entrepreneurial city to learn, work and invest in
- Enjoy and achieve by attending school;
- Schools Capital Programme
- Compliance with the requirement of the 'Birmingham Business Charter for Social Responsibility'.

## B2. Project Deliverables

*These are the outputs from the project e.g. a new building with xm2 of internal space, xm of new road, etc*

To ensure educational and operational continuity and the minimisation of long-term disruption to The City of Birmingham School by completing the refurbishment project and providing 904m<sup>2</sup> of newly refurbished space for the school.

## B3. Project Benefits

*These are the social benefits and outcomes from the project, e.g. additional school places or economic benefits.*

Measure	Impact
<i>List at least one measure associated with <b>each</b> of the objectives and outcomes in B1 above</i>	<i>What the estimated impact of the project will be on the measure identified – please quantify where practicable (e.g. for economic and transportation benefits)</i>
To allow continuation of education operations for City of Birmingham School.	Completing the refurbishment project will minimise disruption to pupils at The City of Birmingham School in the long-term, and it allows the Council to meet its statutory obligations for school's conditions.
The project delivers new teaching spaces.	Raised standards, improved behaviour, staff well-being and reduced turnover, mobility, facilitation of the sharing of good practice.
Support and enrich learning opportunities for children and young people.	On completion of the programme of works, children and young people will have a safe, warm and dry environment before, during and after school hours.
Promoting designs which support Birmingham's Education Vision.	The refurbishment will enhance teaching and learning environments that are suitable for delivering education.

## B4. Benefits Realisation Plan

*Set out here how you will ensure the planned benefits will be delivered*

The planned benefits will be delivered following completion of the refurbishment project.

## B5. Stakeholders

A stakeholder analysis is set out at G4 below.

## C. ECONOMIC CASE AND OPTIONS APPRAISAL

*This sets out the options that have been considered to determine the best value for money in achieving the Council's priorities*

### C1. Summary of options reviewed at Outline Business Case

*(including reasons for the preferred option which has been developed to FBC)*

*If options have been further developed since the OBC, provide the updated Price quality matrix and recommended option with reasons.*

- The option of doing nothing would mean the City Council failing to meet its statutory obligation to ensure that pupils at The City of Birmingham School are able to continue their learning without disruption or adequate heating.
- Resources could be allocated to the Marywood Centre, however this is not the most effective use of our limited resources, as the ground floor of the Sparkhill Council House building is in

much better condition and has the space required for 70 pupils required by the City of Birmingham School.

- The recommended option is to refurbish, the ground floor area of Sparkhill Council House, previously occupied by the Olive School for use by The City of Birmingham School (COBS) which will ensure the school will have a newly refurbished school in which to provide education. Once refurbished the area should provide a life span of more than 10 years and ensure educational continuity for the school, while minimising potential disruptions caused by building related issues.

## C2. Evaluation of key risks and issues

*The full risks and issues register is included at the end of this FBC*

- Risks have been considered as part of the design process and a contingency sum of £38,500 has been allocated to the project.
- Regular meetings are held to ensure that all parties are informed of progress to ensure any concerns are picked up at the earliest opportunity and resolved to ensure that the programme stays on track.
- City of Birmingham school are currently located in the Marywood Centre which is being heated with temporary heating to ensure the school remains operational and to provide educational continuity, to enable Birmingham City Council meets its statutory obligations.
- Working in a live site and ensuring Health & Safety is maintained. As the designated project manager, Acivico have many years' experience at delivering large scale refurbishment projects of this nature and will safely co-ordinate the works in consultation with COBS, and EDI.
- A project risk register will be maintained.

## C3. Other impacts of the preferred option

*Describe other significant impacts, both positive and negative*

- The City of Birmingham School are currently located in the Marywood Centre which is being heated with temporary heating to ensure the school remains operational and to provide educational continuity. Providing temporary heating is not cost effective and COBS are more appropriately located in the ground floor area of Sparkhill Council House, previously occupied by the Olive School which will be newly refurbished.
- Completion of the refurbishment project will ensure pupils are not disrupted from their education needs.

## D. COMMERCIAL CASE

*This considers whether realistic and commercial arrangements for the project can be made*

### D1. Partnership, Joint venture and accountable body working

*Describe how the project will be controlled, managed and delivered if using these arrangements*

Scheme will be delivered by Project Team as follows:

- Client for the project is Birmingham City Council.
- Project Manager services will be provided and carried out by Acivico.
- The end user will be City of Birmingham School.
- Regular 2 – 4 weekly meetings will be held with the project team, including client and the end user.
- Programme will be monitored and developed to ensure that required timescales are achieved.
- Scheme costs are to be continually assessed, developed and monitored.

### D2. Procurement implications and Contract Strategy:

*What is the proposed procurement contract strategy and route? Which Framework, or OJEU? This should generally discharge the requirement to approve a Contract Strategy (with a recommendation in the report).*

The procurement of this contract has been undertaken and managed by Acivico Ltd.

## APPENDIX

The procurement route for delivery of this scheme was via Acivico's CWM2 Framework, Repairs & Maintenance Contract, with a mini tender exercise. Only one tender was returned within the tender time frame, this was reviewed and scrutinised by Acivico's Quantity Surveyor, Value for Money was assessed by checking rates on projects of a similar nature, current price books and BCIS rates. A Value for Money report was produced and Acivico's Quantity Surveyor was satisfied that the tender return offered Value for Money. The contractor recommended for award is Graham Asset Management Ltd and they will work with Acivico who are acting as Project Manager.

### D3. Staffing and TUPE implications:

None

Capital Costs & Funding	Budget Code	Financial Year	Totals
		2022/23	
<b>Expenditure</b>			
The City of Birmingham School	TBC		
Construction costs, incl. Surveys, Investigations, & Statutory Fees and contingency		£659,809	£659,809
Acivico Fees		£83,876	£83,876
EDSI Capitalisation		£22,311	£22,311
<b>Total Project Cost Excluding VAT</b>		£765,996	£765,996
<b>Funding sources</b>			
<b>Schools Condition Allocation (SCA)</b>		£765,996	£765,996
<b>Totals</b>		£765,996	£765,996

### E2. Evaluation and comment on financial implications:

The current costs for the project are based on tendered costs received in 6<sup>th</sup> April 2022 and subsequently revised based on clarifications and adjustments dated 21<sup>st</sup> April 2022.

### E3. Approach to optimism bias and provision of contingency

## APPENDIX

Contingency of £38,500 has been afforded and included in the total project cost, if required.

### E4. Taxation

*Describe any tax implications and how they will be managed, including VAT*

N/A

## F. PROJECT MANAGEMENT CASE

*This considers how project delivery plans are robust and realistic*

### F1. Key Project Milestones

*The summary Project Plan and milestones is attached at G1 below*

### Planned Delivery Dates

Cabinet Member Approval

**June 2022**

Main Construction works

**June 2022 – Sept 2022**

Practical completion

**Sept 2022**

### F2. Achievability

*Describe how the project can be delivered given the organisational skills and capacity available*

- Scope of work identified as in the project description.
- Extensive site investigation carried out.
- Project programme and costs have been developed.
- Funding is in place.
- Contractors have considerable previous experience.
- Similar projects have been delivered on budget and to time by the project team.

### F3. Dependencies on other projects or activities

- Landlord approval has been granted for the project.

### F4. Officer support

<b>Project Manager:</b>	Zahid Mahmood 07860906126	Capital Programme Manager, Education Infrastructure <a href="mailto:zahid.mahmood@birmingham.gov.uk">zahid.mahmood@birmingham.gov.uk</a>
<b>Project Accountant:</b>	Jaspal Madahar 07766922478	Finance & Resources Manager <a href="mailto:jaspal.madahar@birmingham.gov.uk">jaspal.madahar@birmingham.gov.uk</a>
<b>Project Sponsor:</b>	Jaswinder Didially 07825 117334	Head of Education Infrastructure <a href="mailto:jaswinder.didially@birmingham.gov.uk">jaswinder.didially@birmingham.gov.uk</a>

### F5. Project Management

*Describe how the project will be managed, including the responsible Project Board and who its members are*

## G. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

*(Please adapt or replace the formats as appropriate to the project)*

### G1. PROJECT PLAN

*Detailed Project Plan supporting the key milestones in section F1 above*

The project plan will be outlined by Acivico who are operating as the project manager and the chosen contractor prior to the works starting to minimise disruption to the school and to ensure the project is completed within the estimated completion time of eleven weeks.

**G2. SUMMARY OF RISKS AND ISSUES REGISTER**

*Risks should include Optimism Bias, and risks during the development to FBC*

*Grading of severity and likelihood: High – Significant – Medium – Low*

		Risk after mitigation:	
Risk or issue	Mitigation	Severity	Likelihood
Delayed start date due to approval process	Attempts will be made to progress the Cabinet Member report and FBC in time for a start date of June 22.	High	Medium
Building costs escalate	The project team will closely monitor the schedule of works and build costs. Cost schedules include contingency sums. Any increase in costs will need to be met through value re-engineering to ensure projected spend remains within overall allocation	Low	Medium
Building works fall behind	The project team will closely monitor schemes on site and liaise with Contractor Partners to identify action required.	Medium	Medium
BCC faced with increasing revenue costs	Consequential revenue costs arising including additional staffing, utility costs and any on-going day to day repair and maintenance of the asset will be the responsibility of the school. Any increase in revenue costs will be offset by an increase in income through increased pupil numbers provided by the DfE.	Low	Low
Impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the delivery of the construction project.	None at present.		

