

Deputations

Education, Children and Families Committee

10.00 am Tuesday, 23rd January, 2024

Dean of Guild Court Room - City Chambers

Deputations

Contacts

Email: daniel.baigrie@edinburgh.gov.uk / jacqueline.boyle@edinburgh.gov.uk

Tel: 0131 529 4264

Nick Smith

Service Director, Legal and Assurance

This page is intentionally left blank

CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL

Item No 3

EDUCATION, CHILDREN AND FAMILIES COMMITTEE

24 JANUARY 2024

DEPUTATION REQUESTS

Subject	Deputation
3.1 In relation to Item 7.14 on the agenda – Whole Family Wellbeing Fund (Edinburgh) 2024-26 Grant Programme.	Citadel Youth Centre, Board of Trustees (Verbal Deputation)
3.2 In relation to Item 7.4 on the agenda – Education Budget	Edinburgh EIS (Verbal Deputation)
3.3 In relation to Item 7.4 on the agenda – Education Budget	Trinity Primary School Parent Council (Written Deputation)
3.4 In relation to Item 6.1 on the agenda – Business Bulletin (Statutory School Consultation Update)	Steading Owners Association - Kirkliston (Written Deputation)
3.5 In relation to Item 7.4 on the agenda – Education Budget	Bruntsfield Primary School Parent Council (Verbal Deputation)
3.6 In relation to Item 7.4 on the agenda – Education Budget	Stockbridge Primary School Parent Council (Written Deputation)
3.7 In relation to Item 7.4 on the agenda – Education Budget	Royal High School Parent Council (Written Deputation)

Information or statements contained in any deputation to the City of Edinburgh Council represent the views and opinions of those submitting the deputation. The reference to, or publication of, any information or statements included within a deputation, including on the City of Edinburgh Council's website, does not constitute an endorsement by the City of Edinburgh Council of any such information or statement and should not be construed as representing the views or position of the Council. The Council accepts no responsibility for comments or views expressed by individuals or groups as part of their deputations.



Trinity Primary School Parent Council

parentcounciltrinity@gmail.com

Edinburgh

19 January 2024

Deputation regarding the education budget proposals

We are writing to you to express our concerns about the proposals set out in the City of Edinburgh Council's committee papers.

The challenges facing society today are well documented. We are living in an era of low economic productivity and extensive global competition, with an ageing population that will require increasing levels of support to sustain and care for it. In the meantime, one in four children lives in poverty, more and more children are presenting with mental health issues and challenging behaviours, and inequality in experience and attainment continues to slow progress. The recruitment and retention of teachers and school staff is at an all-time low. Children have missed considerable time in the classroom over the past three years.

In order to address these issues, we need to be investing in education. Schools are supposed to be the places that support learners and their families, overcome differences in experience, aspiration and opportunity and equip all learners with the knowledge and skills that they need to become productive members of society who, through their endeavours, character and taxes, will support others. We cannot achieve this if the schools are not properly resourced.

Against this background we wholly oppose the proposed cuts to education and children's services outlined in your budget. School budgets are already stretched and inadequate for the services you expect them to deliver and children are not currently getting the support they need, with impacts being felt by everyone in the classroom. Schools have not been protected from previous budget cuts because they have had to absorb the implications of cuts to other services. They are literally the last service standing. To cut budgets further might well cause them to fall over. These cuts will have short- and long-term consequences that will end up costing us all more money to put right.

We know that you agree with us that education is important to your constituents, which is why so many of you placed it prominently on your election campaign material.

These proposals have been developed with no meaningful consultation with service users (children and their families) or, to the best of our knowledge, with school teaching staff. Those of you who attend our meetings will be aware of the existing pressures on school budgets. Further cuts will, in our view, render the service unfit for purpose. You will be letting our city - and our children - down.

We ask you to reflect on the proposals, and to:

1. Agree that you will do everything in your powers to ensure that the Council Gets It Right For Every Child. Ideally this will mean increasing funding from current levels to adequately deliver the service that is required, and certainly not imposing further cuts.

2. Consider whether there are other areas of council spending where cuts would have a smaller economic or social impact than in education, and prioritise these. Not all cuts in expenditure are equal in impact and to target a service that is time-limited and delivering a universal human right will do considerable harm. The Education Committee could send a strong signal here by encouraging this approach.

3. Pause any proposals to allow for proper consultation with parents and, fundamentally, with your own teaching and support staff.

We ask all of you to work together to resolve this situation, and to take ideas to address it from all political parties. As a group of parents with different political views and priorities please know that we will consider you all more favourably if you cooperate rather than descend into party politics. We would be delighted to engage in further dialogue if that would be useful.

Thank you for your time and support.

Trinity Primary School Parent Council

Kirkliston engagement /views on the new high school at the leisure centre pop in session on the 14 th June 2023 Kirkliston Library and report submitted to the Education committee on the 5th September 2023.

1 .Can I introduce myself my name is Henryk Zukowski and a member and representative on behalf of the Steadings owner association which includes properties located in Kirklands Park Crescent/Gardens and Grove which has a full constitution in accordance with our deeds of condition and adjacent to the leisure centre site in Kirklands Park Street where the new proposed secondary school is to be erected.

2 .Why I am contacting the members of the Education and Families Committee in this unconventional manner after the committee meeting on the 5th September 2023 to progress with consultation process is to express the concern of the members of the association how this whole approach and information concerning the proposals to erect a new feeder secondary school on an overpopulated site at present.

3 .My research and checking of committee meetings and cross reference to educational information has taken time and I am hoping that you will take the time to read this protracted report with information going back from 2016 to September 2023. I am sure that as councillors you will have had more than enough time to digest all the information over the years from reports

4. From early 2016 / report to committee in 2017 regarding the new Queensferry High and recommendations not to provide additional facilities to cover 1400 was rejected on the grounds that by 2023 a new secondary school would be constructed on a site in the West of Edinburgh. For whatever reason and delays this school has not been constructed leaving a dilemma of what and where are the council going to build a new secondary school for the pupils of Kirkliston.

5. Since 2019 to date misleading information has been submitted to the education committee and each time information from the education department they have changed the goalposts with no consistency and adding information that has no relevance to the proposed secondary school on the leisure centre site . This can be followed up by facts.

Planning restrictions.National Planning Framework 4 and city plan 2030

6 .Explanations have been provided as to why the council cannot build a new school on green belt land due to NPF 4 which came into force in February 2023 however many of the policies regarding green belt have not changed under the current local development plan approved in 2016 policy enviro 10 only enforce a national policy NPF4 policy 8 sustainable place

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION.

