

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

**4.00pm 9 JANUARY 2017**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL, NORTON ROAD, HOVE, BN3 3BQ**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor Bewick (Chair)

**Also in attendance:** Councillor Chapman (Deputy Chair), Brown (Opposition Spokesperson), Phillips (Group Spokesperson), Daniel, Knight, Taylor, Penn, Russell-Moyle and Wealls

**Other Members present:** Councillors

**PART ONE**

**55 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**55 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**55(a) Declarations of substitutes**

55.1 There were no substitutes

**55(b) Declarations of interest**

55.2 Councillor Daniel declared a declared a personal but non-pecuniary interest in Item 64, SEND Review, as she worked at Hamilton Lodge School.

Mr M Jones declared a declared a personal but non-pecuniary interest in Item 64, SEND Review, as his wife worked at Hillside School.

**55(c) Exclusion of press and public**

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

**55.3 RESOLVED-** That the press and public not be excluded

## 56 MINUTES

- 56.1 Councillor Brown referred to paragraph 49.5, and said that the Committee had not yet been provided with the number of children who had been referred to CAMHS and which school they attended. The Chair advised that officers had said that unfortunately that information could not be provided as it had not collected in a consistent way.
- 56.2 Councillor Wealls referred to paragraph 49.8 which stated that the '*...the Community and Voluntary Sector were pleased to have supported and been involved in the pilot scheme*', and suggested that the wording include the fact that the Community and Voluntary Sector had provided a bus from the pilot schools to the places where the counselling was being held.
- 56.3 Mr Jones referred to paragraph 52.6 and said that not all of his comments had been included and that he had said the following:

*While this change in Gap evaluation is important for areas where All Pupils are below national average, it is largely irrelevant for our successful schools and becomes a minimum low standard target rather than a target to aspire to. An example being that, using this new definition of Gap, the report states "there was a closing of the Gap between 2014 and 2015" when this is untrue locally as while (commendably) both Disadvantaged and Non-Disadvantaged increased there was a disparity of improvement. If as a City, Non-Disadvantaged Children and Young People are getting much better outcomes than National, we must expect the same for Disadvantaged. Accepting that with the higher attainment overall, it is difficult and this Gap may actually slightly increase. Locally the current disparity is too much and schools where the difference in high are not inclusive and should not state in their prospectus that they are.*

- 56.4 **RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the meeting held on 21 November 2016 (as amended) be agreed and signed as a correct record.

## 57 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

- 57.1 The Chair informed the Committee that it had been decided, on legal advice, to withdraw Item 62 Care Leavers Trust Fund from the agenda.
- 57.2 The solicitor said that it was welcome news that a Deed of Trust for Brighton & Hove City Council care leavers had been completed. However, it was now for the Trustees to decide how to take the matter forward, and in order to keep the Committee and Full Council fully informed, there needed to be an opportunity for Trustees to meet first to consider the basic framework for the trust. A report on the trust fund would come to Committee at a later date.

## 58 CALL OVER

- 58.1 It was agreed that all items would be called.

## 59 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

**59a Petitions**

59.1 There were none

**59b Written Questions****(i) Youth Service – Ethan Carney**

59.2 Ethan Carney put the following question:

*Why would you and why do you want to make kids unhappy by closing these clubs?*

59.3 The Chair provided the following response:

*Your question is one of several today relating to the Administration's proposal to cut some in-house youth services.*

*We are not motivated to cutting services to youths, but we do have to set a legal budget in February which means we have to balance the books and unfortunately that has resulted in a proposal to cut the budget for youth services.*

59.4 Ethan Carney put the following supplementary question:

*What about families who have no money to support their children or give them the entertainment they need?*

59.5 The Chair provided the following response:

It is really regrettable that we are making the proposed cuts, but as a council we will do everything we can to support families in need in the city.