**G3. EXTERNAL FUNDING AND OTHER FINANCIAL DETAILS**

*Description of external funding arrangements and conditions, and other financial details supporting the financial implications in section E1 above (if appropriate)*

N/A

## G4. STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

Stakeholder	Stake in project	Potential impact on project	What does the project expect from stakeholder	Perceived attitudes and/or risks	Stakeholder management strategy	Responsibility
Cabinet Members for ES&C and F&R	Strategic Overview of DGCF expenditure	High	Approval of Cabinet report and expenditure for project.	Strategy not approved	Early Consultation and Regular Briefing on all aspects of Special Provision	BCC / EDI
School's Consultant Partners	Design and Delivery	High	To support delivery and programme management.	Unable to design to budget Unable to deliver to timescales	Close working with other stakeholders Regular feedback	School Leadership Team
School Leadership Team / Governors	Governing Body Agreement and End Users	High	Compliance with GBA Ongoing Revenue costs for R&M once build complete	N/A	Governing Body Agreement signed and regular project meetings	School Leadership Team / Governing Body EDI Project Officer
Pupils	End user	Low	Consultation	Nil	Through school's council	School Leadership Team
Ward Councillors	Knowledge of other developments affecting local communities that may link into project	High	Consultation with community and support for project	Objections from residents	Involve in consultation and planning permission process	EDI Project Officer  Governors/ School Leadership Team

**G5. BENEFITS REGISTER**

*For major projects and programmes over £20m, this sets out in more detail the planned benefits. Benefits should be monetised where it is proportionate and possible to do so, to support the calculation of a BCR and NPSV (please adapt this template as appropriate)*

Measure	Annual value	Start date	Impact
<i>List at least one measure associated with <b>each</b> of the outcomes in B1 above</i>			<i>What the estimated impact of the project will be on the measure identified</i>
<b>(A) Monetised benefits:</b>	£		
<b>(B) Other quantified benefits:</b>			
<b>(C) Non-quantified benefits:</b>	n/a		

**Other Attachments**

*provide as appropriate*

•



# Birmingham City Council

## Report to Cabinet Member for Children Young People and Families

27 May 2022



**Subject:** PROPOSAL TO INCREASE PUPIL NUMBERS AND ENLARGE OSCOTT MANOR SCHOOL ONTO AN ADDITIONAL SITE

**Report of:** Director for Children and Families

**Relevant Cabinet Member:** Cllr Karen McCarthy: Children Young People and Families

**Relevant O &S Chair(s):** Cllr Kerry Jenkins: Education and Children's Social Care

**Report author:** Jaswinder Didially  
Head of Service, Education Infrastructure; Telephone No: 0121 303 8847  
E-mail address: [jaswinder.didially@birmingham.gov.uk](mailto:jaswinder.didially@birmingham.gov.uk)

Are specific wards affected?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No – All wards affected
If yes, name(s) of ward(s): Stockland Green and Gravelly Hill are the wards most likely to be affected but pupils travel from across the city to access this specialist provision.		
Is this a key decision?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, add Forward Plan Reference:		
Is the decision eligible for call-in?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, state which appendix is exempt, and provide exempt information paragraph number or reason if confidential :		

## **1 Executive Summary**

### **1.1 To seek the determination of a statutory proposal:**

- To permanently increase the number of pupil places offered by Oscott Manor School from 116 to 180
- By expansion of Oscott Manor School onto an additional site at Ryland Road, Erdington, Birmingham B24 BJJ
- With effect from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2022

## **2 Recommendations**

- 2.1 That the Cabinet Member for Children Young People and Families , approve, having taken into account the statutory guidance, the statutory proposal to increase pupil places at Oscott Manor School from 116 to 180 by expansion onto an additional site at Ryland Road, Erdington, Birmingham B24 BJJ with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2022.
- 2.2 That the Cabinet Member for Children Young People and Families notes that separate approval has been given by the Director for Children and Families for the costs of refurbishing the building at Ryland Road.

## **3 Background**

- 3.1 Oscott Manor School (the School) is a community special school situated in Stockland Green ward which is the Erdington constituency of Birmingham. The school can offer up to 116 pupil places for pupils with an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) for Autistic Spectrum Conditions (ACS) and Speech Language and Communication Needs (SLCN). The School provides education for pupils aged between 11 and 19 years. The School received an Ofsted rating of “good” when they were inspected on 5<sup>th</sup> December 2017.
- 3.2 On 4<sup>th</sup> January 2022 the School relocated to a new, larger and purpose-built site at Reservoir Road, Erdington, Birmingham B23 6DE (the main site).
- 3.3 Due to an intense increase in demand for ASC provision in the city, the School currently has accommodated more than 116 pupils on roll.
- 3.4 There is significant need for more school places in Birmingham for children with EHCPs, both in special schools and resource bases in mainstream schools. In the last four years the Council has increased the total number of special school places available to pupils with EHCPs by 10%. There has been an increase in the number of pupils with EHCPs in Birmingham, by over 800 in the last two years. There is also an increase in requests for statutory assessments which may lead to EHCPs; these requests are currently averaging 150 each month. There is an acute pressure and particular need for secondary places. The current secondary transfer cohort is 20% larger than two years ago and this rate of increase is expected to continue through into 2023.

- 3.5 The Council is keen to ensure that future places are provided in the areas that they are needed, helping children to attend a school nearer to home and as part of their local community.
- 3.6 The proposed increase in pupil numbers at Oscott Manor School will increase the number of secondary places available for pupils requiring ASC and SLCN provision at a 'Good' school and provide greater choice for parents.
- 3.7 The School and Birmingham City Council (the Council) discussed options to permanently increase the number of pupil places that the School could offer. Discussion included options for expanding the School onto an additional site.
- 3.8 An additional site was identified and proposed, which is a vacant property owned by the Council, already in the education portfolio, which is on Ryland Road, B24 8JJ. The additional site requires some refurbishment which will be funded through the Council's "Special Provision Fund" allocation and subject to all required approvals separately (£100,682 for refurbishment, plus £20,471 for ICT).
- 3.9 The additional site is approximately 1.3km or 0.8miles from the main site. The intention is for the additional site to provide an annex and base for the School's Post-16 provision (currently 35 pupils on roll at the School's main site). This would then increase the number of places the School can permanently offer across the two sites.
- 3.10 Many of the children and young people attending the school will be eligible for support with their travel to and from school from the Council's Home to School transport service and colleagues from the service area have been engaged in the development of this proposal. The School will continue to update their travel plan, as and when required.
- 3.11 The School conducted some early engagement with the current Post-16 pupils at the School ("pupil voice") in the autumn term 2021, the results of which have informed the development of the proposal. The School have shared their intentions but will ultimately decide how best to arrange the school to ensure educational continuity of pupils and to ensure integration between the two sites (in particular for specialist subjects). The location of the additional site provides opportunities for the School to further develop links with local businesses for work experience and for growing the post-16 pupils' resilience and independence into young adulthood (as appropriate to the pupil's EHCP).
- 3.12 In compliance with the DFE guidance and best-practice, pre-publication information was shared with stakeholders. On 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2022 a letter was sent to pupils, parents/carers of pupils, staff and the governing body members of the School (school stakeholders) advising of the development of the proposals and for any immediate comments or concerns to be received by 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2022. No comments were received during that time.
- 3.13 In compliance with the DFE guidance, a statutory notice and complete proposal were published on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2022 for the prescribed four-week consultation, the "representation period". The representation period commenced with the publication

of a statutory notice in the Birmingham Post newspaper, a notice on the school website and on the Council's Birmingham BeHeard consultation website and with notice to stakeholders and groups by letter and email (see also section 5 - Consultation).

- 3.14 During the representation period, comments on the proposal could be submitted in writing to Education Infrastructure via the BeHeard website online survey, by email or letter. A copy of the public notice can be found in **Appendix 1** of this report.

At the close of the representation period on 7<sup>th</sup> April 2022: A total of 82 responses were received, 13 in favour, 66 opposed, 2 neither/don't know and 1 didn't answer that question. The responses were from a mixture of stakeholders including parents, pupils, staff and local community with approximately half of the total responses received being from stakeholders of neighbouring Erdington Hall Primary School and the local community around the proposed additional site.

The following are some of the main concerns or objections to the proposal with mitigating commentary:

- Concerns about safeguarding of pupils at neighbouring Erdington Hall Primary School: The additional building would be secured in such a way as neither staff nor pupils of Oscott Manor School would have freedom to access the neighbouring school or primary pupils. The ratio of supervision in the Post16 provision would be one staff member per four pupils, with direct and passive supervision throughout. Oscott Manor School have a strong ethos instilled within the pupils ("ready, respectful and safe", UNICEF rights respecting schools Gold award).
- Concerns about traffic & parking: The school continue to review the school travel plan with consideration to safety and sustainability of travel practices for the proposed additional site (all alternative transport options are being explored to be less car reliant). The Council's Home to School Transport Service have investigated and proposed an appropriate plan that would be consistent with the individual needs of pupils and sympathetic to the local community and transport infrastructure e.g. arrival and departure times for pupils would be adjusted to avoid the highest congestion period. Options for some additional off-street parking continues to be explored.
- Opinion that the building/location is unsuitable for Post16 provision: Oscott Manor School is judged by Ofsted to be Good. The staff knowledge and experience has formed the basis of using the site for this purpose. The feedback from early engagement with the current Post16 pupils was positive and influenced the proposal. The curriculum will be planned to make most efficient use of the additional site and the facilities at the main school site where required (Reservoir road).
- No outdoor space at the additional site for Post16 pupils: Pupils will have access to a combination of local sites for outdoor curriculum and activities including: the main school site (Reservoir road), community leisure facilities

and local playing fields (options being explored at Jaffray Road and Spring Lane playing fields). A private and enclosed seating area at the front of the site would provide sufficient space for supervised pupils to step outside as needed (this would be in addition to planned leisure time).

- Consultation process / integrity – consultation with local community & Erdington Hall Primary (Summit Academy Trust): The consultation process is as outlined in section 3 and section 5 of this report. Anyone seeing or receiving notice about the proposal is welcome to share details with any interested party. A public notice was in the local newspaper for anyone interested in the proposal to comment within the statutory timescales. Erdington Hall Primary School were notified directly and members of their staff shared the proposal information with the local community. Approximately 25% of all responses received were from the local community and approximately 50% of all responses were stakeholders of, or local to, Erdington Hall Primary School. Some stakeholders may have noticed that preliminary works have been undertaken at the proposed site, this is to ensure that a suitable level of maintenance and decoration is achieved that would allow this proposal to be implemented swiftly, if it is approved.

Joint meetings continue with Oscott Manor School, Erdington Primary School and Council officers to review and address any prevailing concerns.

- A detailed summary of the results and copy of all anonymised comments can be found in **Appendix 3** of this report.

3.15 The Education and Inspections Act 2006 and Regulation 7 of the School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013 (the Prescribed Alterations Regulations) state the Local Authority must have regard to any guidance issued by the Secretary of State when making a decision on such proposals. The relevant statutory guidance is: Making Significant Changes ('prescribed alterations') to Maintained Schools – statutory guidance for proposers and decision-makers - October 2018, published by the Department for Education. The Education and Inspections Act 2006, and Paragraph 5 of Schedule 3 to the Prescribed Alterations Regulations allows for the proposals to be approved, approved with modification, approved subject to meeting a prescribed condition, or rejected.