7. Further to a freedom of information request one of the questions asked what negotiations took place with landowners and when to buy land or compulsory purchase order for a new school.

REPLY

8. The answer given is that the process started with land owners in 2019 however each of the reports provided that unless land is released for housing then the option of some land being given over to build a school would be rejected.

9. However in the reply it was accepted that no one in the council considered options of only providing land for a new secondary school under the city plan 2030 which

10. We find it extraordinary and could have been included in the city plan 2030 on green belt land which would have been fully justified in my opinion?

11. No further negotiations have taken place until 2022 with other land owners due to the publication of the city plan 2030 as minuted by committee in December 2021 and approved to proceed in March 2022.

12. Anything is possible if you try rather than no option take it or leave it very negative. Each local authority is in control of what can be proposed on grounds of necessity and to ensure that needs of the community are met.

13. We will draw to your attention under the Local Government(Scotland) Act 1973 with amendments. Part6 Land Transactions item 69 notes subsidiary power of local authority.

Item 70 explains how local Authorities can purchase land by agreement for the benefit,improvement or development of their areas; a local authority may acquire by agreement any land situated inside their area.

14. Although this does not address the issue of the greenbelt what was stopping continuing negotiations with landowners.

15. Item 71 Acquisition of land by compulsory purchase. If the council pursues this approach it would mean approval would be required from a Scottish Minister and any application required to be justified **please see redacted reply to my request below.**

16. The Council needs to demonstrate that all alternative sites and alternative ways of achieving our aims have been assessed and exhausted before pursuing the compulsory purchase route. Therefore, we need to demonstrate that the redevelopment of the **Kirkliston Leisure Centre site, or the expansion of Queensferry High School**, are not viable or deliverable proposals in the first instance.

17. Should a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) be deemed necessary, legal advice received in January 2019, noted that it would greatly aid the justification of the CPO if Planning Permission has been obtained to build the school on the greenbelt land (even just Planning Permission in principle). Without the certainty given by Planning Permission, that the site can be developed for the proposed school, there is a danger Scottish Ministers may regard a CPO as premature.

18. From the above reply the council could have had an opportunity to resolve the issue of greenbelt sites and include in city plan 2030 for school only.

LDP 2016 ENV 18 PLANNING APPROVAL LEISURE CENTRE SITE.

19. I will give you an example of the **LDP ENV 18 open space policy**.

Where it states changes to open space will be refused unless other mitigation is put in place to offset any loss.

20. The committee will be aware that a new nursery and primary 1 classrooms are being built to the north side of the leisure centre site where planning was approved ref 20/05679/Ful where the justification for approving this development for the loss of open space was as follows.

21. Decision notice: The application proposes a well designed school and nursery annexe which will enhance the education facility for the total community for Kirkliston. There is loss of open space, however the upgrading of the remaining pitches in this locality is considered to be an acceptable mitigation.

IMPACT ON LOCAL RESIDENTS AND COMMUNITY

22.

With this approval no consideration was made and the impact it would have on the residents living in the vicinity where under the transport report and safer routes to schools the parents and children will use this development for easy access by car or foot to both primary school and annexe. should the secondary school go ahead this will only make the situation worse and as highlighted in the transport report published for the new school and that of the new nursery where it is acknowledged that there will be a problem with above but will only be monitored once nursery and new annexe in operation.

23.I will draw your attention to European Commission Human Rights Article 1, Protocol 1 states: —Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law. How will the above and a proposed new secondary school affect residents Rights living in the proximity of these developments.

24.The decision notice is clear: how are the council going to consider this in the proposals for a new school total loss to the community or **are we going to be in a position that the council will again ignore the conditions for the benefit of the Local Residents / community and decide to lose more public open space. Access should be free at all times to the above without restrictions that may be imposed on the management of the school or leisure facilities after school hours.**

Pupils Behaviour

25.Pupils behaviour at break times or lunch times outside school premises. School staff cannot control their behaviour and with limited shops in Kirkliston will only create problems where to go and we cannot see pupils going home at lunch time for a feeder school. How can this be addressed or has it been considered for local residents congregating close to the proposed site.

ACCESS FOR THE COMMUNITY TO USE FACILITIES AT ALL TIMES.

26.I cannot see on any of the feasibility studies that the public can use the site at their leisure and why was the feasibility of retaining the leisure centre not taking any further and cost as in display information provided as alternative.

27.The information provided and noted by the Architects brief was to concentrate whether a new school could be built on the restricted site however no consideration at this point for the use of community facilities or future hub?after hours.

28.If the education department goes down that route on the remaining site it would not meet with NPF4 Policy 21 play recreation and sport when planning has already been approved under mitigation where else locally is there this facility without taking a car to queensferry or winchburgh if you get a chance

29. It has been mentioned that this leisure centre is the only suitable space for both outside use and for indoor sports such as volleyball/basketball/handball/gymnastics/and other events there is no doubt that this facility will be lost for the duration of any proposed development and beyond. This loss is addressed further under green space audit/strategy and feasibility studies ?

30. Various communications have taken place with Edinburgh Leisure regarding the current and future use of the centre. where in comments made by the **education officials that at present the centre is underused during the bay** and issued what was a programme of events and times to justify their comments.

31. What was not explained is that during the week the centre in agreement with the Education department uses the facilities for the pupils at the primary school at various times and days of the week therefore it cannot see where it is underused.

32. A comment from Edinburgh leisure admitted that their capital budget was restricted however they were aware that the facilities would require to be improved not shut down and we understand that no actual discussions have taken place with the Council as to the future management of any facility should it go ahead. These are issues that should be addressed now and a full financial breakdown of all costs should be carried out now, not after the consultation period.

CURRENT AND FUTURE OPEN SPACE AUDITS 2017/21 CITY PLAN 2030

33. In 2016 under the LDP it was a condition that a full greenspace audit be provided which was approved in 2017 provided a fully comprehensive Audit of all greenspaces from public /private and other facilities which was then confirmed as the basis of approval for future greenspace strategy 2021 which still referred to the importance of leisure and sports pitch facilities open space in Kirkliston and is required under the city plan 2030 to confirm above and produce further audit to be completed by 2028

34 .Part of the Council's Open Space Strategy, which has two elements – houses should be within 800m walking distance of —a significant accessible green space of at least 2 hectares and secondly, should be within —400m walking distance of a significant accessible green space of at least 500m².

