

REPORT TO: East Lothian Council

MEETING DATE: 28 March 2017

BY: Depute Chief Executive (Resources and People Services)

SUBJECT: Outcome of the School Consultation on the Proposed Establishment of a New Primary School and Its Associated Catchment Area within the Land at Craighall, Musselburgh

1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 To approve the recommendations set out within the Consultation Report (Appendix 1) to establish a new primary school and its associated catchment area within the land at Craighall, Musselburgh.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 Following completion of the statutory school consultation exercise, the Council has 3 options to consider, namely:
- i. approve, on the basis of the outcome of the school consultation and taking account of the educational and social benefits of the proposal that, subject to the adoption of the emerging LDP in a format that would require these new education catchment arrangements and facilities to be delivered:
 - a. a new primary school catchment area will be established for the Craighall area (LDP Proposal MH1, *hereinafter referred to as 'MH1'*), currently in the Campie Primary School catchment area;
 - b. a new primary school with early learning and childcare provision will be established for the proposed Craighall primary school catchment area;
 - c. the new primary school will be established initially at Stoneyhill Primary School through a "hosting" arrangement until the new primary school building is complete; and

- d. the new primary school will relocate to its permanent site on the completion of the new building.
- ii. withdraw the proposal and make no additional provision for pre-school and primary education for the land at Craighall (MH1). In withdrawing the proposal, the Council would not be able to accommodate the educational requirements of eligible pre-school and primary-aged children arising from planned housing developments in the Craighall area (MH1).
- iii. undertake a further consultation exercise on a new proposal.

3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The *Education (Scotland) Act 1980* places a legislative duty on the Council to provide sufficient school accommodation and plan for growth in our communities. In addition, the Council has a statutory duty to secure best value in terms of the Local Government in Scotland Act 2003.
- 3.2 The Council must consult on certain changes in arrangements for educating children and young people in its area before it can commit to delivering them including, if required, to make proposed development sites effective.
- 3.3 On 24 February 2015 approval was given by East Lothian Council to undertake consultations relating to the school estate (i.e. schools, catchment areas, locations) regarding work necessary to inform the emerging Local Development Plan (LDP), where there is likely to be a need for new or re-provisioned facilities, without further reference to or approval by Council; and to report back to Council on the outcomes of such consultations in order that the Council can make a decision on any proposed changes.
- 3.4 The LDP must be complemented by an educational solution that meets the increase in projected pupil numbers that will be generated from the new housing development. The proposed housing development at Craighall (MH1) identified in the 2016 Proposed LDP will require a new primary education facility with early learning & childcare provision to be established in order for such development to be delivered.
- 3.5 The statutory consultation regarding the establishment of a new primary school and its associated catchment area within the land at Craighall (MH1) commenced at 12.00am on Tuesday 8 November 2016 and lasted until 12.00am on Wednesday 21 December 2016, being a period of six weeks, which also included the statutory minimum 30 school days. This was in line with the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010*. Notification of the consultation was given to all statutory consultees prior to the commencement

of the consultation. The Consultation Document was published on [East Lothian Council's Consultation Hub](#) and paper copies distributed on Tuesday 8 November 2016.

- 3.6 Representations were sought from statutory consultees and the wider public by the completion of an online questionnaire available on the East Lothian Council Consultation Hub. The Consultation Hub also stored all relevant consultation documentation for public viewing. Paper copies of the questionnaire were also distributed at Council buildings around the Musselburgh area.
- 3.7 Publicity material detailed an East Lothian Council email address, phone number and postal address, to which representations and any other queries could be submitted.
- 3.8 HM Inspectors from Education Scotland undertook their statutory duties in accordance with the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010*, by reviewing the educational aspects of the proposal and completing their report. A full copy of the report can be found in Appendix 6 of the Consultation Report (Appendix 1).
- 3.9 All submitted representations, including the Education Scotland report, were analysed by East Lothian Council Officers, summarised and answered to in the Consultation Report (Appendix 1). The Consultation Report, summarising all representations and East Lothian Council's response, was published on the East Lothian Council Consultation Hub on 27 February 2017. This was made publicly available for a minimum period of three weeks before consideration of the proposal by East Lothian Council, in line with the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010*.

