

Policy and Sustainability Committee

10am, Thursday, 25 June 2020

Outcome of the Statutory Consultation Process on the Proposal to Establish an Annexe to Kirkliston Primary School at Kirkliston Leisure Centre

Executive/routine Wards Council Commitments	Executive Almond 28
---	---------------------------

1. Recommendations

- 1.1 Approve the proposal to establish an annexe to Kirkliston Primary School at Kirkliston Leisure Centre.

Alistair Gaw

Executive Director of Communities and Families

Contact: Robbie Crockatt, Learning Estate Planning Manager

E-mail: robbie.crockatt@edinburgh.gov.uk | Tel: 0131 469 3051

2. Executive Summary

- 2.1 On [8 October 2019](#) the Education, Children and Families Committee approved that a [statutory consultation](#) be undertaken on the proposal to establish an annexe of Kirkliston Primary School on the Kirkliston Leisure Centre site. The annexe is required to address accommodation pressure at the school caused by rising P1 intakes linked to housing growth around Kirkliston. Following the consultation, this report recommends the proposal, as set out in the statutory consultation paper, is progressed.

3. Background

- 3.1 On [8 October 2019](#) the Education, Children and Families Committee approved a [statutory consultation](#) to be undertaken on the proposal to establish an annexe of Kirkliston Primary School on the Kirkliston Leisure Centre site.
- 3.2 In summary, the statutory consultation paper proposed the following:
- Establish an annexe for P1, alongside a new early learning and childcare setting, and P2 at a future date, if required;
 - No changes to primary or secondary school catchment areas are proposed.
- 3.3 The annexe could open in August 2022 at the earliest, subject to obtaining necessary consents and easing of the current restrictions affecting workplaces and construction sites because of the Coronavirus pandemic.
- 3.4 If the proposal is not approved the status quo would be maintained and the existing primary school would be extended through the provision of temporary units according to demand. A new early learning and childcare setting would continue to be developed, subject to obtaining necessary consents.

4. Main report

- 4.1 The statutory consultation has been undertaken according to the requirements set out in the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 as amended by the Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014.
- 4.2 The consultation period ran from Monday 28 October 2019 to Monday 9 December 2019. The full statutory consultation paper is available [online](#) and a summary paper is provided in [Appendix 1](#). A copy of the full statutory consultation paper is also available in the Elected Members lounge for reference.
- 4.3 The consultation included an online questionnaire, a public meeting, a drop in event, and a discussion with pupils at Kirkliston Primary School.

Questionnaire and Written Representations

- 4.4 Respondents were encouraged to use a questionnaire available online using the Council's consultation hub. Responses could also be submitted by email or letter or in person at the drop-in event. The consultation attracted 52 responses, 50 online and two from the drop-in event. [Appendix 2](#) provides a summary of the issues raised. The full submissions are available to elected members on request.
- 4.5 The majority of the submissions were from individual parents or local residents. Kirkliston Primary School Parent Council also made a representation.
- 4.6 Those who responded using the online questionnaire or the questionnaire at the end of the consultation paper were asked whether they support the proposal. Of the 52 responses, 33 supported the proposal and 19 did not.

Key Issues and Council Response

- 4.7 The main themes and issues that were raised by the online questionnaire or written representations include:
- A second primary school is required;
 - Splitting the school and associated consequences;
 - Loss of leisure and recreation facilities;
 - Congestion, parking, drop-off and road safety;
 - Should be bigger, accommodating P1-P3;
 - Annexe should be adaptable because the school roll is likely to fall;
 - A long-term solution for secondary education is required;
- 4.8 Comments were also raised in support of the proposal because it reduced pressure on the main school site and for the principle of an 'early level' learning environment.
- 4.9 Further details about the comments that were received, as well as the Council response on each issue are set out in [Appendix 2](#).

Public Meeting

- 4.10 A public meeting was held on Thursday 14 November 2019 at Kirkliston Primary School. Council officials answered questions following a short presentation. A minute of the meeting is provided in [Appendix 3](#), setting out the issues that were raised and the Council response.

Pupil Consultation

- 4.11 A consultation exercise with pupils at Kirkliston Primary School was carried out by a Council Quality Improvement Officer (QIO).

- 4.12 The QIO spoke with a group of eight pupils from P4-P6 and House Captains from P7 about the proposal. [Appendix 4](#) has a summary of the discussion.
- 4.13 The pupils raised concerns about splitting the school (buddies, walking to and from the main school site) but also acknowledged new opportunities, mini buddy system between P1 and nursery, P1's would have more and a quieter space to play and older pupils would benefit from more playground space and longer lunches.

Education Scotland

- 4.14 As required by the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 as amended by the Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014, all the responses received during the public consultation were made available to Education Scotland for their consideration. Education Scotland visited Kirkliston Primary School and discussed the educational aspects of the proposal with staff, parents and pupils before producing their final report. Their report provides an independent and impartial consideration of the proposal and the manner in which the consultation was conducted. The report was submitted in January 2020 and is attached in [Appendix 5](#).
- 4.15 The conclusion of Education Scotland is that the proposal has some educational benefits. The report concludes that *'Given the current accommodation situation at the main Kirkliston Primary School site and the potential it provides for a more cohesive early level transition from nursery to P1 the proposal has the potential to provide some educational benefits. However, the council may need to review the estate should current roll projections change. Senior leaders at the nursery and school are developing coherent plans to ensure that if the proposal goes ahead there is no loss to existing valued programmes and to address practical issues such as starting times.'*
- 4.16 Education Scotland acknowledged the current school site could not accommodate the projected increase in the school roll without compromising access to gathering, play and some learning spaces.
- 4.17 Education Scotland also recognised the school's management team were developing plans to reduce any negative impacts which should mitigate any educational disadvantage from operating across a split site.
- 4.18 The Act requires that the Council's Outcome of Consultation report include 'a statement of the authority's response to Education Scotland's report'. In summary, two key issues were identified. The Council's response to each is set out in the following table.