Many parts of Kirkliston as a small urban town/village at present do not meet the above for walking distance and 20 minute neighbourhood to public spaces/facilities.

35. Should this remaining open space/pitch be lost to a new secondary school which is the only area where the ground is flat for sports facilities and access to public will effectively counteract the aspirations of the council's Green space strategy.

OBSERVATIONS

36. The emphasis of the report to committee on the 5th September 2023 focussed on providing facilities either on the site or offsite for the pupils and not taking into account the community now is the time to produce information how the community will benefit with this site not at The Planning approval stage that is too late.

37. We question whether under the city plan 2030 and policies whether the density/mass and height of the four storey building would be acceptable in this part of the town/village.

38. New educational buildings that progress from consultation report to planning approval have to date never been refused even if the majority of objections were not in favour of the proposals in which the report to committee in September refers to the community having the opportunity to view all plans and consultations then. make comments or objections to the proposals.

39. I will give you an example and mentioned in one of the reports provided by education staff for smaller sites refer to the **new Portobello high school although approved in 2010 it took until 2016 to start on site due to legal challenge.**

COMMENTS

40. I will now go onto the main concerns since January 2023 a survey was carried out and published where it was stated that a preference was that a new school be built in Kirkliston as opposed to expanding Queensferry High where it is suggested the leisure centre as a potential site which we now know is proceeding to consultation

41. Many residents in the community of Kirkliston were not aware of this event occurring and I am almost certain if this was widely available the response may have been different.

42. Item 2.9 of the report to committee on the 5th September 2023 **it states that We had previously ruled out the use of the Kirkliston Leisure Centre site due to its small size, its proximity to the motorway and existing residential properties, its location on the west of Kirkliston and the loss of Kirkliston's leisure facilities.**

However, as this is the only potential site in Council control, in response to the feedback received through the engagement we appointed an architect to tell us whether a high school for 1,200 pupils could be built on the Kirkliston Leisure Centre Site with initial 600 pupils.

43. From the above statement it is the consensus not only of the association members but the anger in the community.

44. As this is the only Council owned site in Kirkliston which is available to build a new school there are no other options for it to be built within the allotted time.

This is the only option and a done deal to state that the school will be built on this land. There are always options.

45. We now refer to the following comments below for your information regarding how the council managed to secure this owned land to build on this site.

APPLICATION TO THE LAND TRIBUNAL TO CHANGE DISCHARGE THE CONDITIONS OF BURDENS IN TITLES DATED 1994

46. The question we wish to put to the committee members was that at any time were you aware that some one in high authority within the council had made an application to the land tribunal of Scotland to change the titles and burdens to allow both the development on site and proposed school to be erected without considering and consulting with the community as a whole.

47. It is the opinion that this conduct was underhand however legal process followed. The land was sold from the Marquis of Linlithgow in 1994 under the condition of the sale that the land only be used for open space and for recreational purposes including dry sports facilities for the community as a whole.

49. In July 2019 an application was made to the tribunal where the city of Edinburgh to discharge the above burden which was unopposed and approved in August 2019 after an advert in the paper.

50. The Marquis of Linlithgow has been informed and has advised that no communications were made to him prior to the application and no knowledge of this application to the tribunal

51.It may not be of any concern to the members of this committee that prior to this proposal the owners of the properties within the steadings had there titles checked and searches made as to the use of the land at the leisure centre before purchasing there houses to have this happen in a peaceful area of kirkliston and surrounding area is beyond belief that the council are not interested of the impact this would have.

52.Regardless of concerns of the community the primary task is whatever it takes to secure a new secondary school on this site and I do hope that the word out in the community is that it is done deal and that the Council and committee have already made their mind up before the meeting.

53.We believe in a democratic society and do hope that this is not the case and that on the 18th December 2023 that taking all matters into account all the facts that an honest decision will be made by the committee not just because the council own the land and are desperate.

54.We put it to you how we can trust the council and not the committee to make good decisions when this happens. What about being open and transparent?

55.We wonder whether the previous elected council and committee should have been informed of such an important decision. Someone or director should be accountable for the above.

This one of the comments made the criticism of the council and committee as noted and done deal.

AREA OF SITE

56.At the informal engagement drop in on the 14 June 2023 held in the library display boards and information was displayed justifying why the leisure centre site was the only site available together with architects feasibility studies of what could be built on the site including a 4 storey school on a smaller site area which stated that although

the site was 2.7 hectares only 1.7 would be available for the school which required as stated 2.4 hectares for a school population of 600 this figure was wrong only 2.0 hectares required however after discussing this with Mr Crockatt manager in Education asset planning advised me that Irrespective of the size it was irrelevant as when they made an application to the Scottish Government to reduce the area of the site under the Schools(General Requirements and standards) Scotland regulations 1967 with amendments for 1200 pupils as soon as possible on approval.

57.The feasibility studies shown on the alternative layouts as submitted do not show how the school can double in their outline space planner; surely that is just as important as the study for 600 pupils to indicate this.?

AREA / SITE FEASIBILITY STUDY

58. There appears to be some confusion as to what exactly the brief for the Architects were commissioned for. In three different documents and reports submitted the committee agreed to proceed with a feasibility study however later documents refer to a pre feasibility study or Viability study. It is the opinion that these alternative Design studies do not realistically reflect the conditions of the site just to prove that it is practicable in this case

59.The figure of 1.7hectares as stated on both the engagement information and report to committee has been reduced considerably after a compulsory purchase order in 2011 required land for the construction of junction 1 M90 Forth crossing.

60.This has not been taken into account and also the land outside the fence where designs show building hard onto public footpath have been adopted by the council for sight lines. Which reduces the site further. This has been confirmed as being required under the The Roads Scotland Act 1984.

61.We would have thought this would have been taken into account together with substandard playing fields on the site again or alternatively sports facilities away from the site

62.The architect has submitted four alternative designs however the principle design is the same with only two options for the building for position of site with alternative designs 1 and 2 indicating non compliant sports facilities and pitches.

63.Alternatives 3 and 4 indicate a football pitch dimensions 90 metres x 45 metres that meet with **Sports Scotland** -school playing field planning and design the requirement for these dimensions are only for S1 to S3 pupils and does not include Run of space which would require a space of 102 metres X 63 metres approx area of 0.65 hectares.

64.The pitch does not comply with Sports Scotland design requirements and in the viability report 0.3.4 submitted 5th September 2023 states It should be noted that this pitch would not encompass the full outdoor pitch provision required by Sports Scotland and off site provision would need to be utilised to meet this requirement.