Summary

- 3.10 The Council received 25 responses to the questionnaire during the consultation period.
- 3.11 Of the 25 questionnaire responses, which provided an overall view about the council's proposal, almost all expressed support. In terms of the three individual elements of the proposal, a clear majority of respondents to the questionnaire (88% support the proposal to establish a new school (8% oppose /4% have no opinion) and its associated catchment area (72% support/ 20% oppose/ 8% have no opinion). A greater proportion of respondents overall oppose the element to host initially at Stoneyhill Primary School before relocating until the new permanent facility is built (72% oppose/ 20% support/ 8% have no opinion).
- 3.12 Although the responses to the questionnaire capture the flavour of opinions regarding the consultation and are all valued, it is important to note that such

a small sample size is not statistically significant given the number of families living within the Musselburgh community. A summary of responses by demographic is provided in the Consultation Report (Appendix 1).

3.13 One written submission was made after the consultation period had ended by Stoneyhill Primary School Parent Council in support of the proposal to establish a primary school within the Craighall area, the realignment of the catchment areas accordingly and the “hosting” element.

3.14 During the consultation period, Council officers visited Campie Primary School and Stoneyhill Primary School, providing good opportunities for pupils to discuss their views. Overall, pupils showed support for the proposal.

3.15 A number of common themes emerged from the written and oral responses, and can be grouped as follows:

- Concerns about the level of new housing proposed for Musselburgh and preservation of heritage and community identity
- Transport Links & Safe Routes to Schools for Craighall area
- Concerns that pupils currently living in the proposed new catchment area will need to move school
- Concerns over increased traffic in Stoneyhill area during "hosting arrangements"
- Capacity at Stoneyhill Primary School for "hosting arrangements"
- Staff retention at Stoneyhill Primary School
- Consider a catchment area review for all Musselburgh schools

East Lothian Council's response to these themes is detailed in Section 7 of the Consultation Report (Appendix 1).

3.16 In line with the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010*, Education Scotland considered the educational aspects of the proposal and submitted a report to East Lothian Council. As part of this consideration, Education Scotland met with children, young people, staff and parents who may be affected by the proposal. The full report from Education Scotland can be found in Appendix 6 of the Consultation Report (Appendix 1).

3.17 Education Scotland reported that the proposal to establish a new catchment area for the planned Craighall Primary School has clear educational benefits as follows:

- the proposal has the potential to provide children who will reside in the Craighall housing development with modern, purpose built accommodation designed to meet the needs of its learners;
- the new school will provide a range of leisure and learning facilities which will potentially benefit the wider community;

- in the medium term, the proposal will also reduce the possibility of overcrowding at both Stoneyhill and Campie primary schools.
- 3.18 Education Scotland reported that almost all parents, pupils and staff who met with HM Inspectors supported the proposal.
- 3.19 Education Scotland noted that East Lothian Council needs to ensure the following, if the proposal is taken forward:
- interim transition arrangements apply to both children living in the new Craighall housing development who will be initially ‘hosted’ at Stoneyhill Primary School and children who attend Stoneyhill Primary School. During the interim ‘hosting’ period the Council should provide both groups of children with a high quality education; and
 - continue to engage with stakeholders over its planned transition arrangements for children who will attend the new school and those children who attend Stoneyhill Primary School.
- 3.20 Following receipt of a total of 25 questionnaire responses during the consultation period, one written submission received after the consultation period had ended, and consideration of oral representations made at a public meeting held during the consultation period, a range of officers from Education, Planning, Property and Road Services reviewed the proposal. This ensured that the Council met the requirements of sections 9(1), 12 and 13(3) (b) of the 2010 Act. Officers of the Education Authority have listened carefully to the points made at the public meetings and have considered the written representations, including the Education Scotland report.
- 3.21 Having reviewed the feedback from consultees, officers conclude that the basis of the original proposal remained the best solution to provide appropriate and effective early learning & childcare and primary education provision for the Craighall area (MH1).

4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 None

5 INTEGRATED IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 5.1 The subject of this report has been through the Integrated Impact Assessment process. Potential impacts have been identified and will be addressed.