Issue 1	The Council needs to consider further whether the decision to not develop a second primary school in the area will be the correct one in the longer term.
---------	---

Council Response 1	<p>Feedback received through the informal consultation process prior to this statutory consultation was that a second primary school would not be supported. A second primary school in Kirkliston is not desirable principally because a new primary school would split the village and potentially families unless there was a mandatory transfer to the new school.</p> <p>There is no site identified for a new primary school, the leisure centre is too close to the existing school to be taken forward as a separate school with a separate catchment area.</p> <p>The Council will continue to monitor any further housing growth and assess, at that time, whether a new primary school to serve the area is required.</p>
Issue 2	<p>The Council needs to consider how best to ensure pupils and their families have safe access and walking routes around and between both sites.</p>
Council Response 2	<p>Start and finish times between the sites will be staggered to ensure parents and carers do not need to be at different sites at the same time.</p> <p>The distance between the sites is relatively short, approximately 500 metres, and there is an existing on demand controlled crossing point on Stirling Road.</p> <p>There is an outstanding action for housing developers to install traffic calming measures (speed cushions) on Kirklands Park Street that will be undertaken in advance of the annexe being complete.</p> <p>Once these measures are complete the Council will work with the school and the active travel team to review the route to the annexe and take any additional measures to encourage walking between sites.</p> <p>The Active Travel team have been consulted and recommend a new pedestrian crossing should be formed over Kirklands Park Street as close to the proposed entrance as possible. The crossing should be a 'flat top' with no level change for pedestrians in keeping with the wider traffic calming proposals on Kirklands Park Street.</p>

	Using the path leading to Kirklands Park Crescent, opposite the controlled crossing on Stirling Street, would be a quiet alternative to walking along Stirling Road.
--	--

Conclusions

- 4.19 It is recommended that the Council approve that the proposed new annexe as set out in the statutory consultation paper is progressed.
- 4.20 The requirement to find an appropriate solution to address secondary school accommodation pressures will be taken forward separately at the appropriate time. The potential for a new West Edinburgh High School will also be considered as part of the preparation of the Council's City Plan 2030.

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 If the recommendations set out in this paper are approved by the Council the project to deliver the annexe will be taken forward. A design team is already in place to develop the new early years setting. The new early years setting could open in January 2022 and the P1 building could open in August 2022, subject to obtaining necessary consents easing of the current restrictions affecting workplaces and construction sites because of the Coronavirus pandemic.

6. Financial impact

- 6.1 A construction cost estimate for the early years and P1 phases was included in the capital programme at £2,974,400. This was to be met by a combination of funding from the Early Years and Rising Rolls allocated capital budgets. This estimate will require to be updated as part of the review of the capital programme being undertaken due to the current COVID 19 circumstances.
- 6.2 A budget for a new pedestrian crossing on Kirklands Park Street would have to be established as part of the project.
- 6.3 A new educational building will lead to an increase in operational costs for the Council. The increased revenue running costs, provided by the Strategic Asset Management Team are estimated to be £78,561 per year for the early years and P1 building. If P2 is delivered at a later stage, the increased revenue costs are estimated to be £116,865 per year. Provision for these additional running costs has been included within the revenue budget framework.

- 6.4 The annexe would be managed by the head teacher of Kirkliston Primary School.
- 6.5 Further detail about the financial impact of the proposal is set out within the statutory consultation paper.

Funding

- 6.6 The delivery of a new Early Years Centre on the Kirkliston Leisure Centre site is funded from the Early Years grant received from the Scottish Government as part of the expansion of Early Years provision to 1140 hours. Funding has been identified in the Council's Capital Programme as part of the Rising Rolls project to allow demand for places at Kirkliston Primary School to be met. It is anticipated that efficiencies will be achieved by combining the Early Years and Rising Rolls projects in a single project.

7. Stakeholder/Community Impact

- 7.1 The statutory consultation to which this paper refers has been undertaken according to the requirements set out in the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 as amended by the Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014.

8. Background reading/external references

- 8.1 Education, Children and Families Committee, 8 October 2019, ['Statutory Consultations – Kirkliston and Queensferry'](#).

9. Appendices

- 9.1 Summary of the Statutory Consultation Paper
- 9.2 Questionnaire and Written Representations - Issues Raised and Council Response
- 9.3 Minute of the Statutory Consultation Public Meeting
- 9.4 Notes from Pupil Consultation
- 9.5 Education Scotland Report

APPENDIX 1 - Summary of Statutory Consultation Paper

Consultation on a Proposal to Establish an Annexe to Kirkliston Primary School Summary Paper

www.edinburgh.gov.uk/kirklistonannexe

On [8 October 2019](#), the Education, Children and Families Committee agreed to carry out a statutory consultation proposing the establishment of an annexe to Kirkliston Primary School.

What is being proposed?

It is proposed to establish an annexe to Kirkliston Primary School next to Kirkliston Leisure Centre. The proposed annexe would be located alongside a new Early Learning and Childcare setting and would be constructed in three phases:

1. New early learning and childcare (ELC) facility;
2. New classrooms for P1
3. New classrooms for P2, if required.

The annexe will have its own dining area and servery and offices for school management and support staff. It is expected a member of the school management team would be located at the annexe along with additional teaching, support and administration staff. The existing school or the Leisure Centre will be used for P.E. and assembly.

The proposal affects all addresses in the existing Kirkliston Primary School catchment area.

There are no primary or secondary catchment changes as a result of this proposal. The existing Kirkliston community will continue to be served by one primary school.

A map showing the location of the school and the leisure centre is included within the statutory consultation paper.

Why is the annexe required?

In 2017 Kirkliston Primary School was extended to 19 classes, excluding two classroom sized GP rooms and a new gym/dining hall with a capacity of 546 pupils.

In August 2019, a temporary unit containing four classes (two classrooms and two GP rooms) was delivered. A temporary planning permission was granted to August

2023 to enable the Education Authority to identify a long term solution for primary provision in the village.

The P1 intake for 2019/20 was 99, the school roll 629 with a class organisation of 22 classes, with four classes operating at P1, P2 and P3.

An annexe is required to support the rising primary school roll that is attributed to the plan led housing growth across the village that has exceeded projected pupil generation assumptions.

Annual school roll projections indicate Kirkliston Primary School's roll will grow beyond 1,000 pupils. However, in 2018 the birth rate dropped, the first significant drop since 2010, and while still high, the P1 intake for 2019 dropped for the first time in four years.

At this time, it is unclear whether the projections are overestimating the peak roll and if the requirement to extend the school to a four stream, 28 class school will be required.

The annexe will reduce pressure on the existing primary school's core facilities and school grounds.

Why relocate the junior stage?

Curriculum for Excellence is the national curriculum of experiences and outcomes for all pupils aged 3-18 years. A broad general education focussing on well planned experiences and outcomes across all curriculum areas is provided from early years to S3. The Curriculum for Excellence identifies experiences and outcomes for five levels of learning to reflect the stages of maturation of children.