Providing a full size pitch requires compromise on the other outdoor spaces provided and, particularly for alternative 3, the location of the building on the site.

65 No account has been taken into account that the area of the land has been reduced and the limitations due to sightlines and adopted land beyond the existing fence line south of the site.

66. Although the Architects have proved that the site is viable, which is questioned ? with a four storey building. There are too many issues that have not been addressed and vital It is the opinion including areas of mitigation that should be included at this stage and not later if approved.

67. Although the feasibility shows what can be designed in the space planning drawings submitted can this be achieved when it comes down to actual detailed design for a passivhaus building and the comments is it a pre feasibility/ /feasibility or a viability study?

68. We again question whether the Planning Department will approve a four storey building where policy refers to height and position of buildings that could affect an area however from a reply to a **freedom of information request from the head of planning has in opinion noted In relation to neighbouring properties, I note that the housing at Buie, Rigg sits behind quite a high hedge the B9080 (Main Street) and the housing at Kirklands Park Gardens backs onto Kirklands Park Street which has some tree planting along it. These features would help mediate between the lower rise housing and a potentially larger school building. feasibility study would help to establish impacts and would likely be helpful in developing design proposals for this site**

69. An assumption has been made that the trees surrounding Kirklands Park Street as shown on the sections of proposed layouts that this will mitigate the height of a four storey building

70. Due to health and safety reasons the majority of the treebelt to the perimeter of the development are being cut down or crown reduced therefore should not be considered.

SMALLER SITES

71. The information provided at the informal engagement refers to a smaller site. It is not unusual for a school to be smaller than the regulations. Few city centre schools meet regulatory site size requirements. For example Boroughmuir High School in

Fountainbridge has a capacity of more than 1.500 pupils and on site of less than 1.0 hectare.

Yes that is correct having knowledge of this site it is completely different demographics. One main distribution road/adjacent sites have a sense of open space /sloping site/ local facilities close to school for pupils and staff and with the Fountainbridge greenways and canal what a pleasant environment.

72.This site cannot be compared with the leisure centre site/motorway/main distribution road /noise/pollution/traffic is too restricted and not in keeping with Edinburgh Learning Estates Strategy 2021 investing in new buildings general principles which was approved by committee in October 2021 together with recent additional briefing.

73.The opinion is that this is biased to convince anyone that all sites are the same. it is disingenuous to refer to this site and others that are located in inner city sites with no comparison to this leisure centre site and offsite sports facilities.

Educational benefits of new school or disbenefits

74.At the Education committee meeting in april 2023 that certain information will be available at the September meeting where operating model for a new secondary school in Kirkliston will be produced to inform future consultation and allow an assessment of the Educational benefits and disbenefits of a new a new Kirkliston High school. This was only partially produced of the educational benefits and disbenefits rather than a full modelling including future management would have been of benefit to the audience disappointing.

75.It may be of interest to read **Schooling Education Learning beyond 2030 published March 2020 by the Goodison Group in Scotland and Scotland's Futures** Forum have done exactly that by exploring what our schools and learning might look like in 2030 and beyond.

76.This report on modelling would have given the committee an insight as to the challenges for the management to organise staffing levels and what courses would be available in the short term for S1 pupils and when staff would be available short term

77. A report was submitted to the Education Committee on the 12 th October 2021 outlining the key aspects of **Edinburgh's Learning Estate Strategy 2021: Investing in New Buildings: Guiding Principles for the next ten years** which was formally approved in December 2021. And briefing note issued later.

78. One of the key elements of sustainability is the **importance of outdoor space** where the **mission is The provision, design and value of outdoor learning spaces is considered by City of Edinburgh Council to be as important as that of interior learning spaces. This will ensure creative approaches to outdoor learning activities are embedded in the curriculum and connect people with nature.**

79. This connection should extend to interior design, creating a mutual two-way relationship between internal and external learning landscapes, promoting positive health and wellbeing through biophilic design. We believe that the Learning Estate's outdoor spaces should be quality places for play and learning and have strong links with the community. The proposed location of school to be considered is not in keeping with learning and well being of the pupils/staff and community.

80. Another document of interest is **learning through landscape 11-18 play area in secondary schools** only enforces the above but goes a bit further their web site is www.ltl.org.uk/scotland as to designs of open spaces for learning to help pupils and staff.

81. With the above in mind and the feasibility studies 1 and 2 indicating outdoor space for learning will not provide a peaceful working educational space due to the environment that exists from pollution and noise

82. Can i draw your attention to a document published by **the Institute of Acoustics (IOA) and the Association of Noise Consultants (ANC)** section 2.1 choosing a site

Noise from road traffic is a common problem, but in some areas noise from railways or aircraft is intrusive. Noise from such sources has been shown to affect pupils' cognitive performance and attainment 1 .

Not to mention any outdoor activities relating to sport.

BERTHA PARK AND OTHER SCHOOLS.

83. The report refers to Bertha Park which is a new school in Perth. After carrying out further research into this development which initially only had 100 S1 pupils with a school designed for 1200 has had many challenges.

It was found that the costs for staffing permanent /full time /ancillary staff was well in excess of the budget proposed for the school which had to be found from other sources of finance, together with what curriculum can be provided for the school pupils was limited.

84. The wellbeing and morale of S1 pupils was affected due to restricted curriculum staff shortages, consistent change of staff and employing short contract staff had an impact on the education quality provided.

From the above information we are of the opinion that the pupils that enter S1 in 2028 to the new school irrespective where built will be used as guinea pigs to establish what exactly will be provided short and long term for the new school.

85. A recent report in the Perth Courier was not complimentary about the school and it was included as one of the twenty worst schools in Scotland for attainment. There were many reasons why this was recorded however it comes back to a new school and what it can provide for pupils.

86. The report in the worst 20 secondary schools included Wester Hailes/Castle Brae with population less than or close to 600. However that cannot be compared due to the locality of the school. What we do not want is the pupils to have a sub standard school environment and courses.

87. Raploch and Winburgh were quoted however Raploch was formed from the existing community and Winburgh due to a well managed education committee, education departments and staff were well organised before the site started and were aware well in advance that these schools would be required grounds suitable for any future 2030 and beyond school estate.