3.16 If the proposals are approved, Oscott Manor School will permanently increase to offer up to 180 pupil places by expansion onto an additional site from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2022.

#### **4 Options considered and Recommended Proposal**

4.1 It is recommended that the proposal to increase pupil places at Oscott Manor school by expansion onto an additional site be approved. There was a high level of objection and concern recorded during the statutory consultation; however, officers

have considered the concerns and note the mitigations as described in 3.14 of this report and believe that recommending approval is the best option to help provide sufficient places for pupils with EHCPs for ASC and SLCN in Birmingham.

- 4.2 The options to physically expand Birmingham schools, including Oscott Manor School, is limited due to the constrained sites within the urban environment. The additional site was identified as being in close proximity of the existing main site, the property is already in the Education portfolio and is vacant.
- 4.3 The option to expand onto an additional 'satellite site' has been considered with reference to the DFE guidance to demonstrate that this would not be a new school but an extension of Oscott Manor School, summarised as follows: the site would be a base for the schools existing Post-16 provision (it is not new provision); the existing curriculum, governance, leadership and ethos of the school would be implemented at the additional site; staff would access the main site for school meetings, training, curriculum and events; the Post-16 pupils would access the main site for specialist curriculum, outdoor activities and whole school events. Travel arrangements between the sites have been considered by the school and they have their own minibuses which can be used to transport pupils between the sites; the additional site is considered to be within a reasonable walking distance of the main site (1.3km or 0.8miles).
- 4.4 If the proposal is rejected, the Council would need to identify alternative solutions to provide sufficient places for pupils with EHCPs for ASC and SLCN. Not increasing pupil numbers at the school may increase the Council's reliance on out of city and independent provision if sufficient places are not available within the maintained, Academies and Free School sectors and could result in additional costs for places and transport, as pupils may have to travel further to access out of city provision.

## **5 Consultation**

- 5.1 The statutory proposal was consulted upon in line with the requirements set out in the relevant guidance from the Secretary of State (as noted in 3.15 of this report).

### **5.2 Internal:**

Information on the proposal was shared with all Birmingham Councillors, Officers from services across the Council which includes Admissions, SEND and Inclusion, Finance, School and Governor Support, SENDIAS, Home to School Transport, Human Resources, Legal, Planning, Research and Statistics Officers and colleagues in Education Infrastructure.

### **5.3 External:**

Information on the proposal was shared with pupils, parents/carers of pupils, staff and members of the governing body of Oscott Manor School; Birmingham Schools (including the Head Teacher of Erdington Hall Primary School – neighbouring the proposed additional site), the Archdiocese and the Anglican Diocese of Birmingham, Professional Associations and Trade Unions, Neighbouring Local

Authorities, the local Member of Parliament, local NHS partners, The Department for Education – School Organisation and the Office of the Schools Adjudicator and by public notice (as described in section 3.13 of this report).

## **6 Risk Management**

- 6.1 As also described in section 4.2 of this report: if the proposal is rejected, the Council may fail to provide sufficient options and places for pupils with EHCPs for ASC and SLCN. The demand for places will continue to increase and may reduce the value for money by potentially increasing the cost to provide alternative places for those that need them. There is a risk that the Council would not achieve its strategic aims in reference to the provision of education in the city (see also section 7 of this report).

## **7 Compliance Issues:**

### **7.1 How are the recommended decisions consistent with the City Council's priorities, plans and strategies?**

- 7.1.1 The proposal to permanently increase the number of pupil places offered by Oscott Manor by expansion onto an additional site supports the Council to:
- Give all children from every background and community the best start in life with a clear pathway to achieve success and realise their potential;
  - Ensure that there is sufficient pupil places and secure diversity in provision of schools and increase opportunities for parental choice through planning and securing sufficient provision;
  - To fulfil landlord responsibilities to ensure that schools are Health and Safety compliant and fit for purpose;
  - To meet the aims set out in the Council's Education Services Delivery and Improvement Plan.

### **7.2 Legal Implications**

- 7.2.1 This report exercises powers contained within sections 19 and 21 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 and Schedule 2 and Schedule 3 to the School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013 (the "Prescribed Alterations Regulations"), whereby the Local Authority of a Community Special School can propose the increase of pupil places in a special school and enlarge a school by expansion onto an additional site. Under the Prescribed Alterations Regulations, the Local Authority is the decision maker for this statutory proposal.

### **7.3 Financial Implications**

- 7.3.1 The works will be funded from the Special Provision Fund Allocation to a maximum value of £121,153, which have been approved previously via a

Form of Authority. Pupil funding will be allocated via SENAR through the High Needs Block.

- 7.3.2 Consequential revenue costs arising that includes the need for additional staffing and any on-going day-to-day repair and maintenance of the asset, will be the responsibility of Oscott Manor and funded from the school's delegated budget.

#### **7.4 Procurement Implications (if required)**

- 7.4.1 Not Applicable

#### **7.5 Human Resources Implications (if required)**

- 7.5.1 Staff will generally be unaffected. If this proposal is approved for implementation, any impact on staff terms and conditions will be consulted upon with Trade Unions / Professional Associations. The additional site is 1.3km or 0.8 miles from the main site with good transport links and arrangements. The school growth may offer new opportunities for professional development.

#### **7.6 Public Sector Equality Duty**

- 7.6.1 An updated Equality Assessment initial screening was carried out in October 2018 (EQUA221) against the School Organisation Change process, which identified that a full impact assessment was not required. No events have occurred since then which would require the preparation of a fresh screening in respect of the school organisation process. The recommendation in this report have not identified any negative impact on protected characteristics and a full equality analysis is not required.

### **8 Appendices**

**Appendix 1:** Public Notice

**Appendix 2:** Full Proposal document

**Appendix 3:** Consultation results

**Appendix 4:** Councillors Consulted

### **9 Background Documents**

- Education and Inspections Act 2006
- Making significant changes ('prescribed alterations') to maintained schools: "Statutory guidance for proposers and decision makers" published by the Department for Education (DfE) October 2018.



## BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL – PUBLIC NOTICE

Proposal to Make Prescribed Alteration – Oscott Manor School.

Notice is given in accordance with Section 19 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 and Regulation 6 of the School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013 that Birmingham City Council proposes to make the following prescribed alteration to Oscott Manor School.

Increase the number of pupil places from 116 to 180, by expansion onto an additional site at Ryland Road, Erdington, Birmingham B24 8JJ, with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2022.

Oscott Manor School is a Community Special School at Reservoir Road, Erdington, Birmingham B23 6DE which offers up to 116 places to pupils with an Education, Health and Care Plan for Autistic Spectrum Condition (ASC) or Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN). The school currently operates from the main site at Reservoir Road, Erdington. An additional site has been identified which would create a base for the School's Post-16 provision and enable the increase in places offered by the school across the two sites. The additional site is approximately 0.8 miles (1.3 kilometres) from the main site.

This notice is an extract from the complete proposal. Copies of the complete proposal can be found at: [www.birminghambeheard.org.uk/people-1/oscottmanor2022](http://www.birminghambeheard.org.uk/people-1/oscottmanor2022)

If you require a hard copy this can be obtained by writing to: School Organisation, Education Infrastructure, PO Box 15843, Birmingham B2 2RT. Within four weeks from the date of publication of this proposal, any person may object to or make comments on the proposal. Anyone who wishes to make representations about this proposal should do so through the above website or by writing to School Organisation at the postal address. The date by which objections or comments must be received is 7<sup>th</sup> April 2022.

Signed: Jaswinder Didially

Head of Service – Education Infrastructure

Date: 10<sup>th</sup> March 2022.



# Full Proposal Document

## **Oscott Manor School**

Proposal to increase the number of pupil places and create an additional site.

## Introduction

Birmingham City Council (the Council), as the Local Authority for Birmingham, is consulting on proposed changes to Oscott Manor School (the School).

## School Information

<b>Type:</b>	Community Special School		
<b>Name:</b>	Oscott Manor School	<b>DFE:</b>	<b>330 7053</b>
<b>Address:</b>	Reservoir Road, Erdington, Birmingham B23 6DE.		
<b>Ward:</b>	Stockland Green	<b>Constituency:</b>	Perry Barr
<b>Age Range:</b>	11 - 19 years	<b>Pupil Places:</b>	116
<b>Last Ofsted:</b>	7 <sup>th</sup> May 2014	<b>Ofsted Overall Effectiveness:</b>	Good

## What changes are proposed?

The Council is proposing to carry out the following changes to Oscott Manor School (the School):

- Permanently increase the number of places the School can offer to pupils, from 116 to 180.
- Expand onto an additional site: Ryland Road, Erdington, Birmingham B24 8JJ.

## Why do we want to do this?

The School currently has 116 places for pupils with an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) for Autistic Spectrum Condition (ASC) and Speech Language and Communication Needs (SLCN).

Due to increased demand for this type of SEND provision, the school currently has over 116 pupils on roll.

The Council is proposing the above prescribed changes to increase the number of places at the School to help support the steadily growing demand for places in Birmingham for children with an EHCP for ASC and SLCN. This proposal also ensures that changes to pupil places are compliant with government requirements.

From 4<sup>th</sup> January 2022 the school opened at its new, larger and purpose-built site at Reservoir Road, Erdington, Birmingham B23 6DE.

In close collaboration with the School, the Council's proposed changes include expanding the school onto an additional site (approximately 1.3 km or 0.8 miles from the main site). The intention is that the additional site would be an annex for the School's Post-16 provision and this would increase the total number of pupil places that can be offered across the two sites.

**Evidence of Demand:**

There is significant need for more school places in Birmingham for children with EHCPs, both in special schools and resource bases in mainstream schools. In the last four years the Council has increased the total number of special school places available to pupils with EHCPs by 10%. There has been an increase in the number of pupils with EHCPs in Birmingham, by over 800 in the last two years. There is also an increase in requests for statutory assessments which may lead to EHCPs; these requests are currently averaging 150 each month. There is an acute pressure and particular need for secondary places. The current secondary transfer cohort is 20% larger than two years ago and this rate of increase is expected to continue through into 2023.

The proposal to increase the number of places offered at Oscott Manor School for pupils with ASC and SLCN will help to address the increased demand for secondary places for these types of specialist provision.