Early Level covers pre-school years and P1 and adopts a holistic, supported learning environment to encourage active learning. Moving Primary 1 to an annexe with a new ELC will allow for a seamless progression in learning in an environment that promotes creative and engaging teaching approaches that will encourage health and wellbeing, participation in sport and outdoor learning. Active learning approaches continue beyond P1 into the first level (P2-P4).

The school day is also shorter for P1 and P2 who finish at 14:45, P3-P7 finish at 15:15.

The P1 annexe will be less overwhelming for them than the alternative which would be to expand and accommodate over 800 pupils on a single site, assuming the school roll grows to a four stream primary school.

At the senior stages of primary school, children take on significant responsibilities, often acting as role models for younger children and those opportunities would be lost if the senior stage of primary school was annexed.

When will the proposed change be implemented?

If the proposal is approved by the Council, and necessary consents obtained timeously to construct the building, it is expected the ELC setting will be available from August 2021 and P1 classes from August 2022.

Why are we consulting?

We want to hear the views of anyone affected by the proposals. There is also a legal obligation to carry out a statutory consultation under the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 as amended by the Children and Young people (Scotland) Act 2014.

How will I know if my views have been considered?

All comments made during the statutory consultation period will be recorded and represented in a final 'Outcomes of the Consultation Report' that we expect to be considered by Council in April 2020. The report will be published three weeks in advance of the Council meeting and parents of pupils attending affected school and anyone who has responded to the consultation will be notified of its publication.

How can I find out more about the proposals or make my views heard?

If you want more information you can find the full consultation paper and other supporting information at www.edinburgh.gov.uk/kirklistonannexe.

We have also organised one public meeting which anyone can attend, as below:

Venue	Date	Time
Kirkliston Primary School	Thursday, 14 November 2019	18:30 – 20:30

The meeting will open with a short presentation about the consultation and what is proposed, followed by a question and answer session. We will take a note of the meeting and all of the points made will be captured in the final 'Outcomes of the Consultation Report'.

Please email kirklistonannexe@edinburgh.gov.uk by Wednesday 6 November 2019 if you need translation services at the meeting.

Tell us your views: public consultation period closes Monday 9 December 2019

It would be helpful if you could take time to complete our short survey – you can find it easily online at www.edinburgh.gov.uk/kirklistonannexe. If you don't have internet

access then you can view the full consultation paper at Kirkliston Primary School, Kirkliston Nursery School, Kirkliston Library, Kirkliston Community Centre, Kirkliston Leisure Centre or the Council Offices at Waverley Court.

You can also email comments to us directly at kirklistonannexe@edinburgh.gov.uk or if you prefer, they can be posted to:

Alistair Gaw
Executive Director of Communities and Families
City of Edinburgh Council
Waverley Court (1.2)
4 East Market Street
Edinburgh
EH8 8BG

APPENDIX 2 – Questionnaire and Written Representations

Issues Raised and Council Response

1	Issue: Reduced leisure centre facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced size and operation of leisure centre
	Council Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed building would result in the loss of one grass, seven aside pitch. This pitch has not been used for sport, insofar as Parks and Greenspace have not cut and lined it for sports use, since 2012. It is reasonable to assume that there is very limited demand to use it for outdoor sports at the present time. The leisure centre is open limited hours to the public and there is scope to increase that should there be the demand to do so. The operating hours are currently: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monday 17:00-22:00 Tuesday 16:30-22:00 Wednesday 09:00-22:00 Thursday 12:00-22:00 Friday 13:00-22:00 Saturday 09:00-17:00 Sunday 09:30-16:30 There are no regular lets of the sports pitches. There was one regular let, to Kirkliston and Queensferry FC for the 11-aside pitch, which has now moved to the new 3G pitch in South Queensferry. The proposal does not affect the 11-aside grass pitch. Since the leisure centre opened (mid 1990's), the Council has continued to invest in outdoor sports facilities in the Kirkliston / Queensferry area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 3G multi use, 7-aside pitch at Kirkliston Primary School (2015). This pitch is let on Mondays 14:45-16:00, Wednesdays 15:15-16:15 and Saturday and Sunday 09:00-12:00. A 3G football / rugby pitch with floodlighting in South Queensferry (2017) A floodlit 3G pitch will be delivered in the school grounds of the new Queensferry High School (2020) As part of the proposal the Council will provide suitable compensation for the loss of the grass pitch. This will be determined through the planning process in consultation with Sportscotland.

2	Issue: New Primary School is required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A new school should be delivered instead of creating an annexe to the existing school.
	Council Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal, if fully delivered, would be the equivalent of a four stream primary school and would be the largest school in the city. In 2006, as part of the proposed housing growth around Kirkliston, Council officials recommended a new, single stream primary school should be provided to serve the new houses. Following consultation with the community at that time, it was agreed instead to extend the existing primary school. This was in the interests of social cohesion, to avoid dividing the village and having regard to the geographically discreet nature of the village. On 30 October 2007, the Education, Children and Families Committee agreed to extend Kirkliston Primary School as opposed to establish a new school. A new school would require its own catchment area and would raise similar concerns that the extension to the school sought to avoid. There is no site in the existing urban area suitable to build a new school. Informal consultation with the Kirkliston community continued to suggest a preference for one school to serve the village. It is acknowledged that some residents do not agree with this approach.
3	Issue: Split School Site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Logistics: drop off and pick up times Relationship with the main school – buddies, assemblies Splitting siblings
	Council Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The School's Senior Leadership team are developing plans to ensure there is no loss to existing valued programmes and to address practical issues such as staggering starting times.
4	Issue: Extend the existing school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional accommodation should be provided on the existing school site to avoid splitting the school across two sites.

	Council Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the proposed annexe is not accepted by the Council, then further accommodation on the existing school site will have to be provided. A statutory consultation to establish a school site is not required to continue to extend the existing primary school. However, it is required to establish a permanent annexe to an existing school. • Continuing to extend the existing school will put pressure on the school's core facilities, such as dining, gym, general purpose, staff accommodation and external space. Establishing a permanent annexe would address this concern.
5	Issue: Future growth, Projections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will not be big enough for future growth in the village • The proposal needs to be adaptable because it will not be required in the long term • Why was the extension to the school not designed to accommodate projected growth?
	Council Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In December 2019 it was reported that Kirkliston Primary School's projected roll would rise to over 1,000 from 2026. If fully delivered, the proposed annexe would increase the school capacity of the school to 840. • The consultation paper explains that projection methodology, which is used across the learning estate, is based on rolling forward historic birth and catchment data, including pupil generation from new housing developments, and there is a concern the projections for Kirkliston are rolling forward a pattern of growth that is unlikely to be sustained. • The current projection does not take account of any further housing growth in Kirkliston. If significant housing growth was to occur a new primary school would be required. • The consultation paper explains a flexible approach is required in order to monitor school rolls. Accordingly, the annexe would be constructed on a phased basis with further accommodation being provided when required. • The existing school's extension was designed to accommodate projected growth at that time. Growth in Kirkliston has exceeded those projections and now a new solution is required. The proposed annexe is, in the opinion of officers, the best solution at this time.