88. From the records and information from the Education committee meeting in April 2023 a letter was submitted by the Kirkliston Primary School Parents Association expressing their concerns and many unanswered questions which to date is the opinion that this letter has not addressed these issues and again these should have been addressed to at least give some confidence that the council knew what they were proposing,

Traffic management

89. A full traffic management report which was to be included in the documents for meeting in September 2023 were not submitted instead a transport report was provided which in my opinion has not addressed the continual issue of traffic and pollution/noise and in many areas contradict the report provided by another consultant when approving the nursery/classes?

90. In the current report the representative from the education department had stated that this would not be issued until an application is made for planning approval.

We question whether the remaining car park proposed in the studies has sufficient spaces for staff for both the primary annexe and any new school and what about the community if to be used as a HUB.

91. The committee must also consider that if this facility is to include a hub where facilities within the school can be used for the community there are many elderly and infirm that may find it hard to walk as proposed under the 20 minute neighbourhood. How does that stand

92. At that point it is too late a mitigation report on traffic/noise/pollution should be addressed now for the Education committee to consider.

93. Examples of problems with traffic and air pollution. In 2009 an application 09/0000186/ was submitted by West Lothian Council to the planning in Edinburgh to review conditions for mineral extractions from the Niddry Bing to remove shale approx 500 metres west of Kirkliston on the B9080 the report was submitted to the Planning committee with recommendations to West Lothian Council which were approved by planning at West Lothian to allow a movement of 100 laden movements a day this approval has been granted for 30 years and it is expected that the final removal of the bing will be in 2052. At any time depending on demand in East Edinburgh/and other areas will come through Kirkliston.

94. New Winchburgh development for the next 10 years housing will be developed with a new town centre where at present the community is experiencing increased heavy lorries from the quarry at Newbridge supplying base materials for new housing at peak times together with increased vehicular movements through Kirkliston which is causing issues with residents in Kirkliston. To propose a new school so close to the main road for a four storey building is complete madness.

Levels of nitrogen oxide that exist close to the site that could affect the health of pupils and any person using these facilities both outside and inside however are not at a dangerous level but close including of pm2 and 12 near the site.

95. A question was raised that the new junction on the M9 at Winchburgh will relieve traffic through Kirkliston not so after talking to drivers that come through Kirkliston.

The problem with the design of the junction is that once you hit the Newbridge junction there is no slip road onto the A8 and the only alternative is to come through Kirkliston. This again will affect staff /parents/pupils/accessing the school.

96. We are aware that the above and other mitigation will be a cost to the Education budget however if the department has appointed an architect to submit feasibility it

should be backed up with all mitigation issues that will affect the site and building which is to be built to passivhaus design and full traffic management proposals.

97. Too much emphasis is placed on the Planning Department to make decisions that should be made well in advance of any full applications,

Noise/acoustics

98. As a former member of transport Scotland Junction 1 construction Forum and to this date involved with issues concerning the above regarding traffic flow/noise Which are monitored are aware that noise from traffic can be high however what was stated that they are unable to produce accurate acoustic levels from the M90 due to the close proximity of the M9 which is literally past the underpass on the B9080 adjacent to the site where levels of noise are greater than that of the M90. What makes matters worse wind and rain can have a major impact and with the majority of prevailing winds from the west and north west. The Environmental Noise (Scotland) Regulations 2006 noise map for Kirkliston in particular to the site show highest levels of noise. From 65 db to over 80 db

99. We have previously mentioned that the education department keeps on changing the goalpost every time that a new report is submitted to the committee. Consistency should be considered not to confuse. In the package of alternative designs submitted to the Committee on the 5th September 2023 again changed the sections which were not shown in engagement drawings now show an acoustic barrier approx 1,7 high on the verge of the M90 which is approx 7,5 metres above ground level as a possible mitigation for noise /acoustic levels to the school.

100. Irrespective of the above the four storey building is in excess of 9.0 metres above the level of the M90 and gantry level we are not convinced that whatever way the building is orientated that this will improve noise levels. Acoustic barriers do not resolve problems.

101..I can clarify that in 2011 after a call of evidence at the Scottish Parliament Acoustic barriers were proposed to the extension of the M90 only at the homes north of the leisure centre where a request was to extend the barriers beyond the leisure centre site to be advised that on no account that these barriers will be extended due to sight lines and the new junction taking traffic to Newbridge. This stands today after sending copies of the engagement drawings displayed at the meeting June 2023

102. A comment was made that Transport Scotland had an interest in land adjacent to the proposed new school and were not included as consultees which they thought was unusual.

103. In their reply Transport Scotland have advised that any acoustic barriers should be designed within their own boundaries and if approved to proceed to planning that the council inform them of any application.

104. From the planning application approved for the classroom and nursery annexe acoustic tests were carried out to check the level of noise from the motorway which was found to be in well in excess of sound levels for inside designs under BB 93 however there is no actual noise level stipulated for outside play areas or outside learning which can be well in excess of levels and not suitable for outside learning.

105. Noise from the motorways or from the the 9080 adjacent to the site consideration should also be taken into account levels of noise from Edinburgh Airport where the flight paths west are close to the site and at peak times and during the day levels of noise for jet engines taking off can be heard for sometime with the backdraft, These levels are monitored under The Environmental Noise (Scotland) Regulations 2006 ,

106. It may be of interest to the committee and education department if they have not read this document Acoustics-of Schools a design guidance 2015 Section 2 published jointly by **the Institute of Acoustics (IOA) and the Association of Noise Consultants (ANC)**. **clearly notes good design of new buildings and pitfalls. One example is shown below.**

107. 2.6 Noise from schools to surrounding areas Noise from schools to the surrounding area can also be a problem and consideration should be given to nearby residential and other noise-sensitive developments that could be disturbed by noise from playgrounds, playing fields, music rooms and halls used for events outside normal school hours, such as concerts and discos. Noise from plant, deliveries and other activities associated with the operation of the school should also be considered.

Loss of leisure centre facilities

108. We refer to deputation from Councillor Lang regarding the loss of the leisure centre should the new secondary school progress. We are disappointed with the comments as he did not go as far as not supporting the location of the new secondary but required assurances that the leisure centre facilities would be available together with issues as previously mentioned about traffic management.

109. We are of the opinion that should this proceed it is absolutely impossible that leisure facilities including the improved football pitch would be provided in such a restricted site, Will the Education officials guarantee continued use of above during any proposed works also taking into account the live use of school and annexe.

110. How will the pupils at the main Primary school be able to maintain period time for sports which is used during school hours if this facility is withdrawn.

Extension of Queensferry High School..