**(ii) Youth Trust – Amy Ramsay**

59.6 Amy Ramsay put the following question:

*Following the Committee's decision to develop a Youth Trust model, young people from across the city have been exploring the possibility of a Youth trust to manage and commission youth services, including meeting other Youth trusts across the county. The group concluded that a trust model involving Young People would be a good idea because: Young People would have a say at citywide level. Services would be better coordinated. Strategic decision-making would be improved. Funding decisions would be more accountable and transparent.*

*What is this Committee's current view on a Youth Trust model and what future actions will be taken?*

59.7 The Chair provided the following response:

*I agree that having a Youth Trust for the city would be a good development. Other authorities do have trusts and when we came into power in May 2015 we hoped to do something similar, but unfortunately due to pressure with both the budget and time that hasn't happened. However, that's not to say that the Community and Voluntary Sector can't come together and create a trust with the Council playing some kind of role. We did secure some Cabinet Office money to look at different models, but we're at the stage now where a trust hasn't been set up and no agreement has been reached by the various local charities on exactly what the model should be.*

59.8 Amy Ramsay put the following supplementary question:

*Would Council members be willing to meet with young people and those working to build this trust to move this matter forward? I believe that £30k was granted.*

59.9 The Chair provided the following response:

*We would welcome any thoughts and ideas on how we can ensure that young people are supported going forward.*

**(iii) Youth Clubs – Kate Barker**

59.10 Kate Barker submitted the following question, which was asked at the meeting by Jack Stanford:

*Youth clubs provide a safe community space for young people. For many youngsters it is the only place in their area they can go without risk of being harmed mentally and physically. If youth clubs are closed then where can young people go to benefit from and socialise in a safe open access environment?*

59.11 The Chair provided the following response:

*You are right about the role Youth Clubs play and I understand there will still be youth club provision across the city as it's not just the Council who are funders, but others such as charities and third sector bodies. What is incumbent on us as a council is to work with young people to think how we can shape the pattern of provision in the future and, if there are any gaps, to look at how we might meet that challenge not necessarily through Council coffers but through other areas of funding.*

59.12 Jack Stanford put the following supplementary question:

*By cutting youth service provision you are targeting some of the most vulnerable young people in the city and how can you, as our elected representatives, reconcile that with your duty to protect those people.*

59.13 The Chair provided the following response:

*You are right and we do have a statutory duty to support the most vulnerable people in the city. The current proposal is to cut some open-access youth work and in-house non-statutory youth work. What we are not proposing to cut is some of the targeted service for vulnerable young people. For example, there is an extended Adolescent Service*

*which will continue to have funding over £100k per annum, the Youth Offending Service with funding of £750k per annum and the Youth Employability Service with funding of £500k per annum, together with support for specialised services such as R U OK, and work with Downside School through the YMCA. Therefore any perception that we are cutting all youth services is wrong, but we are having to make some very difficult decisions.*

**(iv) Youth Clubs – Helen Bartlett**

59.14 Helen Bartlett submitted the following question, which was asked at the meeting by Boudicca Pepper:

*Youth clubs are places that young people can go for free, get a meal and take part in activities that they would not be able to otherwise. Do you think that the plans to cut youth work are unfair because they impact on young people who are less likely to have these opportunities otherwise?*

59.15 The Chair provided the following response:

*These are not proposals that we are putting forward that we want to make, and if we weren't faced with such severe cuts from central government we wouldn't be suggesting them. I would refer you to my previous answers, and we will continue to talk to you, your representatives and the community and voluntary sector to see what we can do between now and February when the Budget Council is held.*

59.16 Boudicca Pepper put the following supplementary question:

*The Labour manifesto promised to eliminate youth unemployment. The Youth Employability Services for work-ready young people will avoid cuts, but it is only through youth services such as those being cut, that many people actually become work ready. How can you reconcile the effect of these cuts on the readiness of young people for work, with your pledge to cut youth unemployment?*

59.17 The Chair provided the following response:

*I am glad you mentioned our pledge to cut youth unemployment in our local party manifesto. Youth unemployment has been coming down consistently over the last two years. We have had a big push via the Employer Skills Taskforce to raise the awareness and status of apprenticeships in the city and am delighted that apprenticeships are up by 20%. There are no plans in the budget proposals to either cut the Youth Employment Service or to change the programme around the Employer Pledge, which is about galvanising the business community to step up to the challenge of giving young people a chance.*