**When will these changes happen?**

If the proposal is approved by the decision makers (following full consultation) it is intended that the changes would be implemented from **1<sup>st</sup> September 2022**. It is proposed that the additional places will be allocated in line with the processes of the Special Educational Needs Assessment and Review Team (SENAR)

**Will there be any effect on other schools, academies and educational institutions within the area?**

There should be no negative effects on other mainstream schools (non-SEN), as the School offers specialist city wide provision. There is currently a shortage of ASC and SLCN places and no indication that other schools offering this type of provision will be negatively affected. Any impact on other schools should be positive as this proposal creates places for pupils with ASC and SLCN needs and so releases places at other schools to meet the needs of other pupils.

**How will the proposal increase educational standards and parental choice?**

The Council is keen to ensure that future places are provided in the areas that they are needed, helping children to attend a school nearer to home and as part of their local community. The proposed increase in pupil numbers at Oscott Manor School will increase the number of secondary places for pupils requiring ASC and SLCN provision at a 'Good' school and provide greater choice for parents.

**How will this affect pupils at the school?**

The filling of places would happen from September 2022. Pupils on the main school site would not notice a substantial increase in numbers, as the Post-16 pupils would simultaneously relocate to the annex on Ryland Road. School places would continue to be commissioned by SENAR, in line with the SEND Code of Practice. The SEN designation for the school will not change. With the additional pupils, the school may decide to organise the school differently to ensure educational continuity but that would be the school's decision.

Pupils within the post-16 group would notice the change immediately, with the post-16 provision opening on the newly refurbished additional site. The School did some early engagement with post-16 pupils (“pupil voice”) in the Autumn term 2021 and the results of which have informed the development of the proposal.

### **How will this affect staff?**

Generally, staff will be unaffected; however, school growth may offer more opportunities for professional development and for working across the two sites (as is the experience of other schools that operate across multiple sites). If this proposal is approved, any impact on terms and conditions will be with full consultation with Trade Unions / Professional Associations.

### **Will there be changes to the school building and, if so, what are the project costs and how will they be met?**

There will be some costs associated with the project. Capacity has been identified within the space of the main school buildings which were newly built using c.£7.1 million from the Department for Education’s “Priority Schools’ Building Programme” (PSBP) and c.£1.4 million from the Council’s “Basic Need Allocation”.

The creation of the additional site will not require the Council to purchase land or buildings, as the proposed site is already owned by the Council. The refurbishment costs for the buildings are c.£110,000 plus c.£20,000 for ICT provision. This is being funded from the Council’s “Special Provision Fund” allocation and subject to all required approvals.

### **Travel and Transport:**

The impact on transport and travel will be minimal. The school will continue to update their travel plan, as and when required. The Local Education Authority transport arrangements for children with special needs will apply (Home to School Transport). The additional site is approximately 1.3 km or 0.8 miles from the main Reservoir Road site.

### **Will this definitely happen?**

No, there is a statutory process that the Council must follow to make these types of changes to schools.

Pre-publication: We wrote to parents/pupils/staff and other stakeholders regarding the forthcoming proposals on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2022 and invited comments until 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2022. During this pre-publication consultation no comments were received on this proposal.

Statutory publication: This document is the full proposal for statutory public consultation, referred to as the “representation period”. All comments received during the representation period will be forwarded to the decision maker for consideration.

Decision: Within two months of the end of the representation period, the Council’s Cabinet Member for Education Skills and Culture will make a final

decision. It is only at that point that we will be able to say with certainty whether or not the proposals will be implemented.

### **What will happen if this proposal is rejected?**

If the proposed increase and additional site is not approved for implementation, the school will continue to operate at 116 places. This will mean that a higher number of pupils will be unable to remain at, or be offered, places by the School in the future. Alternative and additional places would need to be provided at other schools, which could have a negative impact on pupils out of school and on travel arrangements to other provision.

### **How can I make my views known?**

We invite all interested people to give us their views and comment on the proposal.

**Any comments must be received no later than 7<sup>th</sup> April 2022.**

**You can comment online via BeHeard:**

**[www.birminghambeheard.org.uk/people-1/oscottmanor2022](http://www.birminghambeheard.org.uk/people-1/oscottmanor2022)**

You can write to the Council:

(Please include: **Oscott Manor SOT10180** in correspondence)

- By email: [eds.enquiries@birmingham.gov.uk](mailto:eds.enquiries@birmingham.gov.uk)
- By letter, or by completing and sending the attached comments form to:  
Birmingham City Council,  
School Organisation Team,  
PO Box 15843,  
Birmingham, B2 2RT.

### **What happens next?**

The following timescale is for guidance only. At any point during the process, the proposal might be withdrawn or rejected by the City Council. The proposed dates below meet the government requirements for us to consult fully with the people affected by the proposal and every effort will be made to keep to these dates.

#### **Key dates**

<b>Action</b>	<b>Date</b>
Statutory notice to be published	10 <sup>th</sup> March 2022
Beginning of 4 week consultation period	10 <sup>th</sup> March 2022
End of 4 week consultation period	7 <sup>th</sup> April 2022
Final decision to be made no later than	7 <sup>th</sup> June 2022
Changes implemented	1 <sup>st</sup> September 2022

**Groups Consulted:**

Oscott Manor School: governors, staff, parents/carers and pupils

Birmingham City Council colleagues and services

NHS partners

Local Councillor(s)

Member(s) of Parliament

Birmingham Schools

Local Archdiocese

Other/Neighbouring Local Authorities

Trade Unions/Professional Associations



**Statutory Proposal: Oscott Manor School - increase the number of pupil places and create an additional site.**

**Consultation Response Form**

Please help us to analyse your response by completing the following:

**Your name** (optional\*):

**Your contact details** (optional, if you would like a reply\*)

**What is your interest in the proposal?** (select one of the below):

Pupil	
Parent	
School Governor	
School Staff	
Local Resident	
Local Councillor	
Member of Parliament	
Other (please specify)	

**Are you in favour of the proposal?** (select one of the below):

YES	NO	NIETHER / DON'T KNOW
-----	----	----------------------

**Write your comments** (optional) (attach an additional page, if required):

\*Personal details are used by Birmingham City Council for the purpose of this consultation only. Your details are not shared publicly or with any other organisation or company.



## School Organisation: Consultation Results: Oscott Manor School SOT10180

### Summary Analysis Table

Total number of responses:	82
Number in favour or against the proposal:	
In favour	13
Against	66
Don't know	2
Not answered/indicated	1
Method of response:	
BeHeard (website)	82
Email	0
Letter	0
Respondent by type:	
Pupil	4
Parent/Carer of pupil	29
School Governor	3
School Staff Member	17
Local Resident	20
Local Councillor	1
Member of Parliament	0
Other (describe as required)	7
Not answered	1
Comment themes: (counted per mention from total of 60 written comments)	count
Concern – impact/safeguarding Erdington Hall Primary (neighbouring)	31
Concern - Traffic & Parking	29
Concern / Opinion – site / building not suitable for Post16 education	12
Concern – no outdoor space on site for Post16 pupils	10
Concern – consultation process – lack of engagement with local community	10
Suggestion – alternative – transfer/use building as part of Erdington Hall Primary School / Early Years & Childcare	8
Opinion – pupil places are needed / increase is needed	7
Concern / opinion – Post16/SEN pupils' – antisocial behaviour - negative impact on local community	6
Concern – integrity of consultation process / transparency / “a done-deal”	6
Concern – consultation process – lack of engagement with Erdington Hall Primary (staff/parents)	5
Concern – change & disruption for Post16 pupils	3
Concern / Opinion – keep pupil numbers lower / don't increase Oscott Manor / don't need places [in that area]	3
Suggestion – alternative location for Post16 provision – create at St Chads/other secondary	3
Concern – safeguarding Post16 pupils of Oscott Manor (locally/between sites)	2

Concern – air pollution locally	2
Opinion –positive for Post16 pupils’ development	2
Concern – impact on teachers / teaching lessons	1
Concern – time and cost for pupils and staff between sites	1
Concern – safety of staff between sites	1
Suggestion – transform Elwood Centre to be Oscott Manor Post16	1
Concern – quality of educaiton across split sites	1
Positive – Oscott Manor has good Ofsted judgment	1
Opinion – increase is positive for neighbouring Local Authorities	1
Suggestion – parking – use Bracebridge Road entrance to site/Erdington Hall Primary	1

#### Analyst notes:

The description and count of themes from the responses are generated by the judgment of the analyst reviewing and summarising all written comments.

Approximately half of all written comments were from parents and staff who are stakeholders of Erdington Hall Primary School and the surrounding community. Erdington Hall Primary School neighbours the proposed Oscott Manor Post16 provision. The concerns of Erdington Hall stakeholders are mainly representative in the highest counted themes of the summary table.

The stakeholder identified as a Local Councillor did not match any details of any known Birmingham Councillors; no clarification or verification has been requested at the time of analysis.

All comments and responses have been reviewed, no comments or responses have been excluded from the review or results summarised in this table.

What is your interest in the proposal? - Type of respondent	What is your interest in the proposal? - other, please specify
Parent	
Parent	
Parent	
Parent	
Parent	

Staff Member	
Local Resident	
Staff Member	
Local Resident	Resident of ryland rd. No letter of consultation has been given to us.
School Governor	
School Governor	

Local Resident	
Staff Member	
Other, please specify	CEO of Summit Learning Trust of which Erdington Hall Primary is an academy
Local Resident	
Staff Member	
Staff Member	
Parent	I am also a staff member at Erdington Hall Primary School.

Local Resident	
School Governor	
Local Councillor	



Local Resident	
Parent	
Other, please specify	Parent of a child in Erdington Hall Primary School
Parent	
Other, please specify	Parent of children at neighbouring school.
Parent	

Local Resident	
Local Resident	
Parent	Parent and Local Resident
Local Resident	
Parent	
Parent	
Local Resident	

Staff Member	
--------------	--

Local Resident	
Local Resident	
Local Resident	
Other, please specify	Pupil Planning Analyst - Worcestershire Children First (neighbouring authority)
Parent	

Local Resident	
Pupil	
Staff Member	
Parent	
Local Resident	

Local Resident	
Local Resident	
Other, please specify	Local resident where new place they are proposing. My child also attends the schools this building is attached to.