6	Issue: Secondary School Provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certainty over future secondary school provision is required.
	Council Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This consultation addresses future accommodation pressure at Kirkliston Primary School and does not propose a solution to future secondary school provision. • It is acknowledged that a permanent and sustainable conclusion to the future of secondary school provision for pupils from Kirkliston Primary School is required. • In December 2019 it was reported that Queensferry High School's projected roll would exceed the notional capacity of the new high school in 2024. • The projected increase is attributed to pupil generation from new housing developments in South Queensferry. In the long term it is expected that Queensferry High School will not be able to accommodate pupils from Kirkliston Primary School and the new primary school at Buileyon Road. • The Council is consulting on the future development of the city and it is expected City Plan 2030 will consider the requirement to deliver additional secondary school capacity in West Edinburgh having regard to long term growth in the whole area.
7	Issue: Access and Travel Routes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion and traffic management issues will be worse because parents will have to drop off at two sites • Safe walking route between the two sites is required.
	Council Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council promotes sustainable forms of travel and discourages using cars to drop off and pick up pupils. Staggering start and finish times will ensure parents and carers have time to walk between sites if they need to drop off and pick up at both sites. • Active Travel have been consulted and their recommendations to form a new crossing on Kirklands Park Street will be developed along with the proposed building. • Road safety will be considered as part of the planning process.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kirkliston Primary School will update its Travel Plan to encourage pupils to walk to school by identifying ways that routes could be made safer between the sites and around the village in general and promote initiatives like 'walking buses'.
8	Issue: Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about air quality because of the proximity of the proposed site to the M9.
	Council Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An air quality consultant has been appointed as part of the design team and any recommendations / mitigation measures will be incorporated in the design of the new facilities if required.
9	Issue: Various	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road infrastructure in Kirkliston is poor. Will the bus gate be removed? Will public transport be improved? Will community facilities be improved, i.e. swimming pool, community centre?
	Council Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This statutory consultation does not propose to address wider infrastructure issues in the village. These matters are outwith the scope of this statutory consultation to address accommodation pressure at Kirkliston Primary School.

Record of Meeting

Proposal to Establish an Annexe of Kirkliston Primary School at Kirkliston Leisure Centre

Public Consultation Meeting held at 6:30 pm, Thursday 14 November 2019, Kirkliston Primary School, Edinburgh

Present: Eighteen members of the public

In Attendance:

Peter Wilson (Independent Chair).

Councillor Alison Dickie (Vice-Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee);

City of Edinburgh Council Officers: Crawford McGhie (Senior Manager, Operational Support), Elaine Watson (Learning Estate Planning Officer), Lucy Henderson (Head Teacher), Janice Watson (Quality Improvement Officer) and Blair Ritchie (Committee Services).

1. Introduction

Peter Wilson introduced himself. He explained that he was the independent chair with a police background, that he had been invited by the City of Edinburgh Council to ensure impartiality and his role was to ensure that everyone has their say. This was part of a process where comments by the public would be included in a Council report, which would then be published. Elaine Watson, from Communities and Families would give a presentation of the proposals, then members of the public would have the opportunity to ask questions. There might be issue around the possible construction of a high school, which would be accommodated, but he urged people to focus on the proposal in the consultation.

The Schools (Consultation Scotland) Act 2010 required the Council to conduct a public consultation. The public consultation would provide people with the opportunity to express their views and feed directly into the consultation process.

2. Presentation/Proposal

The event started with a presentation that provided some background information on the reasons behind the Proposal to establish an annex of Kirkliston Primary School at Kirkliston Leisure Centre.

Background

Kirkliston Primary School was extended to a 19-class capacity in August 2017. In 2018/19 the P1 intake was 107 pupils and the class organisation was 21 classes. A temporary four classroom extension to the school was delivered in August 2019. The school is now using the leisure centre one day a week for PE to reduce pressure on its gym/dining hall. The P1 intake for 2019/20 was 99 pupils and the school was operating with 22 classes.

The draft statutory consultation paper set out further the context in which the consultation was proposed and provided details of the proposal in full. Some of the key points were summarised below:

- New housing has driven up the Kirkliston Primary School roll with 804 properties delivered since 2010/11.
- The number of houses being completed has fallen each year since 2012/13 and no significant approved sites remain to be developed as yet.
- The Council's annual school roll projections continue to show that Kirkliston Primary School's roll would grow beyond 1,000 pupils. However, as these were based on rolling forward historic patterns of growth there were concerns that for Kirkliston they may be overestimating the peak roll.
- In 2018 the birth rate in Kirkliston dropped – the first significant drop since 2010. While still high, the P1 intake in 2019 also dropped for the first time in 4 years.
- It was unclear whether a requirement for 25 classes was likely to be sustained in the long-term. A flexible approach was required to avoid the potential for over-provision in future years.

The views expressed at the public consultation meeting showed that a new and separate primary school within Kirkliston was the least preferred option over concerns of dividing the community, and therefore this should be considered only if necessary. The proposals set out in the consultation paper did not directly impact on secondary school provision for pupils from Kirkliston. Pupils from Kirkliston would continue to attend Queensferry High School and there were no changes to catchment boundaries or transfer arrangements proposed as part of this paper.

Secondary School Provision

At the December 2017 meeting of the Education, Children and Families Committee it was agreed that it was not possible to rule out the feasibility of Kirkliston supporting a new high

school in its own right. In June 2018 the Committee requested that Officers continued to negotiate with landowners in relation to a site for secondary provision in Kirkliston.

Linked to this consideration was the issue of whether Kirkliston would grow in the future if further land was released for housing development. While there were no current approved further housing developments, there was also interest from local developers to expand the village, most recently made public through a consultation event from one developer, for 2000 homes. This was not in the development plan and was a matter for the planning department. Education officers remained aware of these.