111. Much of the discussions at the meeting in September 2023 was focussed on whether the committee would agree to progress with the Consultation process however what was not fully discussed apart from comment from a councillor on the committee what will happen if the majority are against progressing with the leisure centre site go back to extending south queensferry.

112. At the meeting in April ,I understand that in tandem with the new school that further work and studies will be carried out on the extension to this school although not ideal is a solution also included in their work programme an estimated cost of 23 million is that realistic.Is this being progressed or is the goal to provide this school on this site. We would be interested to view documents of how this is progressing or just another delay.

113. We appreciate that after the survey in January 2023 where 808 replies were received of which the majority in south queensferry 293 of the 473 replies were in favour of a new school in kirkliston while 188 of the 240 replies were in favour of a new school in Kirkliston. Obviously from this survey although not specifically build on the leisure centre site the consensus from local replies from south queensferry that they are not in favour of extending the school however we are of the opinion that this survey was did not have sufficient information to realistically provide full information as to the impact of building a school on the site.

Conclusion

114. From 2016 it has been clear that there is going to be a problem with over capacities of pupils at South Queensferry high whether to extend and where a new Secondary school could be built in Kirkliston with the restrictions of greenbelt land.

Many reports/discussion meetings with education committees have taken place from this date to september 2023 to arrive at progressing with the consultation process results to be provided at the education committee meeting in January 2024

115. The information and research available together with the Freedom of information requests it is the opinion that the process has been protracted and with the continual changes to reports has been confusing issues only make matters worse.

116. We cannot see anything in any of the reports that there has been a joined up approach of all affected departments forming a forum or a special joint committee of councillors only to concentrate, discuss and approve projects such as this or any other project to ensure that progress was being made in a timely manner securing a site in Kirkliston.

**117 Too much emphasis is placed on the role of the planning department and to do all the work and checking before recommendation to the planning committee to either accept or refuse an application; however we do not have knowledge of any application for new schools to be refused. It may take longer to approve so setting deadlines to have a school ready as set out in the report submitted in september for 2028 is premature
Who knows there may still be legal challenges or other issues that may be challenged.**

118. It is the belief that the council has been dragging their heels and have no option as they own the leisure centre site to meet the opening dates in 2028. Together with the way the council managed to change the titles in 2019 to discharge burdens unknown to the residents and community of Kirkliston was underhand although legal.

118. The council may dispute this but evidence does show that progress has been slow or delayed and could and the situation regarding the use of greenbelt site could have been avoided in 2019 before the city plan 2030 was produced as there was nothing that would have prevented the council in providing a site for a secondary school only as NPF4 was not in place at the time.

119. The consensus is that there are too many issues that have not been addressed .

120. The council have estimated the build cost on the current project on site will be in the region of 67 million pounds out of the education budget.

I urge members of the committee to consider this cost as value for money for a development that is full of comprises and not in the interest of the pupils/staff and local residents,

Whatever and where it is built the leisure centre site is not the place for a new school just because they own the site and as an association we strongly object to any new school on the site.

121. Please do not make mistakes and panic on the basis as no other site is available, This school wherever built should be long term legacy and not as white elephant. Please let the residents and others have the enjoyment of what open space and leisure facilities that are left and to sustain the peaceful environment

Further to approval of the Education committee to proceed with the consultation process to meet the requirement and procedures before submitting any report to the education council for approval.

A meeting was held on the 10th October 2023 at kirkliston primary school by Senior Education staff to discuss the procedures and seek the views of the public present regarding the new school and the benefits that a new school will provide to the town/village.

Concerns were raised as to how the meeting was chaired and specific that first questions should only be from affected parents. This was to be an open session however not enough time was given to the location of the school on the leisure centre site pitfalls and planning issues.

The consensus from the meeting is that there was no one in the hall in favour of the new school being built on the leisure centre site and why cannot alternative be found.

The main points raised by the panel is how good a new school would benefit the S1 pupils that would attend. The main goal was to convince the audience that this school will be built and other issues were not fully addressed. This was a paper exercise to prove that they have followed the protocol.

We are aware that no decision on moving forward to the next stage for approvals will not be made until the meeting in January I believe will be decided at full council meeting in February 2024. Although a decision will not be made at the meeting on the 23rd January however it is covered under business bulletin with recommendations to approve decision made in January 2023 to proceed with a new secondary school on the site. We and many others understood that a decision was going to be made at this meeting however no information apart from advising the committee that the report has been completed and will be recommended to approve at this meeting.

No information as to how the Education managers have come to this conclusion and the committee are being asked to approve and to proceed to a full council meeting on what basis. I understand that a report will be submitted to the full council in February which the public will have access to then. Maybe too late. any decision will hopefully be made by the committee on the basis of the outcome of the online survey and any deputations which we hope that the results would not be in favour of building a new school on the leisure centre site.

We mentioned the meeting that took place on the 10th October 2023 a question regarding the discharge of deed of conditions as to how the council had managed to secure the site for new nursery and annexe where a statement was made that the panel was not aware of this discharge and yet under a freedom of information request several senior managers were aware of this a they made the decision to proceed with changing the deeds. Honesty and transparency has again been lost with misleading information provided.

In that same reply a question was asked if councillors should have been advised of the councils intentions to be discharged answer no why not.

What has also come to light is that the council officials did not contact the Marquis because they did not know where to contact him regarding the application to the land tribunal. The comment back it was made public with an advert in the west lothian couriers to object as no one knew the discharge was approved. The council employs what are called gazetteers whose job in the council is to research and find titles and any legal documents why they were not used.

At the public meeting on the 10th October 2023 re consultations emphasis by the panel in particular to the head of planning that NPF4 was to blame for not finding a site on greenbelt and explained that under this National Planning Framework 2023 that a school has not been included as essential infrastructure however after contacting the Scottish Government they have advised me that a school does not come under infrastructure but part of essential services where the council decides if greenbelt land should be allocated as a must for a community under their development plan which was not considered. It is not too late for the council to amend the development plan under city plan 2030.

The last comment and apologise if too long is the question of planning. The management of the education department mentioned that their job is to secure the approval of a new school and residents and any other will have the opportunity to make their views known when a planning application is made. That statement is not strictly correct as with the case for the new nursery and annex. Under the planning regulations only affected properties or land within 30 metres of the proposed development are sent a letter advising them of the application should they wish to make a comment. Not all residents and community of Kirkliston are advised of the planning application. Too late when finding out.