**(v) Youth Clubs – Adam Muirhead**

59.18 Adam Muirhead submitted the following question, which was asked at the meeting by Bette Davis:

*“Isn’t supporting a youth club to stay open socially, ethically and fiscally better than leaving young people to commit crime on the streets?”*

59.19 The Chair provided the following response:

*You touch on the issue of investing in our public services for the long term, and that is something we want to do. One of the difficult choices that politicians have to make when looking at the size of the budget gap, which is £2m, is the issue of where you place your investment. I don’t want to give the impression that we are prioritising one group over another, but the fact that this Council has been able to continue to invest in Early Years and keeping the nurseries in public ownership is something we’re proud of in the administration. I appreciate that doesn’t fully answer your question about 14 year olds who need a place at a youth centre, but I would refer you back to the answers I gave earlier on that point.*

59.20 Bette Davis put the following supplementary question:

*Don’t you think these cuts are going to end up costing the Council more money in the long run?*

59.21 The Chair provided the following response:

*You touch on the issue of how we as a society invest in our future, our young people, infrastructure, public and social services etc but we do have to work within the parameters set by Central Government. I think that potentially these cuts are short sighted, in the sense that the evidence is there that there’s a long term pay back on these things, but I would refer you to the answers I gave earlier about the challenges and prioritisation that we have to go through.*

**(vi) Youth Clubs – Maddie Davidson**

59.22 Maddie Davidson put the following question:

*“If I have problems at home, who will I talk to, if there aren't youth worker?”*

59.23 The Chair provided the following response:

*Schools have some responsibility to support you in terms of pastoral care, and I would hope that you felt that there was someone at your school you could talk to. We will continue to provide services such as the youth Employability Scheme, RU-OK?, and to work with schools to support young people,*

59.24 Maddie Davidson put the following supplementary question:

*Do you accept young people will feel safer talking to someone they know?*

59.25 The Chair provided the following response:

*Absolutely, and I would hope that support structures were available in all schools to allow young people to do that. Also, parents, carers and peer groups should also be able to provide that safe environment.*

*The Chair asked Maddie if there were any specific areas where she felt someone may need to talk to someone, and she cited examples of domestic violence or problems at school. The Chair said that the commitment of the Council was to keep all children safe, and that was one reason why the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub was set up. Those working at the Hub included Outreach Advisers who would support young people.*

**(vii) Youth Service – Mitchie Alexander**

59.26 Mitchie Alexander put the following question:

*“I would like to ask the Councillors who sit on this Committee whether they feel that it will be just and right and fair to vote for this forth-coming budget when they know how devastating the cuts to the Youth Services will be? I've heard it stated that if it wasn't Youth Services cut then it would be one of the other 700 services cut instead. But the Youth in our city think that Youth Services are far more important than the cutting of grass verges. I do too and so I beg you NOT to cut the Youth Services!”*

59.27 The Chair provided the following response:

*All of the 700 services you refer to are all vital public services, and we wouldn't want to say one service was better than another. To give you a sense of the financial challenges we face, even if you took all the Council Tax and Business Rates revenue, which were two important sources of income, the cost of social care in the city would still not be covered.*

59.28 Mitchie Alexander put the following supplementary question:

*As a progressive city, isn't it time we stood up to the Tory Government and fought against these cuts. We all know how important youth services are and that by cutting these services it would cost the city far more in the long run. It is time to be bold and time to stand up and fight. My question is to the Labour Councillors – how far does the knife have to cut before you stop sharpening the blade?*

59.29 The Chair provided the following response:

*That is a rather political question and I'll give you a political answer. There is not a single colleague who thinks 'what can we cut now'. We have all come into the Labour party and into public life to support our communities and young people. For me personally, as someone who came to the city as a foster child and have now made this my home, it pains me deeply to see the kind of challenges we face as a Labour Administration. However, we were elected by the residents to set a legal budget, and if we don't we are abdicating our responsibility. I can assure you that this is not about the Labour Administration taking some pleasure in implementing Central Government cuts.*

**59c Deputations**

59.30 There were none.

## **60 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

### **60a Petitions**

60.1 There were none.

### **60b Written Questions**

60.2 There were none.

### **60c Letters**

60.3 There were none.

### **60d Notices of Motion**

60.4 There were none.

## **61 SCHOOL OFSTED PRESENTATION**

61.1 The Head of Standards & Achievement: Education & Skills provided an update on schools which had recently been inspected by Ofsted.