Work to develop options for secondary education for children in Kirkliston would continue and would be the subject of a separate statutory consultation process at the appropriate time.

Proposal

It was proposed to permanently increase the capacity of Kirkliston Primary School from 19 classes to 23 classes by establishing a permanent annexe of Kirkliston Primary School on the Kirkliston Leisure Centre site. The annex would initially only accommodate P1 pupils along with a new early learning and childcare facility. The new P1 classrooms would be built with an expansion strategy to allow P2 pupils to also move to the Leisure Centre site at a future stage, extending the school's overall capacity to 28 classes.

The existing temporary units on the Kirkliston Primary School site would be kept on the main school site to temporarily increase the capacity of the school to 27 classes until the long-term accommodation requirements of the school could more accurately be assessed.

This proposal made no changes to the existing primary or secondary school catchment areas. The new annex could open in August 2022 at the earliest, subject to obtaining the necessary consents.

The leisure centre was located 500m to the north-west of the existing primary school site and was within walking distance of the existing primary school. There was an existing pedestrian crossing on Stirling Road. Since August 2019 the school had used the sports facilities in the leisure centre to provide P.E. one day a week.

The proposed building would be designed to be delivered in three phases. The first phase would provide a new early learning and childcare facility. The second phase would provide new classrooms that supported and encourage active, play based, learning for up to 120 P1 pupils. The requirement for a third phase providing accommodation for 120 P2 pupils would be monitored. The annex would have its own dining area and servery and offices for school management and support staff. It was expected the school would continue to use the leisure centre and the main school building for P.E. and assembly.

Next Steps

The six-week statutory consultation would come to an end on the 9 December 2019. Any comments that the Council received would have to be considered and responded to in an Outcome of Statutory Consultation Report which would be put to the full Council most likely in March 2020. Once the public consultation phase had finished, details of the representations received would be issued to Education Scotland for their consideration.

Education Scotland would issue a report on their findings which would be included in the final Council report on the consultation.

Peter Wilson thanked Elaine Watson for the presentation and asked for any questions or comments.

3. Questions/Comments

Question 1 - In the proposals, it was planned to open the school annex in 2022. What was the interim plan, over the next three years, for the school and for the nursery children as the nursery would not be big enough for the increase in nursery hours.

Answer (Council Officer) – The plan was to use the present building. If more accommodation was required, it would be possible to do this. For Early Years it would only be possible to build the nursery when it could be delivered. One of the challenges when building on the Leisure Centre Site, the authority did not yet know how they would phase it.

There were discussions going on at present with Edinburgh Council about the possibility of starting the 1140 hours of nursery provision in August 2020. Instead of this being for “open-term” time, it might be full year provision, to allow children to have 1140 hours. Considering all the other nurseries in Kirkliston, including partnership nurseries, it should be possible to accommodate all the children that were entitled to 1140 hours. If they went for the full year, it might be easier to provide the full 1140 hours. The intention was to start in August 2020.

Supplementary Question – When would this be finalised?

Answer (Council Officer) – There would be further consultations taking place in January 2020, but nothing had been established yet. There was some difficulty with space at the nursery. Children could not get out to garden, during the drop off-time and there was a need to have proper kitchen space for lunches. The Authority would have to be creative to organise this.

Question 2 – Had the capacity of private nurseries been assessed? They could not currently accommodate children, how then could additional children then be accommodated?

Answer (Council Officer) - According to the 1140 hours plan, children could be accommodated, but not necessarily in the nursery that they wanted. It was necessary to look at the numbers in all nurseries . This was still in process, but it was planned for there to be 1140 hours of nursery provision in August.

Question 3 – Could nursery hours be split between various nurseries, including Kirkliston Nursery and carry the balance to a private nursery?

Answer (Council Officer) Quite a lot of private nurseries, but not all of them did that.

Supplementary Question – Was it 640 hours of nursery provision that parents received through the scheme. The remainder could be claimed back.

Answer (Council Officer) - It was confirmed that this was the case.

Question 4 – A parent had two children at school and he was concerned about the size of the primary school and what would happen if the number of pupils exceeded the limit. What experience did the Authority have of running a primary school of that size?

Answer (Council Officer) There was no school of that size in Edinburgh. It was estimated that the population of the school would rise to 1000, based on projection methodology. However, it was now expected that the birth rates and rolls would decrease. Nevertheless, it would end up being biggest primary school in Edinburgh. That was why they were having this consultation. They were trying to accommodate all the children. There was informal consultation to decide if people wanted a second primary school or to retain one school. Most people seem to be favour of keeping one school. Before having this consultation, there were close discussions with the school.

(Head Teacher) – The Authority did have a “big schools” network in Edinburgh, where they met and discussed various issues and on the management of big schools. In Dunbar there was a big school on 2 sites and it would be beneficial to check out how this was managed. Kirkliston was a big school that felt like a village school and was fortunate in the staff, teams, parents and the community. With all the networks, it was possible to make a bigger school a good learning experience.

(Council Officer) - There were other examples of this approach. By taking the annex option, they were reducing pressure on this site.

Question 5 – How big did you expect the school to get, did the annex proposal cover it and was the site big enough?

Answer (Council Officer) - The long-term projections showed over 1000 pupils, with a very high P1 ratio, but this might be narrowing. The officer who compiled the projections thought it would might not be necessary to build provision for p2 on that site, which was why the Authority were trying to maintain flexibility.

Supplementary Question – Were you confident that the site was big enough?

Answer (Council Officer) - It should accommodate all P1 and P2. The Authority was not so confident that Kirkliston rolls were heading in a particular direction.

Answer (Council Officer) – There was a definite trend whereby a lot of families moved into housing that had young families and those families would stay there. However, that trend would stop and the children would get older. (This happened in Ratho after the financial crash in 2008.) There would probably then be a reduction in numbers at Kirkliston. The Authority had done a review of the projections and had new pupil generation rates from the housing developments. This was not an exact science.

Question 6 – It seemed obvious that lots of young families moved into these types of houses and was this accounted for?

Answer (Council Officer) – At the time, the Council wanted another school that could be expanded, but this was turned down by the people who were consulted.

Question 7 – Might not the quieter children in earlier years get lost in a cohort of 100 P1's ?

Answer (Head Teacher) - At present, the P1's only got to use a section of the playground. But as the school grew, it might be necessary to put more safeguards in place. Although there were lots of children, they were still in their classrooms groups and only got to use one part of the playground. This ensured that they did not find it too overwhelming.