As mentioned before, from my knowledge no new school has ever been refused planning. However we will give you an example which pertains to the new nursery and annex being built which was approved.

The planners rely on information provided by the agent as to professional advice given on the site ground conditions/flooding/sepa/transport/noise which the planners will take into account as being acceptable from specialised consultants and yet if you read the approved documents for the above relate to a two story building/it location and reports on ground conditions/structures etc. that is why once approved we are not convinced that the site proposed is suitable however will that mistake be made again.

Other issues with transport and future agreement on catchment areas. A recent meeting with the planning committee discussed the future of approx 11000 new homes at the new garden city and the Business Gateway placemaking policies adjacent to the A8 gogarburn /edinburgh airport where no provisions were made for transport improvement to kirkliston. Should catchment areas be considered now and not in 2027.

In the report for the meeting bulletin 6.1 for Tuesday item 4.11

.While many of the comments concerning the limitations of the Leisure Centre site due to its size and proximity to the motorway have been considered, feasibility work has now demonstrated it can be developed into a successful secondary school and community hub.

Has the consultants come back with a revised design bearing in mind the area of the site has been reduced due to restrictions and compulsory purchase of land and current planning restrictions. As mentioned in comments Area and site and Feasibility.

[REDACTED] Strategic Asset Planning Manager mentioned during the meeting on the 10th October that he was not aware that the site was smaller however would look into this.

When the application to discharge the burdens in the titles for the centre a copy of the plans and decision refer to the compulsory purchase of the land which is very clear and was made aware of this as it was his decision to proceed with the application however that is not to say that the consultants were made aware of this and assumption were made.

We question again whether a design can be successfully provided at this stage and not at planning.

Finally item 4,14 in the bulletin refers to

Many respondents suggested alternative sites for a new school. These alternatives are shown in Section 3 of Appendix 2. All have been considered as potential school sites. However, most of these alternative sites were within the designated Greenbelt or Countryside areas and are protected by the Council's planning policy and local development plan. We refer to previous comments regarding planning policy. NPF4 essential infrastructure does not cover essential services such as schools/surgeries or other facilities for the community. It is the councils development plan that there is an opportunity to use greenbelt or countryside land.

End.

Re Motion to Education, Children and Families Committee, 23 January 2024 “Education Budget”

Call to consider impacts of DSM cuts on children’s educational attainment and well-being, pupil attendance, staff workload and welfare

Stockbridge Primary School is a City of Edinburgh non-denominational local authority school and nursery with a student body of approximately 265 pupils aged 3 to 12. As a Parent Council, we wish to formally log our concerns with the Education Budget proposal, which despite threatening to significantly impact our children’s education, was published with little time for consideration or comment.

The Parent Council recognises the pressure the Committee is under to find savings. However this report shows little robust assessment or analysis of the impact of these cuts. It also makes broad assumptions about schools’ abilities to absorb further cuts on the back of an already-stretched service.

We have highlighted four concerns in particular. In doing so we share examples from our school of the impact cuts to the DSM can have.

Cutting teaching and support staff

As a small school with support staff numbers already at the bare minimum, Stockbridge Primary is particularly exposed to staffing absences and gaps. The report acknowledges the cuts will unavoidably impact staffing groups. This will exacerbate existing staffing issues in our school.

For example, the proposal under Option 2 to remove PSAs for P1/2 will affect the educational attainment of those years.

As a Parent Council we recently got involved when our parent body expressed concern with the lack of PSAs in our classrooms, which was affecting children’s attainment levels. We were informed that there were three PSA vacancies. Exacerbated by unforeseen staff absences and an inefficient centralised recruitment process, our P2 class in particular did not have regular PSA provision for the first term of school. Although these vacancies have now been filled this was only achieved through direct intervention from our ward councillors and Amanda Hatton - existing systems were not sufficient to plug the staffing gap.

This experience highlighted the difficulties class teachers face delivering play-based learning to 29 children of varying abilities, behavioural and SEN requirements without adequate and training support staff. While there is consensus amongst parents in support of play pedagogy, their reasonable expectation is that some structured learning will take place. In practice, this cannot be sustainably delivered with Stockbridge’s teacher-pupil ratio, which is significantly lower than the national average of 13.2 and City of Edinburgh’s average of 14.5^[1]. Some P2 parents have raised concerns that their child’s reading levels are not where they should be, whilst others have noted advanced readers are often left alone for long periods whilst the teacher focussed on bringing others up to necessary levels.

Our Head Teacher worked hard to rectify the staffing problem, and senior leadership staff and parents regularly stepped in to provide additional reading support, but these are not sustainable solutions and it was not until P2 got a dedicated PSA that the situation improved.

Additional needs are not being met

We are concerned that your report does not acknowledge that - due to cuts to external services - schools are working with an increasing number of children with SEN, and dealing with many more children experiencing dysregulated behaviour, but are not given extra money or staff to deal with this. As a result, the role of PSA has changed to pick this up.

Support staff have also been crucial in providing pastoral support to help improve attendance – a Scottish government priority. Like many schools, a large number of pupils in Stockbridge require close support (whether 1:1 or 1:2-3) throughout the day to attend school, manage anxiety and regulate behaviours to allow their own learning to take place, and the learning of others in their class. In practice, the school is not funded to provide this intensive support with specially trained staff, and it is being provided by PSAs. In all cases, this support is non-SEN badged and so is vulnerable to cuts. But removing this provision will have a devastating impact with lots of ripple effects on all our pupils. It will exacerbate attendance issues, and put teachers, pupils and parents under even greater and unacceptable strain to tackle problems alone.

Child Protection and Health and Safety

Although the statutory support hours for PSAs do not currently cover individual children's health plans, such as diabetes and allergies, these are of course vital to enable children affected by such conditions to remain safe in mainstream schools. Although EYPs may have enhanced training around statutory provision, PSAs are in fact trained in these other vital areas.

Stockbridge Primary relies on its PSAs to conduct individual daily monitoring and health checks for many of its pupils, to administer medications, and to provide first aid in class and in the playground. Stockbridge Primary would not be able to offer trips and residential camps to all its children without this indispensable aspect of round-the-clock support.

Given that there can also be several health and safety incidents in the course of a single day at school, the absence of PSAs would mean that the office or teaching staff would be required to deal with these, taking them away from statutory provision.