6 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Financial – Developer contributions will be sought from the developers of relevant sites allocated in the Land at Craighall area (MH1) to fund the costs of this permanent provision which will be the subject of legal agreement with relevant landowners. School revenue budgets and staffing complements are set in line with the school roll in accordance with the approved Scheme of Delegation for Schools and the Council’s devolved school management (DSM) policies. The Council will incur additional revenue costs associated with the day to day running of the new early learning & childcare and primary school provision at Craighall (MH1).
- 6.2 Personnel - The Education Service closely monitors school rolls and plans staff recruitment in response to increases in rolls. The new provision will be staffed in line with current East Lothian recruitment procedures, appointing the best candidates for each vacancy. Recruitment will be open to all appropriately qualified staff from East Lothian and beyond. Whilst this will provide career opportunities for many of our existing staff, the staffing will be phased in over a number of years and should not have a detrimental impact on the teaching and learning in neighbouring schools. A senior management team will be recruited a number of months before the school is open. The key tasks of this group will be to appoint the staff team in readiness for the school opening, and to prepare for transition.
- 6.3 Other – None

7 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 7.1 Consultation Report on the outcome of the consultation on the the proposed establishment of a new primary school and its associated catchment area within the land at Craighall, Musselburgh (Appendix 1).

AUTHOR’S NAME	Fiona Robertson
DESIGNATION	Head of Education
CONTACT INFO	frobertson@eastlothian.gov.uk Tel No – 01620 827834
DATE	13 th March 2017



EAST LOTHIAN COUNCIL
RESOURCES AND PEOPLE SERVICES
EDUCATION
CONSULTATION REPORT

**REPORT ON THE OUTCOME OF THE CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSED
ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL AND ITS ASSOCIATED
CATCHMENT AREA WITHIN THE LAND AT CRAIGHALL, MUSSELBURGH**

February 2017

This Consultation Report has been issued by East Lothian Council in accordance with the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010.

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION
2. BACKGROUND
3. CONSIDERATIONS
4. THE CONSULTATION PROCESS
5. THE PUBLIC MEETING
6. RESPONSES TO THE CONSULTATION EXERCISE
7. EDUCATION AUTHORITY RESPONSE TO WRITTEN AND ORAL REPRESENTATIONS
8. EDUCATION SCOTLAND REPORT
9. TRANSITION ARRANGEMENTS
10. ALLEGED OMISSIONS OR INACCURACIES
11. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 9(1) OF THE SCHOOLS (CONSULTATION) (SCOTLAND) ACT 2010
12. LEGAL ISSUES
13. PERSONNEL ISSUES
14. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES
15. CONCLUSION
16. RECOMMENDATIONS

List of Appendices

- Appendix 1 - Note of public meeting (pages 22 to 28)
- Appendix 2 - Summary of Questionnaire Responses (pages 29 to 35)
- Appendix 3 – Comments from Questionnaire Responses (pages 36 to 38)
- Appendix 4 – Written Response from Stoneyhill Parent Council (pages 39 to 40)
- Appendix 5 - Note of pupil voice sessions (pages 41 to 43)
- Appendix 6 – Education Scotland Report (pages 44 to 46)

EAST LOTHIAN COUNCIL

RESOURCES AND PEOPLE SERVICES

EDUCATION

This report has been prepared following consultation on the following proposal:

- A new primary school catchment area will be established for the Craighall area (LDP Proposal MH1, *hereinafter referred to as 'MH1'*), currently in the Campie Primary School catchment area;
- A new primary school with early learning and childcare provision will be established for the proposed Craighall primary school catchment area;
- The new primary school will be established initially at Stoneyhill Primary School through a “hosting” arrangement until the new primary school building is complete; and
- The new primary school will relocate to its permanent site on the completion of the new building.

This proposal **directly affected** the following schools:

- Campie Primary School
- Stoneyhill Primary School

Having had regard (in particular) to:

- a) Relevant written representations received by the Council (from any person) during the consultation period
- b) Oral representations made to it (by any person) at the public meeting held on 6th December 2016
- c) Oral representations made to it at the public drop-in sessions
- d) Oral representations made to it at the pupil voice sessions
- e) Education Scotland’s report on the proposal

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This is a Consultation Report prepared in compliance with the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 on the above proposal.