61.2 The Committee were advised that Ofsted had given a Good rating to four local schools in the past two months. The four schools were: Portslade Aldridge Community Academy (PACA), St Bernadette's Catholic Primary, Aldrington Church of England Primary, and Carden Primary. This meant that 91.7% of all schools in the city were now rated as Good or Outstanding, which was higher than the national average of 89%. Brighton Aldridge Community Academy (BACA) had recently been inspected; as yet the results had not been confirmed but it was expected to receive a Good rating.

61.3 Councillor Phillips noted that currently the percentage of secondary schools rated as Good or Outstanding was 70%, which was below the national average of 78% and asked if the expected results of BACA would change that figure. The Head of Standards & Achievement: Education & Skills said it would and if BACA received a Good rating, it would increase the percentage to 80%.

61.4 Mr Jones asked if future updates could provide information on the number of schools rated as Outstanding. It was agreed that that would be provided.

61.5 Councillor Daniel said the results were fantastic and wanted to thank the Head Teachers and Governors of those schools, and the in-house team who supported the schools.

61.6 The Chair echoed Councillor Daniel's comments and thanked everyone for their work on improving and supporting the schools.

61.7 **RESOLVED:** That the update be noted.

**62 CARE LEAVERS TRUST FUND**

62.1 Item withdrawn from agenda.

**63 FAMILIES, CHILDREN AND LEARNING FEES AND CHARGES 2017/18**

63.1 The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director Families, Children & Learning regarding the Families, Children and Learning Service's fees and charges. The report was introduced by the Head of Service, Early Years & Family Support.

63.2 Councillor Wealls noted that there would be a 2% increase for 3-4 year olds, but a 7% increase for under 3 year olds, and asked why there wasn't a general increase for all ages. The Head of Service, Early Years & Family Support said that there were many more 3-4 year olds in nursery care in the city, and those families currently received 15 hours of free provision per week which was funded by the government, and which would increase to 30 hours per week from September 2017, so therefore the amount they paid themselves was less. The staff ratio was different depending on the ages of the children; for 3-4 year olds it is 1:8, or 1:13 if there was a qualified teacher present, and for those under 3 it was 1:3 Therefore the cost of provision for the younger children was much more expensive. Councillor Wealls accepted that there was a need to increase the fees but thought that a 7% hike was very high and would impact on families financially, and therefore it could be preferable to have the same lower increase for all ages. The Head of Service, Early Years & Family Support said that from September the proportion of childcare which parent's would pay for 3-4 year olds was quiet small, and so the Council would have to significantly increase the fees paid to generate the necessary additional income required. The Government were increasing the tax free child care, so for every 80p paid for child care parents could claim back 20p so there were other sources of income available to help them. Councillor Wealls asked if that change to tax would take away the disadvantage of the 7% increase, and he was advised it would.

63.3 Councillor Phillips asked what the Council's subsidy was for nurseries and for training. The Head of Service, Early Years & Family Support advised that the annual subsidy for nurseries was £350k, and for training it was around £25k to £50k.

63.4 Councillor Phillips referred to paragraph 5.7.1, and asked how many children were in receipt of Free School Meals. The Head of Service, Early Years & Family Support said she didn't have that information, but would find out and let the Committee know.

63.5 Councillor Brown asked if it was known what the Arts Council Music Hub grant would be. The Executive Director Families, Children & Learning said that the Authority was advised at the end of December 2016 that the grant would be broadly the same as in previous years.