Answer (Council Officer) - When people came into the school in the morning, all the children were in the front playground and it appeared to be really busy, but later, they had moved round a side and had staff supporting them. The school was fortunate to have such space.

Answer (Head Teacher) - P1 and P2 did not mix with older pupils, as this could cause problems. The school made sure that this was timetabled.

Answer (Council Officer) – The Annex had its own playground area and there would not be so many children on site. It could be beneficial to have the school on 2 sites, based on the prevailing circumstances.

Question 8 – What about pollution from the major road next to the Leisure Centre?

Answer (Council Officer) – The Authority were about to appoint a design team and an air quality consultant. But if there was anything to be taken on board through the design process, air quality would be a consideration.

Comment – The Council should make sure that the survey was taken between 8 am and 9 am when traffic was at a standstill, to get a proper result.

Question 9 – A proposal had been made at a previous meeting, but was then rejected because of the cost. What had changed?

Answer (Council Officer) – At the last meeting, the Authority were considering a temporary solution for P1. Through the design process, P1's would have been isolated. This would have been quite a costly solution and the long-term solution was to provide what was wanted. It was necessary to be in a formal setting to progress matters.

Question 10 – A parent indicated that her son had just started P1 and this had been a positive experience. She was worried that her daughter would not receive this and wanted her to have the same experience of starting school, not just moving from a nursery.

Answer (Head Teacher) - One of the most important aspects for transition for children was coming into a new building and carrying out the same activities as older children. The school would ensure that there would be buddy opportunities. They had started having assemblies to try to make P1s and P2s mix together. New P1's would be entering a different learning environment. Although they were not going from the nursery to the main school, this would be a different but very good experience. The school wanted a close link between the Nursery and P1. Once that transition become the norm it would become easier. Here, the school had the opportunity to do something exiting.

Answer (Council Officer) There was a similar situation in South Morningside Primary School. That transition was managed well and it would be the norm for these children. The physical transition was different, but the learning transition was the same.

Answer (Head Teacher) The current set-up meant that P1's had to walk further. After P1's had attended their assemblies, they headed up for their classes. If this was on same site, there would be more opportunities.

Question 11 – Was there anything that would stop this proposal from happening?

Answer (Council Officer) – There was always a planning risk, wherever there was a potential loss of playing fields. Informal discussions had been taking place with Sports Scotland. There was an informal agreement to put a fence round the 11-a side pitch, but there had not been any detailed site investigations.

Chair - Regarding the statutory consultation process, there would be the consultation period, it would go to Education Scotland, they will give their opinion, it would then go to Full Council for final approval. Therefore, there were various hurdles to be overcome.

Question 12 – How was it possible to measure if there was public support?

Answer (Council Officer) – They were inviting comments through the Consultation Hub, the results of which would be one part of report to the Council.

Supplementary Question – What percentage would demonstrate public support?

Answer (Council Officer) – The report would reflect the comments which were received

Answer (Council Officer) – For any comments from members of the public, officers had to provide definite answers, which the elected members would consider. There might be 60% – 40% against, but the members might still approve the proposals.

Question 13 – On either side of the argument, the views of the most vociferous side were usually taken on board – even if they were in the minority. Local people did not want two primary schools at Kirkliston.

Answer (Council Officer) – In 2007, the Education, Children and Families Committee decided not to have two primary schools

Comment – In the community, people thought that this was now a bad decision. Because of the recent massive housing construction, they thought that another school would be a positive development to relieve the pressure.

Answer (Council Officer) – It was always possible to consider different opinions and there would always be loud voices in these consultation exercises. The Authority would not propose this if they thought it was not feasible. If there was further housing development in this area, then there would be a proposal for another school.

Comment – The problem was that no one foresaw the scale of growth that had happened. The village had not formally been consulted to determine if the view they held in 2006 was still the current view.

Question 14 – How relevant were these opinions – what was the current opinion of the population?

Answer (Council Officer) – He did not know the figures. The Authority could only put forward the best option the current situation, have the consultation and make the decision. The informal consultation preceded the formal consultation.

The feeling in the community in January 2019 was that they did not want another primary school at that time, or for the school to be split.

Comment – It would make sense to have this consultation at same time as the secondary school consultation. It was surprising that this was not being included in this discussion.

Question 15 – How would the two sites work in terms of catchment? Some schools were split by age, but this was this not considered here.

Answer (Council Officer) – This proposal would address that, with the Early Learning being located on one side and other age groups on the other side. It was intended that additional classes would be located on the annex side. This put different ages in different areas.

Question 16 – Was it not the case that in larger schools, they had different arrangements for the classes. This was almost like two schools.

Answer (Head Teacher) - The school roll in the earlier years was now much bigger than in the later years and this had to be balanced. They had not thought of going as far up the school as P3. If the roll did not grow at a sufficient rate, the proposal would not be approved as there would be a large amount of learning space that was not utilised. That's why the school thought of P1 and P2 because that's what could be accommodated in this building.

The Chair asked for the view of the Association.

Answer - Anyone who did not have children at school, but had comments, should contact them. The discussion seemed to have been around the pupil journeys and ensuring that

each child had the experience of their first day of school. It was beneficial to have open the open dialogue with the Council. It had been possible to talk through the positive and negative aspects of each option, which seemed to be positive step. In order to have a flexible solution and to progress matters, it was necessary to protect the pupils.

Question 17 – Would the pick-up for children of both sites be staggered?

Answer (Head Teacher) - If the proposal was to go ahead, that what was being proposed. It was thought to have a slightly later drop off time for the P1's. This might be difficult for parents, but the school could accommodate this.

Answer (Council Officer) – At South Morningside Primary School, they carried out a similar procedure. There were three sites, the nursery, the main school and the Annex and the pick-up times were staggered.

Question 18 – If the proposal did not go ahead, what would be the position for the children.

Answer (Council Officer) – There were the new classrooms and it was possible to add another fourth classrooms above them. If they wanted to make this a permanent solution, even though they modular buildings, would still have to meet building/health regulations.

Answer (Head Teacher) - If that was to happen, more classes would use the leisure centre to make sure they had their physical education too. The Annex Option meant that there was less pressure on this site, therefore, this proposal was the best one.

Comment (Chair) – It would be good to know if there was a plan B, if the proposal was not accepted.

Question 19 – Under the new arrangements, would P1's still were a uniform?

Answer (Head Teacher) – Yes, they should, but there would have to be discussions with parents.