Impacts on Leadership

Staffing absences due to illness or other unplanned reasons are an unavoidable fact of school life. Given that schools are required to pay for the first thirty days of each teacher's absence, and all of a PSA's absence (without limit), it only takes a small number of long-term absences to exhaust the budget for supply teaching, and put pressure on staff to cover short term absences internally. This is a particular challenge for small schools like ours and will be almost impossible with reduced PSA support.

In Stockbridge, the practical implication of staffing shortfalls and budgetary requirement has been that the Senior Leadership Team have stepped in to deliver classroom and group learning. This has reduced the time they have available to deliver their core tasks of managing the school and implementing a curriculum in line with Curriculum for Excellence principles and local requirements. This work has at times been tackled outside of the working day, placing a huge burden on an already overburdened workforce. As a Parent Council we have witnessed first-hand the extent to which this has curtailed the HT capacity to work with parents working groups. Proposed cuts to protected time for school leaders to meet in learning communities (Options 1 & 4) would only add to this workload.

Tailoring CfE to classroom realities is a complex and demanding task. As the 2021 OECD report notes, teachers require space, time and support for professional development to deliver this effectively. This requires sustained investment and ongoing support from the system^[2], which the proposed cuts threatens to remove.

It also continues the current assumption that Head Teachers, teaching staff and PSAs will absorb unsupported activity into existing workloads, which for Stockbridge is already very difficult.

Conclusion

The Parent Council works closely with our school to tackle challenges and enrich the extra-curricular opportunities for children. However parents should not be expected to step in to deliver statutory learning and essential child protections. We have full confidence in our teachers, who provide great learning in line with the CfE when given the opportunity. However it is unreasonable to expect teachers to singly devise and deliver high quality, tailored learning to large classes, or provide much-needed pastoral care and health care to students without additional support.

Our school provides an illustrative example of the impacts a stretched teaching workforce is already having on our children's education. The cuts being proposed will only compound this problem across the city.

We ask that you take our experience into consideration on Tuesday.

Sincerely,

Kirstie (Chair)

Stockbridge Primary Parent Council

This deputation addresses the likely impact in Stockbridge Primary, but we the undersigned can confirm that many similar impacts would be felt in our schools.

James Gillespie Primary School
Bonaly Primary School
St Margaret's School, South Queensferry
Comhairle nam Pàrant Bun-sgoil Taobh na Pàirce
Nether Currie Primary School
James Gillespie High School
Royal High School
Trinity Primary School Parent Council

^[1] Schools in Scotland 2023: Summary statistics ([link](#))

^[2] OECD Scotland's Curriculum for Excellence, 2021, pp 12 ([link](#))

21st January 2024

**Motion to Education, Children and Families Committee, 23 January 2024 “Education Budget”
Call to consider impacts of DSM cuts on children’s educational attainment and well-being, pupil attendance,
staff workload and welfare.**

The Royal High School is a City of Edinburgh non-denominational local authority school with a student body of approximately 1,500 pupils aged 11-18. Teaching resource sit at 99 and the school has 8 PSAs.

‘Only by having a diverse lifelong education, research and skills system can we provide the opportunities needed by Scotland’s people. We want to make the system fit the needs of the people of Scotland so that everyone can fulfil their potential and contribute to our society, economy, and place in the wider world.’ Source: Minister for Higher and Further Education, Scotland, published 28 June 2023.

We question how this goal can be achieved if there is a cut to our investment in education and children’s services. The Education paper proposes a **1.2% cut to the school budget** which we expect to be prorated across schools, with the Royal High School potentially being impacted by a larger cut given it is not protected in relation to the deprivation criteria. Therefore, we wish to **formally log our concerns with the Education Budget proposal**, which, despite threatening to significantly impact our children’s education, was published with **minimal time for consideration** or comment. We recognise the pressure the Committee is under to find savings. However, the outlined report shows minimal robust assessment or analysis of the impact of these cuts. Our concerns are as follows:

1. Cutting teaching and support staff

As a large secondary school, we are exposed to staffing absences and gaps. The report acknowledges the cuts will unavoidably impact staffing groups.

As a Parent Council body, our observations are that the recruitment and retention of teachers and school staff is at an **all-time low**. The Scottish Government aimed to recruit 2,336 teachers during the 2022-23 academic year but just 1,506 students applied for secondary teaching qualifications in that time (the third year in a row that the targets have not been met).

Due to the points outlined above, we believe that existing staffing issues will be exacerbated in our school, with a **1.2% cut equating to 3 teachers at the Royal High School**.

2. Additional needs are not being met

We are concerned that your report does not acknowledge that - due to cuts to external services - schools are working with an increasing number of children with SEN and dealing with many more children experiencing dysregulated behaviour. No additional financial support is provided to address this issue. Support staff have also been vital in providing pastoral support and guidance to help improve attendance.

Withdrawing this provision will have a devastating impact. It will escalate attendance issues, and put teachers, pupils, and parents under even greater and unacceptable strain to tackle problems. The impact on the wider society will put even greater strain on healthcare, social and business services.

3. Impacts on Leadership

Staffing absences due to illness or other unplanned reasons are unavoidable. However, schools are required to pay for the first thirty days of each teacher's absence. This will inevitably impact supply teaching budget. Consequently, **budgets will be drained rapidly if there are several long-term sickness absences.**

We therefore strongly oppose the proposed cuts to education and children's service outlined in your budget. These proposals have been developed with **no meaningful consultation** with service users (children and their families) or, to the best of our knowledge, with school teaching staff. Those of you who (sadly only occasionally) attend our meetings will be aware of the existing pressures on school budgets. **Further cuts will, in our view, render the service unfit for purpose.**

Schools are places that **teach** and **educate** our young people. Schools provide **opportunities**. Schools support **equality**. Schools offer **support**. Schools offer **guidance**. Schools support **diversity** and **inclusion**. Schools cannot do this without investment and resource.

We request that you reflect on the proposals regarding:

1. 'Getting it right for every child'. This proposal does not. Funding levels need to, quite simply, increase.
2. Explore other areas to reduce spending. Why focus on a cohort of society who will support our aging population? This proposal is short-sighted and ill thought out.
3. Support a democratic, structured consultation with the right bodies – parents, teachers and educational professionals.

We know that you agree with us that **education is of high importance to your constituents**. We ask all of you to work together to resolve this situation, and to collectively engage with all political parties. As a Parent Council, we would welcome the opportunity to work with you to 'get it right for every child'. **We all have an invested interest, let's collaborate.**

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

Philippa Gray (Vice Chair, Royal High School Parent Council) on behalf of the Royal High School Parent Council

This page is intentionally left blank