63.6 Mr Glazebrook noted the subsidies available and asked what the take up of young people using the Music and Arts Service was. The Assistant Director Families, Children & Learning said she didn't have that information, but would find out and let the Committee know.

63.7 Councillor Taylor referred to the charges for school meals, and asked why the Retail Price Index (RPI) was used rather than the Consumer Price Index (CPI), as the RPI tended to rise faster. The Executive Director Families, Children & Learning said that the RPI was used by the Council for calculating all fees and charges, but Finance would be asked to provide a more detailed response.

63.8 Councillor Penn asked if it would be possible for parents to be able to spread the cost of paying for music lessons over a number of months, which would make it for affordable for many people. The Assistant Director Families, Children & Learning said that she would check with the Head of Music Service.

63.9 **RESOLVED:** The Committee agreed:

(1) That the position on fees charged for Nurseries as detailed in Section 3.3 be agreed.

(2) That the position on fees charges for Childcare Workforce Development as detailed in Section 3.4 be agreed.

(3) That the position on fees and charges for the Music and Arts Service as detailed in Section 3.5 be agreed.

(4) That the position on the charges for School Meals as detailed in Section 3.6 be noted.

#### **64 SEND REVIEW - FEEDBACK FROM FORMAL CONSULTATION & PUBLICATION OF STATUTORY NOTICE PERIODS**

64.1 The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director Families, Children & Learning, which provided an update on the current review of special educational needs and disability (SEND) provision in the city. The report was introduced by the Assistant Director, Health, SEN & Disability Families, Children & Learning.

64.2 Councillor Brown noted that there was a feeling in the city that final decisions now needed to be made, and asked whether the Committee would know in March where the host school and Jeanne Saunders Centre would be. The Assistant Director, Health, SEN & Disability advised that a further report would be considered by the Committee at the meeting on 6 March 2017, which would set out those proposals.

64.3 Councillor Phillips asked whether the Authority provided transport for nursery school age children, and was advised that it didn't for those under statutory school age.

64.5 Councillor Phillips was pleased to note that the proposal was to have a new special facility within a mainstream school, and asked if consideration had been given to areas such as whether those children would use the main entrance and whether they would have the same school hours etc. The Assistant Director, Health, SEN & Disability said that those things had not yet been agreed, but would certainly be areas for discussion.

64.6 Councillor Phillips noted the final Recommendation in the report and asked if there was a timeline and/or a deadline for exploring the various options, and was advised that

there was a timeline and it would be included in the report due to be considered at the March meeting of the Committee.

64.7 Mr Jones asked if any schools had shown an interest in having a special facility, and was advised that three schools had.

64.8 Mr Jones noted that some mainstream schools were more or less popular than others, and asked whether it was felt that having a special facility within a school could change those perceptions. The Assistant Director, Health, SEN & Disability Families said that it could; if there was successful provision in mainstream schools, it would provide the opportunity for mainstream inclusion and special needs support which some people would prefer.

64.9 Mr Jones noted that Patcham House were only expecting two students to start in July 2108, and asked if that was a normal number, or whether the possibility that the school could close had impacted on applications. The Assistant Director, Health, SEN & Disability said that the number of pupils at Patcham House had been dwindling over recent years. The number of children in special provision hadn't changed, but where they chose to attend had, with many now opting to go to mainstream schools.

64.10 Mr Jones asked if there was a gap between the vision for special educational needs provision, and what could actually be provided given the pressure on finances. The Assistant Director, Health, SEN & Disability said that it would always be a struggle to do everything you wanted to, but the Authority was being as ingenious as it could to provide the desired service.

64.11 Mr Glazebrook asked whether any young people would be placed at Patcham House in the current year groups. He was advised that there was no reason why they wouldn't be as there was no intention to close the school.

64.12 **RESOLVED:** The Committee agreed:

(1) To note the outcome of the recent consultation to extend the age range of both Hillside School and Downs View School attached as Appendix 1 to the report.