Question 20 – Regarding upgrading 3G pitches, had any other improvements of the leisure centre been considered to benefit the community and would there be a joined-up approach with leisure centres?

Answer (Council Officer) – If this proposal went ahead, the Authority had been in discussions with Edinburgh Leisure, to look at how the building could link in with the Leisure Centre.

The Chair asked if members of the public had asked the questions that the wanted and had received satisfactory answers.

Question 21 – At the last meeting, there were some concerns raised about the use of the leisure centre.

Answer (Head Teacher) – That concern had been largely resolved. The main issue was that people were using the gym at the same time. She had spoken to Edinburgh Leisure about availability. The status quo had been maintained. If the school needed to use the gym more often, there would have to be negotiation.

Elaine Watson indicated that she would be at Kirkliston Community Centre on Monday 18 November from 9.00 am to 4.00 pm to answer questions.

Comment – It was thought that this event was badly advertised and some better advertising for Monday would be beneficial.

Additional Comment – A parent did not get any communication from school about this meeting tonight, but only heard by word of mouth.

Answer (Council Officer) – All parents were sent a letter about the consultation.

Answer (Head Teacher) – The Consultation Paper was circulated some time ago.

Answer (Council Officer) – Besides the parents, the local private nurseries were advised of the Consultation Meeting.

Additional Comment – A parent indicated that she had to go through a very convoluted route to find the meeting, but she had finally managed to pick it up from the Council Website.

Further Comment – A parent indicated that this was very badly advertised, which was reflected by the low number of people attending. This was the type of evening meeting that people could usually attend.

Answer (Council Officer) – The Authority set up the meeting on Monday in response to a communication from a parent, so someone must have received the letter.

Answer (Council Officer) – She had also asked local nurseries to contact the parents and had sent a copy of the summary paper and the consultation paper. The Authority had done its best to contact parents, but on occasion, some were not contacted.

Comment – The Chair indicated that the Council should perhaps check its procedures.

Conclusion to Discussion on Kirkliston Primary School

Councillor Dickie indicated that the Council was here to listen to the parents. Some of issues raised were valid, such as rising rolls and play-based connections. Anything which had been raised would be scrutinised and the Council would assess the strength of feeling and base its decisions around that. She then thanked everyone for coming along to the meeting.

Discussion on Proposed Secondary School

Question 22 – Was there any information about the proposed high school?

Answer (Council Officer) – The Authority was not carrying out a consultation on this as they did not yet own a site. There were many sites near this vicinity that might be suitable for a high school. They would have to go through the compulsory purchase order process to acquire a site. It was then outwith their control and it was not known how long that would take.

Question 23 – Had the acquisition of a site been considered?

Answer (Council Officer) – Kirkliston was not of sufficient size to support a high school by itself, whereas there was a large amount of development in West Edinburgh that needed secondary education. If Kirkliston was to grow, then there would be a stronger case for a high school. In this scenario, it would be more possible to acquire a site. However, the Authority had to be careful about timescales before initiating the compulsory purchase order process.

Extra capacity would be required in Queensferry in 2025. The longer it took the sites at Queensferry to be built, the more this became an issue. However, the Authority was monitoring the situation. They would bring forward a statutory consultation at the appropriate time. They would not want to be in the situation where the population of the high school would be smaller than the primary school, because of a potential drop off in 5th and 6th years.

Question 24 – Was it the case that South Queensferry and other schools would cover this until 2025? Developments in the housing market had been delayed.

Answer (Council Officer) – South Queensferry would cover this area until 2025.

Question 25 – Was that why the High School had been delayed?

Answer (Council Officer) - The High School had not been shelved, the Authority had been through the whole of the West and South West of Edinburgh. Officers had been instructed to see if there was site for a high school in Kirkliston, but this had not been completed yet. This was dependant on the location of new housing. This would be decided at a statutory consultation.

Question 26 – Was the Authority still considering a site at Ratho Station?

Answer (Council Officer) – The situation was that along the AA corridor, there had been approval granted for a new primary school. This was now with the Plan Reporter, if this was approved, there would be another 11-class primary school. All the high schools in West Edinburgh were currently at full capacity.

Question 27 – Had working with Winchburgh High School been ruled out?

Answer (Council Officer) – This had been ruled out as an option. People could apply for an out of catchment placement at that school, however, the Authority was not proposing consultation that would make Kirkliston part of the Winchburgh catchment.

Question 28 – How long did it take to build schools?

Answer (Council Officer) – It took about two years to construct the school at Queensferry. The entire process took three and a half years from the date a site had been acquired.

Comment – The pressure for a new school was not quite as high as previously thought.

Answer (Council Officer) – The Authority would like to progress matters as soon as possible.

The Chair indicated that if people wanted to see the difficulties that the authority had in choosing the correct site, they only had to look at the situation in St Andrews. This had been a very convoluted process, where three or four sites had been considered.

4. Conclusion

Mr Wilson brought questions to a close and thanked everyone for all their contributions which were extremely valuable. He reminded everyone that they had until 9 December 2019 to make any further contributions on the website or in writing.

Councillor Alison Dickie thanked everyone for coming and for their contributions.

APPENDIX 4 – Summary of Pupil Consultation

A Quality Improvement Officer from Communities and Families visited Kirkliston Primary School to talk to a group of children from different year groups about the proposal and gather their opinions. A summary of the discussion is provided below.

Pupil Consultation Kirkliston Primary School

8 pupils P4-6 from Pupil Council and House Captains from P7

What are the best things about belonging to Kirkliston Primary School?

- The pitch – there is lots of space, space to do sport (III)
- Adventure
- Christmas jumper day, movies, parties, red nose day
- Charity fund raising
- Buddies
- Kind people
- Teachers and PSAs are nice, so are the senior leaders
- Staff are lovely, always there, hear both sides and are fair
- School dinners – they are lovely so are the dinner ladies, they work really hard and do lots of extras for us – Christmas lunch, Halloween, nice table cloths
- Lots of iPad and technology to use
- Benches – games and buddy
- We are really lucky to go to this school

From what you have heard about the proposed changes, what worries, if any do you have?

- P1s walking to assembly could be an issue, quite a long walk for small legs and stressful as they have to cross lots of roads/dangerous (III)
- Travel time for buddies to go and see the P1s
- Less opportunities to buddy at play time
- Space at the leisure centre will be reduced for others
- If you have a family member who is in P1, you wouldn't see them at school
- After school clubs will be more difficult for P1s to access
- Parents have to go to 2 places making it more difficult to drop off/collect – increase stress (II)
- Makes the move from P1 to P2 a bigger jump
- Impact on community living beside the leisure centre as it will become busier and noisier (II)

What opportunities might this change offer?