Parent	Resident
Parent	
Other, please specify	Teacher at Erdington Hall Primary School
Staff Member	
Staff Member	
Staff Member	

Parent	
Parent	
Parent	
Staff Member	
Parent	
Parent	



Are you in favour of the proposal? - In Favour?	
Yes	
Yes	
No	
No	
No	

Yes
Yes
Yes
No
No
Yes

No
No
No
No
No
No
No

No
No
No

No
No
No
No
No
No
No

No
No
No
No
No
No
Yes

No

No
No
No
Yes
No



No
No
No
No
No

No
No
No

No
No
No
No
No
No

No
No
No
No
No
No

Are you in favour of the proposal? - Please give details
There isn't enough places in Birmingham for all children with asd or language and speech difficulties so using the number of children that can be allowed at a school ie oscott manor is a good idea in my opinion
I'm in favour of the proposal because I think that it is a very good idea to extend the of pupils in the school to in able children to have the chance to have the education that they need
I think the kid's have had too much disruption as it is dealing with covid the move & now you want them to move again. The move was meant to be a new start for post16 they we're consulted how they wanted there area to be & developers listened. Now they will be moved to a site with a primary school right next to it. I think it's great that the school want to expand there intake of kid's but at the cost of post16 being moved off site I'm not in favour unfortunately. Surely this will effect there lessons as teachers are teaching different lessons so all teachers will need to be on a rota to be on both sites throughout the day. Sorry it's a no from me as it's unfair on the kid's they've just settled in & i think it's unfair on the teachers too.
Keep the school number of pupils low as possible. Another transition, is not beneficial to pupils who are Autistic.
<p>The levels of pollution in this area, has and continues to rise due to lack of mitigation in the area. Since BCC have allowed industry to operate in our local amenities areas, which has brought HGV onto our residential roads causing congestion. The aculmmative impact of cement/sand dust along with the dust from excuavation lorries passing through Bromford and Tyburn for HS2. The high level of vehicles and lorries coming into this area and parking belonging to highways is concerning. Along with fumes from the local Asphalt factory that blow over community when wind is blowing.</p> <p>Residents concerns in relation to pollution seem to have been ignored, yet Noise Air and light pollution has increased in our adjacent residential roads significantly and now seems on a par with Tyburn A38. The highways around this area have become unsafe for pedestrians but more so for disabled elderly and children due speed and dangerous parking.</p> <p>The local Green Party candidate highlighted her concerns regarding health issues the community is experiencing, after speaking with them in local election campaign. The high levels of illnesses many now suffer due to pollution increase has and continues to be a concern. Yet no other party have addressed, yet it has been the silent killer in this area for many years. Council forums, complaints to councillors, MP, and fixmystreet app has complaints many with photos, detailing highway dangers and pollution in this area just apply postcode.</p> <p>To be in favour of this proposal would support putting vulnerable children at risk , when we have a duty to protect. The local health records also support the lifespan gap between communities here. Communities less diverse with clean air and green spaces less than 2.5 miles away. Yet the life span for living here is a deduction of approx 8 years, a very unhealthy Environment for children.</p>

<p>It is quite clear that there is a heavy demand for places for pupils with SEN across Birmingham and also as our KS3 classes move up to KS4/5 we will need more space to accommodate this in the future.</p>
<p>I thin that with a separate Post-16 site, we will be able to offer a much wider variety of academic and non-academic subjects and help to better prepare pupils for adulthood and for attending college Post-19 if they so wish.</p>
<p>I think there is a desperate and inappropriate lack of Special school places in Birmingham and am heartily in favour of this proposal that will increase capacity (even if this increase is still no where near enough places)</p>
<p>The proposal will enable post 16 pupils to have a space dedicated just to them and will enable the school to provide additional spaces in the main building</p>
<p>There is already a huge problem with parking on ryland Road, school traffic additional, parents havjng altercations. Police involvements. Traffic wardens.</p> <p>Additional staff at the school.. will need parking as the building has no parking facilities. This will cause parking issues for us , the people that live on the street. More children , Older children, and the impact on the school already there. Safe guarding issues.</p>
<p>Hall. There are many incidents of antisocial behaviour from members of the public, calling out, drunkenness and alcohol abuse, and drug abuse in the roads around Reservoir Road and Ryland Road. There have also been incidents of knife attacks. The School leadership are keen to build up resilience amongst the pupils so that they face situations where they may not feel comfortable and manage to cope. However I think this is unreasonable. There is also the impact on the staff (mainly young and female) who will be accompanying the pupils.</p> <p>There is also the time factor of expecting 24 pupils to walk to and from each venue (1 mile). It is likely to take about half an hour, which is one hour out of their school day. I am concerned that it will affect the pupils so much that they may decide not to go to school, or the parents may decide to take their child to a different school. It is unlikely that the pupils will be transported by mini bus (according to the school), but if they were, there is the environmental impact on use of petrol, cost of petrol and for the BCC to pay for another minibus.</p> <p>I think that BCC could make the Elderly Care Centre which shares the premises at Reservoir Road with Oscott Manor school into the KS 5 facility. This would ensure that all the pupils remain on one site. it will also help security as the school would be able to close the main gate. This will have a positive impact on Safeguarding. As the Elderly care Centre is largely used as a transport hub, this will not impact this service as much as the children at Oscott Manor.</p> <p>I am also concerned that the number of pupils at Oscott Manor has gone up from 116 less than eighteen months ago to 147, and then there will be 180 in September 2022. There will be very little opportunity for the pupils to make a good transition to their new school because of the sheer number of pupils involved. This will also be important for the new KS5 pupils getting to know the premises and staff at both Reservoir road and Ryland Road.</p> <p>The school at Ryland Road does not have any out door space for the pupils to learn</p> <p>AS long as the quality of teaching remains high for students</p>

There is enough traffic and children in the area as it is with our driveways being blocked off all the time making us late
<p>Impact on residents and children with the additional traffic during the school day. Ryland Road is a busy residential street with limited parking at the moment. Extra cars for new staff and those used to transport the children would put a strain on the already busy road.</p> <p>In addition, the centre does not have any open outdoor provision for these children which would not in my opinion support their provision.</p>
<p>We have grave concerns about the increased traffic flow in an already very busy road outside our primary school which will pose a significant risk to our children. We understand that several minibuses will need to travel down this road several times a day, in addition to staff cars. Increased parking on this road by additional staff at the centre will further exacerbate traffic danger for our parents and children.</p>
<p>Site was previously used as a children center providing services for the local community. Site is unsuitable for post 16 pupils, limited space, no outdoor space. Opening will impact heavily on local primary school, safety and safeguarding of pupils. It is my understanding that primary school and children center have shared facilities and therefore opening of post 16 school will impact negatively on primary school children wellbeing and safety. Additionally it will increase traffic on Ryland road during peak times.</p>
<p>There is insufficient parking on Ryland Road. This will impact local residents and also Erdington Hall staff.</p> <p>The additional congestion and fumes would also lead to potential health and safety issues for the pupils attending the school.</p> <p>The pupils attending the proposed provision will need an outdoor space. This is not available on the site.</p>
<p>I worry regarding the safeguarding of all pupils of this proposal was to go ahead, there isn't much space on the property provided, where would these children with needs stretch their legs, take a walk, have some outside time, where would they eat lunch?</p> <p>Secondly, Ryland road is an already busy place in the am, with the parents from Erdington Hall, how will this be managed with the prospect of transport buses for these children, plus the parking for the staffing that would be required for the placement to run successfully and safely.</p>
<p>I do not believe that this is a suitable site for this particular educational setting. Not only will it impact on our children attending Erdington Hall Primary School, it will also impact on the local residents. Parking is already an issue on Ryland Rd and this will be impacted further more with the dropping off and dismissal of the learners and also staff parking. The building is on Erdington Hall primary site and will mean that there will be contact between both sets of learners, this is not acceptable. I do believe that this is in the best interest of not only my own child, but also that of the children attending Erdington Hall Primary.</p>

Although I am in favour of this proposal in principle, it has not been appropriately communicated to the community around the new site. As such, it should be postponed/cancelled until the community has been involved and provision put in place to protect the existing school on the same site. We only found out about this development incidentally and not through any direct communication from the council. We are also of the understanding that building work is taking place on the new site despite the consultation not closing until April 7th - this would suggest that it is already a 'done deal' and this consultation is just a front, a farce if you will. Your proposal also states that there is expected to be no impacts on Oscott school, but does not mention the school that already exists at B24 8JJ or the surrounding residents. There will surely be an increase in traffic around the new site, as well as more staff. Where are they going to park and how are they going to travel to the new site, around which there is little space for parking or additional vehicles. Furthermore, your proposal completely fails to mention the primary school on the same site and any attendant safeguarding risks from placing post-16 students in such proximity to very young children and their families. The proposal only seems to consider Oscott and has no awareness of the context of the new site.

The site you are proposing is very small for the number of autistic young people that you want to use it for. There is no outside space and no parking facilities at all. These factors alone would present some safety and safeguarding concerns for the pupils at Erdington Hall where parking is already a challenge and the road layout already presents safety issues for the parents and pupils. Increasing this by busing in some children with challenging needs only serves to create more issues.

We live directly across from Erdington Hall School and we deal with the traffic already.

There is no need for another school location with further students to be situated here.

The school that is already there is a primary school so I don't understand why it is appropriate to have older children and adults at the adjacent building.

There has been absolutely no consultation with local residents and no explanation of what the disruption will be. The new students will be older and require different type of care as they are autistic etc. Does this mean more traffic?

In addition that building has no car park so where will teachers, parents and students park? Will there be further vehicles for students that require special attention?

This has clearly not been thought through properly and is being done in a manner that is not open and honest with local residents.