(2) To agree that the Local Authority should now proceed to publish statutory notices to :

- i. Extend the age range of Hillside School from the existing 4-16 years to 2-16 years, with a view to implementation in September 2017
- ii. Extend the age range of Downs View School from the existing 3-19 years to 2-19 years, with a view to implementation in September 2017.

(3) To agree that the Local Authority proceed with the identification of a suitable host school for the new special facility.

(4) To note that the feedback from the formal consultation on the proposal to close Patcham House School in July 2018 will be closely analysed before a report is brought back to CYPS committee on 6 March 2017 for a decision whether or not to proceed with a statutory notice proposing closure of the school.

(5) To note the progress made on other areas of the review.

**65 ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS 2018/9**

- 65.1 The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director Families, Children & Learning regarding school admission arrangements for 2018-19. The report was introduced by the School Admission Manager.
- 65.2 Councillor Phillips accepted that this report related to admissions for 2018-19, but was aware that there was a possible shortfall of 80 places for children living within the Dorothy Stringer/Varndean catchment area for the academic year 2017-18, and asked why it wasn't possible, given that there would most likely be a new secondary school in the future, to have had a new year 7 in place for September 2017. The Executive Director Families, Children & Learning said that the decision on a new school was one for the Department for Education, so the Authority was constrained in what it could do, and therefore a new school could not be opened until a formal decision had been made. The Committee were advised that the allocation of places for September 2017 had not yet been undertaken, and so at this stage it was only a predicted shortfall of places. The Assistant Director Education & Skills confirmed that the situation was being monitored, and would be discussed at the next Cross Party School Organisation Working Group meeting in February 2017.
- 65.3 Councillor Wealls noted that paragraph 3.4 of the report stated that the admission arrangements for the new school would not include a defined catchment area. He said that the expectation was that it would have a catchment area, and suggested that that paragraph be amended to read "*The free school will act as its own admission authority and it is anticipated that its admission arrangement will not **initially** include a defined catchment area*" to reflect that. Councillor Phillips agreed and seconded the proposed amendment. The Chair and the Executive Director Families, Children & Learning both agreed that the anticipation was that the new school would indeed have a catchment area as part of its admission arrangements, but reminded the Committee that that would not be a decision for the Council. The solicitor referred to the proposed amendment, and said that as that matter was not part of the recommendations there was no need to vote on that proposal.
- 65.4 Councillor Wealls suggested that an additional recommendation be added to read "*The Committee notes that the admission arrangement referred to in paragraph 3.4 for the Brighton University Academy Trust School were anticipated for one year only*". Councillor Phillips seconded the proposed amendment. The Executive Director Families, Children & Learning noted the proposal but was concerned that if it were agreed, the Committee would be locking themselves into something over which it had no control. The Chair asked the solicitor for their advice. The solicitor stated that she was concerned that such a recommendation could be perceived as the Committee having agreed admission arrangements which were contingent on an understanding of what the Free School were going to have in the future as their admission criteria, but on which the Committee had no control. There was a risk that the Free School could adopt different admission criteria, and it could then potentially be said that the basis on which the Committee adopted the admission criteria for 2018-19 was based on misinformation. It would be perfectly safe to note this discussion that there was an understanding, but no guarantee, on what the Free School would do. The Free School were initially looking at having city-wide criteria, but would have a consultation in early 2017 on future

admissions. However, such consultation would not be concluded prior to 28 February 2017 when the Council must have confirmed its admission arrangements as set out in the School Admissions Code. The solicitor therefore advised that the recommendations should not be amended to have wording which could indicate that the Committee's decisions were contingent on issues on which the Committee had no control. It was therefore agreed that the recommendations would not be amended.

65.5 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee agreed:

- (1) That the proposed school admission numbers set out in Appendix 1 to the report be adopted for the admissions year 2018-19;
- (2) That the admission priorities for Community Schools set out in Appendix 2 to the report be adopted for all age groups;
- (3) That the co-ordinated schemes of admission and relevant area be approved.

## 66 ITEMS REFERRED FOR COUNCIL

66.1 **RESOLVED:** it was agreed that no items be referred to Council

The meeting concluded at 6.00pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of