

DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting of the Council for the hearing of deputations from members of the public. Each deputation may be heard for a maximum of five minutes following which one Member of the Council, nominated by the Mayor, may speak in response. It shall then be moved by the Mayor and voted on without discussion that the deputation be thanked for attending and its subject matter noted.

Notification of one Deputation has been received. The spokesperson is entitled to speak for 5 minutes.

(a) Deputation concerning Hove Park Tennis Courts**Spokesperson Mr. N. Dickson**

Supported by:

Jason Pither

Penny Telford

Don Lee

Michelle Roycroft

Georgina Gibson

Ward affected: Hove Park

Councillor Mitchell, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee will reply.

(b) Deputation concerning Benfield Primary School**Spokesperson Mr. Scott Theobald**

Supported by:

Sam Scerri

Jess Keilthy

Sylvia New

Clive Bolton

Sarah Brooking

Deborah Coghill

Ward affected: Hangleton & Knoll

Councillor Chapman, Chair of the Children, Young People & Skills Committee will reply.

**(a) Deputation concerning Hove Park Tennis Courts
Spokesperson Mr. N. Dickson**

I represent The Hove Park Tennis Alliance; we are a group formed of all the clubs that use Hove Park tennis courts extremely perturbed at the prospect of our astro tennis courts being handed over to a football only surface after 27 years.

We have been sharing this surface quite happily with local football clubs who use it in the winter under floodlights and then handed over to tennis in the summer, when demand for our sport is high and football has the whole use of the park to set up training or 5-a-side games.

Although it has been known for some time that the astro courts at Hove park were nearing the end of their life and becoming shabby, we were only informed about 5 weeks ago that the decision had been made to resurface the courts in a 3G surface,(funded completely by 106 development money) making it available for football only.

The agenda was driven by the Head of City Parks and subsequently sanctioned by Hove Park ward councillors Jayne Bennett and Vanessa Brown alongside the Chair of the ETS committee Councillor Gill Mitchell.

As existing users of this facility we have never at any stage been consulted regarding its future and would like clarification as to how and when the decision was made.

Since learning of the Council's intentions we have been frantically lobbying councillors, seeking press coverage and demonstrating. Our view is that we are being cast aside and a feeling of political will to see the demise of tennis at the expense of other sports, perhaps due to the misconception, 'that we must all be able to pay at a private club', however, nothing could be further from the truth, we are a real diverse group, the whole ethos of Parks league Tennis set up over 60 years ago was to promote players from different socioeconomic groups.

We are asking that a new multi-sports surface be laid so that we can continue to share this facility with footballers and why not other sports who may wish to use an excellent new surface.

Whilst Hove Park councillors have been sympathetic to our cause, they refer us back to Head of City Parks to answer our questions, who in our opinion dismisses our wish for multi-sports and hides behind bureaucratic barriers regarding the use of 106 monies and has wilfully neglected to collect funds from tennis to make finances from football look like the best option.

The lateness of the decision means that 106 money has to be spent by April 2018 leaving little time for opposition, as work is due to start in February 2018.

**(b) Deputation concerning Benfield Primary School
Spokesperson Mr. S. Theobald**

Reducing Benfield Primary School to a 1 form entry school (PAN of 30) from a current 2 form entry status.

Summary

Benfield Primary School governors, parents, teachers, and the community the school serves strenuously object to the reduction of the school to single form entry. The arguments for this will be given to full council and will include:

1. Benfield is a 'Good' school with areas of Outstanding, with progress in the top 25% of schools nationally.
2. Benfield has been awarded 'Teaching School' status forming an alliance with other schools, achieving this on the excellence of its leadership and teaching standards. This has been awarded on the basis of the school as a 2 form entry.
3. The school has a balanced budget, a rigorous approach to financial management and planning, and has been able to accommodate varying school numbers year on year. Unlike other schools, it is not in a budget deficit and does not require additional financial support.
4. The local community the school serves already has a choice of single form entry schools. Removing Benfield as a 2 form entry reduces choice of parents going to a larger school as the only remaining larger option would be St Nicholas, a religious school able to set its own admission criteria if over-subscribed.
5. The council know single form entry schools are not financially efficient and not an ideal model for Primary Schools. The creation of a 4th single form Primary School in the local area not only reduces choice, but also sets up a poor financial model.
6. The council expanded West Hove and St Andrews schools against the schools wishes, with those schools feeling they were large enough already, and opening the Connaught School, without strategic foresight as to the PAN across the city. This poor planning has led to the schools on the boundaries that do not want to be reduced.
7. The argument for expanding certain schools has been 'to give parents there first preference', however this is contradicted by the secondary school boundary changes that take away choice from the same parents that they expanded Primary schools for, so they don't have that same choice for secondary.
8. Benfield Primary School is a school that has been showing year on year consistent improvement, development, and progress across all areas of the school. The council should not be pulling the rug from under a school that is demonstrating remarkable results from a diverse cohort which it welcomes, accommodates, makes safe, and ultimately makes learning enjoyable.
9. A reduction in PAN is not what the school wants, it isn't what the community wants, and ultimately will not save any money given the financial prudence of the school.

Petition: Presented to CYP&S Committee 13.11.17 Signatures objecting to the reduction of the PAN at Benfield Primary School: Online 1322, Paper 167, Total = 1489 signatures