There is already a great deal of problems with parking and traffic with the current school being on the site without increasing the amount of parents that will be using the school in their cars
The building is not suitable for the proposed use. No out door provisions. Even the fire exits are on Erdington Hall School land so would cause safeguarding issues for the kids. Parking and congestion issues for residents of Ryland Road.
Don't want this centre to be used by older children 16+ as this will cause issues e.g. safeguarding issues as younger children are in next door building, parking issues as there is already trouble with the school parking. Better to be used for younger children as it used to be before. Toddlers stay and play sessions, younger children's library, sessions made for the community.
I am concerned that this would have a negative effect on the pupils of Erdington hall primary school and would cause safe guarding issues.
<p>The propsed changes will increase traffic in an area that already has high traffic during school hours.</p> <p>I am not opposed to the Pupils or Oscott Manor receiving education and support, but I know the proposed site well and believe that it would be a disservice to the pupils to use a site that has not been built to meet their needs and has out door provisions. Furthermore the fire exits for the proposed site come onto Erdington Hall school site which causes a safeguarding concern for the children as Oscott Manor pupils are 16+</p>
<p>The centre was for young children and then suddenly closed down. No reasonable explanation was ever offered as to the reason why. If funding was an issue, no viable alternative was ever explored with the community.</p> <p>In respect of the proposal, again, it is disappointing that no adequate notice was given of when it was intended that the centre be proposed for this purpose.</p> <p>My objections are numerous, however, at this stage I set out the following;</p> <p>No evidence has been provided to support;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why this is a requirement for this local community;</li> <li>2. Why or how the local community would benefit from this proposal;</li> <li>3. Risk assessments setting out the benefit v impact for the local community;</li> <li>4. If any alternative venues were considered;</li> <li>5. Why this community has been chosen;</li> </ol> <p>A further consultation, setting out a clear agenda, sent to the local residents as to the purpose of that consultation, must be arranged before any approval.</p>

<p>Parking problem already without any more traffic drives being blocked constantly dangerous parking, noise, no letters sent to residents if it hadn't been for a local school teacher we wouldn't have known anything about it council already approved it at meeting on 4,4,22 which is before deadline date</p>
<p>There is already no parking available with the road being blocked completely during key times! This has been a constant battle since the childrens centre was first opened. I live directly opposite the centre and at no time have the local residents been informed of the possibility of change of use. Is that allowed that no consultation is given. It feels that this has been done very stealthily!!</p> <p>The building is small and not suitable for taking the extra pupils listed above. The school itself is always short of space and yet there is no indication of how it will affect the children aged 3 to 11 and if it will affect their education, safety and a plentiful environment.</p>
<p>It will cause overwhelming traffic concerns which is unsafe and can cause harm to our young students and elderly local residents.</p>
<p>Would have been good to have been informed.</p>
<p>Too much congestion on ryland road already and this new proposal will cause alot of disturbance. I will be looking at moving my kids out of the school.</p>
<p>I just don't feel comfortable having 16-18 year old around the school my child is going to especially because my child is young. Not trying to stop them from educating etc. Just feel it's too close</p>
<p>Think it be great to be used for additional space for children with needs, But will need look at if mini buses becoming at drop off and pick up times as there's always load cars already parked on street</p>

As the Principal of Erdington Hall Primary School, which is attached to the building that Oscott Hill have begun decorating for use from May 2022, I have deep concerns as to the suitability of sharing our immediate vicinity with up to a maximum of 36 students and 11 members of staff. There is no parking for the 11 members of staff on site.

In the first instance, our school had submitted a proposal in November 2021 to take over the running of the building to provide a range of support to the children and families in our community. This proposal was after a meeting with BCC who gave us guidance to follow, however when we submitted our proposal, it was not even acknowledged.

Despite emails asking for feedback, we only heard on 9th March that work would be commencing and Oscott Hill were running a project with a view to opening an additional site for their use in September 2022.

There has been no site assessment to date and I believe this will not be shared before the period of consultation ends.

There is little or no parking on Ryland Road at the moment and having up to 36 extra 16- 18 year old students bused in at the same time of day as our 370 primary aged pupils arrive and depart will cause severe congestion to what is already an extremely busy road at these times. A traffic survey needs to be carried out immediately to assess the risks to our pupils and their families.

I understand that none of our families who are residents of Ryland Road have been informed of the proposal. I am also concerned that there may be safeguarding risks to primary age children. I have had many of our parents show concern about the location of Oscott Hill next to our school and disappointment that the building was not considered as an option to provide extended services for our community.

I would like to see the site assessments and traffic risk assessments before any decision is made.

Concerning the children center building on Ryland rd (attached to Erd Hall Primary School)

The school put in a proposal to use the building but the council have given the money and space to Oscott Manor without proper consultation with local residents, the school or parents.

The building is not suitable for the proposed use for 16-19 year olds, No out door provisions. Even the fire exits are on EHS land so would cause safeguarding issues for the children, Foot traffic, traffic On the road and parking issues for the residents on both Ryland & Bracebridge Road.

Key things to mention are that we are not against the rights of the Oscott children getting an education -it's down to the council to ensure there is adequate provision for them. But knowing the building, we know this isn't purpose built for them and will not benefit like a building with additional outdoor facility and parking would.

The safeguarding issues for primary school as the children center building backs on to school car park, access to play ground and canteen...plus fire exists are all on Erd Hall Primary School.

And very importantly the council have been underhanded about this and that they have ignored the schools request and done this without consulting the local community.

The deadline for objections to this proposal are for this Thursday... seriously how can this agenda be so fast tracked without consultation.

Parking issues on our street. No playground facilities for the proposed children? Where will they have time to burn off their energy ? Safe guarding issues with the primary school right next door. Their staff and children will be vulnerable. The site should be given back to the school..which would cause no extra burden on the residents as they have parking.

Traffic on Ryland Road and parking is already difficult thus will make it even worse

We can confirm sufficiency for special school places is lacking currently and with this school being a county neighbour and increasing spaces for children, we would welcome the proposal. They also have a Good Ofsted inspection which is a good sign they provide a quality service to the young people they serve, and therefore this increase would open potential opportunities for Worcestershire to commission places.

Roland road is not a suitable place for this center. You have primary school children which will be exposed to serve anti social behaviour which will have a knock on effect on their behaviour.

<p>Parking is a real problem in Ryland and I have to play days round school drop off and pick up times. As things are now , getting on and out of road at these times is impossible due to traffic from parents. As a single pensioner living on my own, parking nearby is very important to me. Ryland Road cannot cope with any more traffic and parking at these times.</p> <p>Perhaps you plan to open up the bracebridge road entrance again to ease the burden on Ryland Road and provide suitable parking provision on site for additional staff and parent drop off/pick ups.</p> <p>Had this not been published on an election leaflet delivered to me on 5/4/2022 I would have known nothing about this proposal and question what consultation has been offered to affected local residents regarding this application bearing in mind the end date for responses is only 7/4/2022. When exactly did the LEA plan to inform local residents about this application for change of use</p>
<p>I do not like this proposal because our children are quite young. Their safeguarding is most important and I feel that they should not be mixed with older kids. The kids from Erdington Hall may not engage well with the other students which will cause more problems and unnecessary trouble.</p> <p>I feel like having another school right next to Erdington Hall Primary School will cause more problems during drop off and pick up. Parking will be a real struggle. The more people we will have, the more unsafe the environment can be for children.</p> <p>In my opinion, this decision should be reconsidered. I don't think this is a right decision, as it can have an impact on the kids.</p>
<p>Considering we are a primary setting and this proposal would allow 16-18-year olds, with severe needs, onto our premises, it is the safety of our children that is at risk. Furthermore, with such a narrow and busy road, I cannot see the drop offs and pick ups working with additional buses and cars having to enter the road. It is not safe and the matter has not been handled well as so many people whose interests are at heart have not been informed properly and timely.</p>
<p>Safety of the children in primary school. Too much traffic already. Safeguarding as our children will be around young adults and vulnerability.</p> <p>Feels that the property's are too close and will clash. School could use that building for parent partnerships workshops training, stay and plays, family support team, nurses lending library. We need this as it was a pillar of our community.</p>
<p>The age group for current school will increase to 11+</p> <p>Mixing young children with older pupils will put the younger children in danger of bullying</p> <p>The potential for vandalism will increase</p> <p>Traffic will increase on a narrow and congested road (Ryland road)</p> <p>Will cause additional parking problems for the residents</p> <p>Drug dealers currently living opposite the school will have access to unaccompanied children.</p>

Traffic in Ryland road will increase with congestion during pickup and drop off times. currently there are numerous road rage incidents every week on Ryland Road the main pickup and drop-off focal point

I live on Bracebridge road which Erdington hall school is placed on. Moved here eight years ago my children attend this school. Since moving here both children have developed health issues due to the lack of management and mitigation for Air/Noise pollution even thou the area is within a AQMA. I have HGV regularly using this road to preform three point turns bearing in mind its a school road. My children do not go to local shops because it is now used by business which have brought additional pollutants into this area. Cement sand aggregates dust along with fumes have failed to be addressed hence the high level of child and elderly health issues within the area. My question would be to parents and i understand the need for these school places. Would you feel happy to expose your children to this silent killer which has long term health implications as we are seeing now with the generation of who grew up in area. Education is needed but not at the expense of the health of children. The highway especially Wheelwright road is another danger due to lack of management speeding illegal parking HGV thundering along a residential road at 40mph.

I feel that this people is not fit for purpose of 32 + 11 adults. This building is a one storey building and at the moment comprising of a large room to the back of the building and a small room to the front. The kitchen area is open area and the emergency exits lead on the grounds of the primary school. Having children dropped and picked up at the front of the school will create further traffic. I have to drive to school as I pick my children from three different area of Birmingham therefore going by foot is not possible and I've seen what the traffic situation gets outside the school. They don't have a designated parking area for safety of the children arriving as-well as children walking to school passing the building.

I understand and accept that there isn't enough SEND provision in the area and it will release the pressure on schools and colleges but feel a 16plus provisions would be suited against a secondary school or college which sees the transition of these children from mainstream to SEND or the other way round.

No consultation was done with the residents of this area or the parents of the school next door. We were not given any information of this proposal until we saw work happening at the building and started asking questions as we would like something there for the community. A stay and play, workshops and classes for parents for new residents lack of English and education, we have many refugees who have been lived in the area some help for them, mother and child sessions and baby clinics. Meeting area for children in the area who are under care, maybe a fostering network as we have such an adverse community . Something that will help the parents of children connected with the school which will help with the transition between pre schools and school. Hopefully the school will extend its provision knowing they will have more children will come to school as it can.

This building will be more suited for the community in many ways.

We were upset to see that all the consultation process was under held and kept from the community and we need to be heard.