- P1's could come to P3-7 assembly and have one playtime at the big school
- More fun for P1 – more space, nursery close so can play there too
- More space for older children in playground if P1 not there
- Younger siblings won't annoy you!

- P1s can use leisure centre facilities
- Nursery good for them to have P1s to look up to, could have mini buddies and this could help them when they come to settle in to P1 (III)
- Nursery and P1s could work on some topics together
- Quieter space for P1s to play on – fewer accidents in the playground
- Lunch would be quicker without P1

What could the adults do to help you with your concerns?

- Reduce the speed limit for cars on the route
- Wonder what is happening to the old nursery – could it be joined to the community centre to give them more space?
- Will need more PSAs so concerned there will be enough money for that
- Need more lollipop people as route dangerous
- Create a by pass to ensure safe travel for children
- Railings needed outside leisure centre



Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010

Report by Education Scotland addressing educational aspects of the proposal by The City of Edinburgh Council to establish an Annexe of Kirkliston Primary School at Kirkliston Leisure Centre.

January 2020

1. Introduction

1.1 This report from Education Scotland has been prepared by Her Majesty's Inspectors of Education (HM Inspectors) in accordance with the terms of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 ("the 2010 Act"). The purpose of the report is to provide an independent and impartial consideration of The City of Edinburgh Council's proposal to establish an Annexe of Kirkliston Primary School at Kirkliston Leisure Centre. Section 2 of the report sets out brief details of the consultation process. Section 3 of the report sets out HM Inspectors' consideration of the educational aspects of the proposal, including significant views expressed by consultees. Section 4 summarises HM Inspectors' overall view of the proposal. Upon receipt of this report, the Act requires the council to consider it and then prepare its final consultation report. The council's final consultation report should include this report and must contain an explanation of how, in finalising the proposal, it has reviewed the initial proposal, including a summary of points raised during the consultation process and the council's response to them. The council has to publish its final consultation report three weeks before it takes its final decision.

1.2 HM Inspectors considered:

- the likely effects of the proposal for children of the school; any other users; children likely to become pupils within two years of the date of publication of the proposal paper;
- any other likely effects of the proposal;
- how the council intends to minimise or avoid any adverse effects that may arise from the proposal; and
- the educational benefits the council believes will result from implementation of the proposal, and the council's reasons for coming to these beliefs.

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

- attendance at the public meeting held on 14 November 2019 in connection with the council's proposals;
- consideration of all relevant documentation provided by the council in relation to the proposal, specifically the educational benefits statement and related consultation documents, written and oral submissions from parents and others; and
- visits to the site of Kirkliston Primary School, Kirkliston Leisure Centre and Kirkliston Nursery, including discussion with relevant consultees.

2. Consultation process

2.1 The City of Edinburgh Council undertook the consultation on its proposal(s) with reference to the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010.

2.2 The statutory consultation period ran from 28 October 2019 until 9 December 2019. A public meeting was held on the 14 November 2019 in Kirkliston Primary School. The public meeting was advertised on the consultation hub and details of the meeting were included in the consultation paper. The consultation document was sent to statutory consultees. Copies of the consultation document were also available on the council website and at the public meeting.

2.3 The public meeting was attended by 18 members of the public. In addition, 50 responses were received through the online survey and two people completed drop-in forms. Of the responses to the online survey and from the two drop-in surveys 46 of the 52 were from parents or carers. Of the 52 responses, 33 were in favour of the proposal and 19 against. The main areas of concern raised through the comments and from stakeholders who met with HM

Inspectors were about whether this provides a long term solution or whether a second school is required to accommodate the growing population of Kirkliston. In addition, many were concerned about the impact that splitting the school across two sites could have for school cohesion.

3. Educational aspects of proposal

3.1 The council outlines how the proposal to establish an annexe of Kirkliston Primary School at the Kirkliston Leisure Centre site will reduce accommodation pressure at the existing Kirkliston Primary School site. It states that were the proposal not to go ahead this would result in significant accommodation pressure at the existing site. There are educational benefits to this aspect of the proposal as the current site could not accommodate the projected increase in the school roll without compromising access to gathering, play and some learning spaces.

3.2 The council outlines how the proposal will maintain a single school with an unchanged catchment area in Kirkliston. The proposal sets out how this will address future accommodation pressure while avoiding splitting the community into two catchment areas that developing a new school would necessitate. In finalising its proposal, the council needs to consider further whether the decision to not develop a second primary school in the area will be the correct one in the longer term.

3.3 The council outlines how the proposal will improve the learning environment for children in P1. The nursery is relocating to the leisure centre site. There are potential educational benefits to having nursery and P1 pupils on the same purpose built site which will be well equipped to deliver a play based early level curriculum. The consultation sets out a potential third phase of the site development to accommodate P2 pupils should the school roll require this. It is less clear that this is of educational benefit other than reducing accommodation pressure on the main site.

3.4 The proposal accepts that there are potential disadvantages to splitting the school over two sites. Parents and pupils also raised concerns about this. For example, parents were concerned about start and drop off times at the two sites, a reduction in integration between P1 and the rest of the school and arrangements for P1-P2 transition. Parents and pupils were concerned about any potential loss to existing highly valued school systems such as the buddy programme. However, senior leaders are already developing plans to reduce any negative impacts which should mitigate against any educational disadvantage.

3.5 A minority of stakeholders are concerned about traffic management around both sites and safe walking routes between the sites. In addition, a few parents were concerned about air quality standards at the new site given its proximity to a major road network. The council needs to consider how best to ensure pupils and their families have safe access and walking routes around and between both sites.

3.6 Pupils at the school considered the proposal well, setting out thoughtful concerns and proposals. They have identified potential educational benefits such as the option to develop a mini-buddy system between nursery and P1 children and more outdoor space for P1s to play in.

4. Summary

Given the current accommodation situation at the main Kirkliston Primary School site and the potential it provides for a more cohesive early level transition from nursery to P1 the proposal has the potential to provide some educational benefits. However, the council may need to review the estate should current roll projections change. Senior leaders at the nursery and school are developing coherent plans to ensure that if the proposal goes ahead there is no loss to existing valued programmes and to address practical issues such as starting times.

**HM Inspectors
January 2020**