<p>Already congested road in morning and after school. Centre being full of pupils will make traffic worse</p> <p>Also think as there will be older children/adults at the centre this should not be allowed next to primary school which has much younger children,</p> <p>The risk to younger kids in such close proximity is high. How will children be managed when they go out of the building?</p> <p>Managed prior to entering managed while in the building which is right next door to the centre.</p>
<p>I have been told that there will be safeguarding issues as the children centre is linked to erdington school playground and the pupils will be able to access the schools grounds.</p>
<p>The proposed site is on and within school grounds of another school, housing children from the age of three.</p> <p>There are currently several issues throughout the day with parking. Where is the space for two mini buses? We don't have space in our school car park and the allocated parking space for the new site is tiny.</p> <p>The building overlooks our school site and the new pupils are essentially adults with unknown levels of needs. This could cause anxiety in our young pupils as the windows look over into our dinner canteen.</p> <p>The new building will need an outdoor space - where?</p> <p>None of the issues have been thought about and the whole thing is ill conceived.</p>
<p>As this is on the same site as the school grounds, I feel concerned for the safety of the pupils at Erdington Hall. Having older students on the same grounds will also cause disruption for residents. I also feel that there are many safeguarding concerns for the children surrounding this proposal.</p>
<p>I work in the office at Erdington Hall Primary School. I have concerns regarding safeguarding issues with our primary school age pupils and post 16 provision being on the same site. We already have lots of parking issues during the day with limited parking on the street and it gets particularly busy at the start and end of the day. Traffic will also increase making it less safe for our children and families whilst arriving and departing school.</p> <p>The children's centre has direct access to our premises with two doors that open on to our site. This presents a risk of older children gaining access to our site and our children potentially gaining access to there site. These doors cannot be locked as they are a means of fire escape.</p>
<p>This is going to cause immense issues to the community. Parking and traffic around the school is at high levels anyway nevermind with added crowds. There is also the issues of safeguarding.</p>

<p>I believe Erdington Hall could benefit by offering this building to the community and provide services to the locals. These will include stay and play sessions, toy libraries, coffee mornings ,baby massage and adult education classes. Their is a real need for these services as mental health has become a real concern after covid. Also I feel that before work started on the building the proposed changes should have been discussed.</p>
<p>Not in favour of mixing older children with such younger kids.</p>
<p>I do not agree for the centre to be opened up here as I know what the special children are capable of! They can be a hazard to the properties, primary school children, cars and streets. With the other centres I know of resident who lives next door had damage to her garden! Her dog was hurt! Has it has taken over her social time completely and confidence in going into her own back garden! Having a alternative provision is a very good idea but having it next door to schools and residents is a big No No! You are thinking about them kids yes but what about the safety of our children and people? Please find somewhere else for this centre as this is not the right place for children with needs. Thank you very much</p>
<p>The current building is on the school grounds and as such makes the children in our school vulnerable. Children who have need of a specialist provision will be in extremely close proximity of children under 10.</p> <p>The traffic in Ryland Road is already dangerous before and after school and it would be under more pressure including transport minibuses etc. This would add more difficulty to our children getting to school.</p>
<p>I feel this is far too close to a primary school, and the age range is inappropriate, I can't see it working properly! The pupils will need a break outside and therefore will have to use Erdington hall primary, how would lunchtimes work when our children will be on lunch too, I think this is a massive safe guarding issue! I think St chads would be a better space for the children as that has a massive kitchen and access to outdoor space!</p>
<p>Building is attached to the premises of Erdington Hall Primary School... safeguarding issues as the building will be used for post 16. B"ham city council has not contacted any parent or resident in the area, so no consultantion has taken place</p>



Are you in favour of the proposal? - Analyst notes
<p>opinion - need places in Birmingham</p> <p>opinion - increase is good idea</p>
<p>opinion - in crease is need/good</p>
<p>concern - moving/disruption to pupils (again)</p> <p>concern - current site purpose built/designed with pupils</p> <p>concern - how will this effect teachers - teaching different lessons</p>
<p>concern - moving/disruption to pupils (again)</p> <p>opinion - keep pupils number as low as possible</p>
<p>concern - air pollution in the area is bad</p> <p>concern - traffic safety for pedestrians is bad</p>

opinion - need more SEN places in Birmingham opinion - separate P16 site will expand education offer opinion - help prepare P16 pupils for adulthood
opinion - need SEN places in Birmingham opinion - good to increase places
opinion - positive for post 16 (have space dedicated) positive - main site provide more places.
concern - traffic concern - parking concern - impact on Erdington Hall Primary.
concern - post 16 pupils safety (between sites) concern - time spent travelling between sites. concern - school staff safety (between sites) concern - additional travel costs between sites opinion/suggestion - BCC convert Elwood Centre to school post16. Concern/opinion - pupil numbers too high / impact on transition concern - no outdoor space at Post16 annex (no gym either).
concern/opinion - quality of education must remain high

<p>concern - traffic</p> <p>concern - parking</p>
<p>note: type - staff member [erdington hall school - not Oscott Manor]</p> <p>Concern - traffic</p> <p>concern - parking</p> <p>concern - no outdoor space</p>
<p>concern - traffic</p> <p>concern - parking</p>
<p>opinion - site unsuitable for post16</p> <p>opinion - negative safety &amp; safeguarding neighbouring pupils (opinion - primary school and post16 shared facilities (?))</p> <p>concern - traffic</p>
<p>note: staff member is Erdington Hall (not Oscott Manor)</p> <p>concern - parking</p> <p>concern - traffic (pollution)</p> <p>concern - outdoor space</p>
<p>note: staff member is Erdington Hall - not Oscott Manor.</p> <p>concern - outdoor space</p> <p>concern - traffic</p> <p>concern - parking</p>
<p>note: parent is also staff member at Erdington Hall</p> <p>opinion - not suitable for post16</p> <p>opinion - negative impact on primary children and residents (undefined)</p> <p>concern - parking</p> <p>concern - safety / safeguarding (interaction between different age ranges of pupils).</p>

concern - consultation process (local community)  
concern - process (presumptuous - ref building works)  
concern - impacts on other schools (Erdington hall)  
concern - traffic  
concern - parking  
opinion / concern - safety safeguarding (primary pupils)

note : presume staff member is erdington hall (not oscott manor)  
concern parking  
concern safety safeguarding (primary pupils)  
concern - outdoor space  
concern - traffic

note: not identified as a Birmingham Councillor  
concern - traffic  
opinion - school not needed (?)  
concern - pupils mixing (primary pupils)  
concern / opinion - process - consultation with community (lack transparency)  
concern - parking

<p>concern - parking</p> <p>concern traffic</p>
<p>concern - outdoor space</p> <p>concern - safety safeguarding (primary pupils)</p> <p>concern - parking</p> <p>opinion - building not suitable post16</p>
<p>concern / opinion - safety safeguarding primary pupils</p> <p>concern parking</p> <p>opinion / suggestion - building used for EYCC</p>
<p>concern - safety safeguarding primary pupils</p> <p>erdington hall</p>
<p>concern - traffic</p> <p>concern - parking</p> <p>opinion - building unsuitable post16 / SEND</p> <p>concern - safety safeguarding primary pupils</p>
<p>concern - previous EYCC/community use discontinued</p> <p>question - why locate / need post16 in this locality?</p> <p>question - what benefits to local community?</p> <p>question - risk / options appraisal ref local community?</p> <p>question - other sites considered?</p> <p>question - why this community chosen?</p> <p>concern - process - consult community</p>

concern parking concern process - local community consultation concern process - presumptuous "council approved 4.4.22"(?)
concern parking concern - process community consultation opinion building unsuitable post16 concern - safety safeguarding primary pupils
concern - traffic
opinion - consult local community [directly]
note: likely parent of pupils at Erdington Hall Primary concern - traffic
note: parent of erdington hall primary concern - safety / safeguarding of primary pupils
opinion - good for SEN provision. concern - transport concern - parking

Staff (principal)Erdington hall:

concern - parking

concern - traffic

concern - safety / safeguarding primary pupils

concern - Oscott manor already working on the building.

suggestion (complaint) - Erdington hall proposal to use the site

concern - process - communication with erdington hall staff and  
parents and the local residents

<p>concern - process - communication with Erdington hall staff / parents and the local residents</p> <p>suggestion - Erdington hall proposal</p> <p>opinion - building not suitable for SEN / post16</p> <p>concern - parking</p> <p>concern - outdoor space</p> <p>concern - safety safeguarding primary pupils</p>
<p>concern - parking</p> <p>concern - outdoor space</p> <p>concern - safety safeguarding primary pupils</p> <p>suggestion / opinion - support erdington hall proposal</p>
<p>concern - traffic</p> <p>concern - parking</p>
<p>opinion - positive - need SEN places</p> <p>positive - Oscott Manor has good ofsted</p> <p>positive - additional places may help other LA's (neighbouring LA's)</p>
<p>concern - safety safeguarding primary pupils</p> <p>concern - antisocial behaviour [o foscott manor pupils?]</p> <p>opinion - not suitable for SEN / post16</p>



<p>concern - parking</p> <p>concern - traffic</p> <p>suggestion - solution for parking / entrance to school(s) (bracebridge road)</p> <p>concern - process - communication / consultation with local residents (note misunderstanding "application for change of use" )</p>
<p>note: erdington hall parent</p> <p>concern - safety safeguarding primary pupils</p> <p>concern - traffic</p> <p>concern - parking</p>
<p>note: staff erdington hall</p> <p>concern - safety safeguarding primary pupils</p> <p>concern - traffic</p> <p>concern - process communication</p>
<p>concern - safety safeguarding primary pupils</p> <p>suggestion - support erdington hall proposal</p>
<p>concern - safety safeguarding primary pupils (misunderstanding "mixing")</p> <p>concern - vandalism antisocial behaviour [of oscott manor pupils?]</p> <p>concern - traffic</p> <p>concern - parking</p> <p>concern - drug dealers near children/young adults [antisocial behaviour of others?]</p>

concern - traffic (current issue "road rage" [erdington hall parents])
<p>concern - pollution / environmental issues [+existing concern ref erdington hall]</p> <p>concern - traffic [+existing concern ref erdington hall]</p>
<p>note erdington hall parent</p> <p>opinion - building not suitable for SEN / Post16</p> <p>concern - traffic</p> <p>concern - parking</p> <p>opinion / suggestion - use / create on a secondary school site [not primary]</p> <p>concern - process - oscott manor doing works</p> <p>concern - communicaiton / consultation with erdington hall staff and parents and the community</p> <p>suggestion / opinion - support erdington hall proposal</p>

<p>note: local resident</p> <p>concern - traffic</p> <p>concern - safety safeguarding primary pupils</p>
<p>note: erdington hall parent</p> <p>concern - safety safeguarding primary pupils</p>
<p>note: erdington hall staff</p> <p>concern - parking</p> <p>concern - outdoor space</p> <p>concern - safety safeguarding primary pupils (anxiety)</p>
<p>note: erdington hall staff</p> <p>concern - safety safeguarding primary pupils</p> <p>concern - antisocial behaviour /disruption [caused by oscott manor pupils?]</p>
<p>note: erdington hall staff</p> <p>concern - safety safeguarding primary pupils</p> <p>concern - parking</p> <p>concern - traffic</p>
<p>note erdington hall staff</p> <p>concern - impact on community [?]</p> <p>concern parking</p> <p>concern traffic</p> <p>concern safety safeguarding [primary pupils]</p>

<p>suggestion opinion - support erdington hall proposal</p> <p>concern - process oscott manor started works</p>
<p>note [likely] erdington hall parent</p> <p>concern - safety safeguarding primary pupils</p>
<p>note erdington hall parent / local resident</p> <p>concern - antisocial behaviour by oscott manor pupils</p> <p>opinion - SEN pupils have hazardous behaviour</p> <p>concern / opinion - site not suitable for SEN / post16</p> <p>concern - safety safeguarding primary pupils</p>
<p>note: erdington hall staff</p> <p>concern / opinion - safety safeguarding primary pupils</p> <p>concern - traffic transport</p>
<p>note: likely erdington hall parent</p> <p>concern - outdoor space</p> <p>opinion - not appropriate site for SEN / post16</p> <p>suggestion - alternative site = St Chad's</p> <p>concern - safety safeguarding primary pupils</p>
<p>note likley erdington hall parent</p> <p>concern safety safeguarding primary pupils</p> <p>concern - process communication consultation with erdington hall parents and the local residents community</p>

Last Modified Date	Response ID
2022-03-21 14:36:36	ANON-HS75-315Z-T
2022-03-21 14:37:09	ANON-HS75-315U-N
2022-03-21 14:41:58	ANON-HS75-315T-M
2022-03-21 14:42:25	ANON-HS75-315C-3
2022-03-21 14:45:59	ANON-HS75-3157-Q

2022-03-21 14:47:58	ANON-HS75-3154-M
2022-03-21 14:48:30	ANON-HS75-3155-N
2022-04-11 12:28:11	ANON-HS75-315G-7
2022-04-11 12:29:55	ANON-HS75-315B-2
2022-04-11 12:36:05	ANON-HS75-315A-1
2022-04-11 12:36:36	ANON-HS75-3153-K

2022-04-11 12:37:55	ANON-HS75-315F-6
2022-04-11 12:40:25	ANON-HS75-3151-H
2022-04-11 12:47:29	ANON-HS75-315P-G
2022-04-11 12:49:57	ANON-HS75-3156-P
2022-04-11 12:51:04	ANON-HS75-3159-S
2022-04-11 12:53:27	ANON-HS75-315V-P
2022-04-11 12:56:45	ANON-HS75-3152-J

2022-04-11 13:01:06	ANON-HS75-315H-8
2022-04-11 13:03:17	ANON-HS75-31BN-U
2022-04-11 13:10:26	ANON-HS75-31BU-2



2022-04-11 13:10:48	ANON-HS75-31BX-5
2022-04-11 13:13:26	ANON-HS75-31BS-Z
2022-04-11 13:14:46	ANON-HS75-31B7-4
2022-04-11 13:16:01	ANON-HS75-31BJ-Q
2022-04-11 13:19:59	ANON-HS75-31BY-6
2022-04-11 13:23:56	ANON-HS75-31BG-M

2022-04-11 13:27:40	ANON-HS75-31BR-Y
2022-04-11 13:31:13	ANON-HS75-31BE-J
2022-04-13 16:53:02	ANON-HS75-31BA-E
2022-04-13 16:59:57	ANON-HS75-31BF-K
2022-04-13 17:02:25	ANON-HS75-31B1-X
2022-04-13 17:03:40	ANON-HS75-31BD-H
2022-04-13 17:06:54	ANON-HS75-31BP-W

2022-04-13 17:17:16	ANON-HS75-31B6-3
---------------------	------------------

2022-04-13 17:20:26	ANON-HS75-31BV-3
2022-04-13 17:21:40	ANON-HS75-31BH-N
2022-04-13 17:22:22	ANON-HS75-31YN-J
2022-04-13 17:24:22	ANON-HS75-31YZ-X
2022-04-13 17:26:36	ANON-HS75-31Y8-V

2022-04-13 17:29:51	ANON-HS75-31YC-7
2022-04-13 17:30:52	ANON-HS75-31YM-H
2022-04-13 17:32:05	ANON-HS75-31Y7-U
2022-04-13 17:32:53	ANON-HS75-31Y4-R
2022-04-13 17:34:45	ANON-HS75-31YJ-E

2022-04-13 17:35:43	ANON-HS75-31Y5-S
2022-04-13 17:38:09	ANON-HS75-31YG-B
2022-04-13 17:42:06	ANON-HS75-31YW-U

2022-04-13 17:43:24	ANON-HS75-31YR-P
2022-04-13 17:43:58	ANON-HS75-31YB-6
2022-04-13 17:47:00	ANON-HS75-31Y3-Q
2022-04-13 17:48:10	ANON-HS75-31YF-A
2022-04-13 17:53:51	ANON-HS75-31Y1-N
2022-04-13 17:54:34	ANON-HS75-31YP-M

2022-04-13 17:55:18	ANON-HS75-31YD-8
2022-04-13 17:55:50	ANON-HS75-31Y9-W
2022-04-13 17:58:21	ANON-HS75-31Y6-T
2022-04-13 17:59:11	ANON-HS75-31YV-T
2022-04-13 18:00:34	ANON-HS75-31Y2-P
2022-04-13 18:01:37	ANON-HS75-31YH-C



Comment themes: (counted per mention from total of 60 written comments)	count
Concern – impact/safeguarding Erdington Hall Primary (neighbouring)	31
Concern - Traffic & Parking	29
Concern / Opinion – site / building not suitable for Post16 education	12
Concern – no outdoor space on site for Post16 pupils	10
Concern – consultation process – lack of engagement with local community	10
Suggestion – alternative – transfer/use building as part of Erdington Hall Primary School / Early Years & Childcare	8
Opinion – pupil places are needed / increase is needed	7
Concern / opinion – Post16/SEN pupils’ – antisocial behaviour - negative impact on local community	6
Concern – integrity of consultation process / transparency / “a done-deal”	6
Concern – consultation process – lack of engagement with Erdington Hall Primary (staff/parents)	5
Concern – change & disruption for Post16 pupils	3
Concern / Opinion – keep pupil numbers lower / don’t increase Oscott Manor / don’t need places [in that area]	3
Suggestion – alternative location for Post16 provision – create at St Chads/other secondary	3
Concern – safeguarding Post16 pupils of Oscott Manor (locally/between sites)	2
Concern – air pollution locally	2
Opinion –positive for Post16 pupils’ development	2
Concern – impact on teachers / teaching lessons	1
Concern – time and cost for pupils and staff between sites	1
Concern – safety of staff between sites	1
Suggestion – transform Elwood Centre to be Oscott Manor Post16	1
Concern – quality of education across split sites	1
Positive – Oscott Manor has good Ofsted judgment	1
Opinion – increase is positive for neighbouring Local Authorities	1
Suggestion – parking – use Bracebridge Road entrance to site/Erdington Hall Primary	1



Appendix 4: Cabinet Member Report:  
Ward Councillors Consulted

School Organisation: Oscott Manor School: Increase pupils places by expansion onto an additional site.

Councillor Name:	Date Consulted:	Method of consultation:	Comments
Councillor Adam Higgs	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Adrian Delaney	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Alex Yip	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Bruce Lines	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Darius Sandhu	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor David Barrie	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor David Pears	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Debbie Clancy	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Deirdre Alden	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Ewan Mackey	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Gareth Moore	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Ken Wood	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Kerry Brewer	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Matt S Bennett	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Maureen Cornish	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Meirion Jenkins	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Richard Parkin	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Rick Payne	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Robert Alden	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Ron Storer	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Simon Morrall	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Timothy Huxtable	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Akhlaq Ahmed	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Albert Bore	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Alex Aitken	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Amar Khan	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Barbara Dring	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Basharat Mahmood	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Brigid Jones	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Bushra Bi	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Chaman Lal	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor David Barker	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Des S Hughes	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Diane Donaldson	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Fred Grindrod	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor GurdialSingh Atwal	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Hendrina Quinnen	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Ian Ward	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Jack Deakin	10/03/2022	Email	No comment

Councillor Jamie Tennant	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Jane E Jones	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Jayne Francis	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Jilly Birmingham	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor John Cotton	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Karen McCarthy	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Kath Hartley	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Kath Scott	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Katherine Iroh	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Kerry Jenkins	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Kirsten Kurt-Elli	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Lauren Rainbow	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Lee Marsham	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Lisa Trickett	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Liz Clements	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Mahmood Hussain	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Majid Mahmood	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Marcus Bernasconi	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Mariam Khan	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Marje Bridle	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Martin J Brooks	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Mary Locke	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
			Requested additional information on the proposal, consultation process and noted concerns from ward constituents. The concerns are represented in this report and appendices.
Councillor Mick Brown	10/03/2022	Email	
Councillor Miranda Perks	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Mohammed Azim	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Mohammed Idrees	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor NarinderKaur Kooner	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Nicky Brennan	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Phil Davis	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Raqeeb Aziz	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Rashad Mahmood	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Ray Goodwin	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Rinkal Shergill	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Rob Pocock	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Saddak Miah	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Saima Suleman	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Sam Forsyth	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Saqib Khan	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Shabina Bano	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Shabrana Hussain	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Shafique Shah	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Sharon Thompson	10/03/2022	Email	No comment

Councillor Shehla Moledina	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Sybil Spence	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Waseem Zaffar	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Yvonne Mosquito	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Zafar A Iqbal	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Ziaul Islam	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Ayoub Khan	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Baber Baz	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Colin F Green	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Deborah Harries	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Izzy Knowles	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Jon Hunt	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Morriam Jan	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Mumtaz Hussain	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Paul Tilsley	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Penny Wagg	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Roger Harmer	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Zaker Choudhry	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Julien Pritchard	10/03/2022	Email	No comment
Councillor Rob Grant	10/03/2022	Email	No comment