1.2 The purpose of this report is to:

- Provide a record of the total number of written responses made during the Statutory Consultation period;
- Provide a summary of the written responses;
- Provide a summary of oral representations made at the public meeting held on 6th December 2016;
- Provide a statement of the Council's response to those written and oral representations;
- Provide the full text of Education Scotland's report and a statement of the Council's response to this report;
- State how the Council reviewed the above proposal following the representations received during the Statutory Consultation period and the report from Education Scotland;
- Provide details of any omission from, or inaccuracy in, the Consultation Proposal Document and state how the Council acted upon it; and
- State how the Council has complied with Section 12 of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 when reviewing the above proposals.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Education Authorities have a statutory duty in terms of the Education (Scotland) Act 1980 to make adequate and efficient provision of school education across their area. This duty applies in respect of both the current school population and anticipated pattern of demand. In addition, Councils have a statutory duty to secure best value in terms of the Local Government in Scotland Act 2003. Most importantly, the Education Authority would wish to optimise the educational experience to ensure:

- East Lothian's young people are successful learners, confident individuals, effective contributors and responsible citizens;
- East Lothian's children have the best start in life and are ready to succeed;
- East Lothian's children experience equality of opportunity within an inclusive educational experience'
- East Lothian's children's care, welfare and personal and social development is central to raising their attainment and achievements; and
- In East Lothian we live healthier, more active and independent lives.

- 2.2 East Lothian Council is committed to raising educational attainment and ensuring that all children and young people have the best opportunities in life. The educational benefits that will arise from this proposal for children affected or likely to be affected are outlined in the Consultation Proposal Document.
- 2.3 The Strategic Development Plan (SDP) for South East Scotland was approved by Scottish Ministers in June 2013. The SDP with its Supplementary Guidance on Housing Land requires the Local Development Plan (LDP) to ensure sufficient housing land is available to deliver 10,050 homes during the period 2009 – 2024 with 6,250 of those homes capable of being delivered across East Lothian in the period to 2019.
- 2.4 In order to accommodate these strategic development requirements for East Lothian, East Lothian Council approved a Proposed LDP 2016 for representation on 6th September 2016. The Proposed LDP sets out East Lothian Council's proposed spatial strategy for East Lothian. As part of this, the Land at Craighall, Musselburgh (MH1) is one of the main development proposals in the Musselburgh Cluster which is proposed to be allocated for a mixed use development including 1,500 homes.
- 2.5 Significant additional education capacity at primary and secondary level will be needed to support the new housing development proposed in the Musselburgh cluster, including a new primary school for the site at Craighall (MH1). The Council must ensure provision is and can be made for the education of children in its area, and therefore wants to align the future provision of additional education capacity with its proposed development strategy for the area.
- 2.6 The Council must consult on certain changes in arrangements for educating children and young people in its area before it can commit to delivering them including, if required, to make proposed development sites effective. The LDP must be complemented by an educational solution that meets the increase in projected pupil numbers that will be generated from the new housing development. The proposed housing development at Craighall (MH1) identified in the 2016 Proposed LDP will require a new primary education facility with early learning & childcare provision to be established in order for such development to be delivered.
- 2.7 On 24th February 2015, approval was given by East Lothian Council to undertake consultations relating to the school estate (i.e. schools, catchment areas, locations) as necessary to support the emerging LDP, where there is likely to be a need for new or re-provisioned facilities, without further reference to or approval by Council; and to report back to Council on the outcomes of such consultations in order that the Council can make a decision on any proposed changes.
- 2.8 The proposed catchment area for the proposed Craighall primary school is currently within the Campie Primary School Catchment area and will directly affect the following schools and was considered in the Consultation Proposal Document:

- Campie Primary School
- Stoneyhill Primary School

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 The main considerations relating to the establishment of a new primary school and its associated catchment area for the land at Craighall (MH1) are fully explained in the Consultation Proposal Document and the main points are highlighted below:

- The need to address early learning & childcare and primary education provision for the Craighall area (MH1) and create a sustainable school estate for future generations;
- The increasing pupil roll projection in the area;
- The condition and suitability of the establishments to facilitate learning and teaching processes in the 21st Century; and
- The need to develop inspirational learning environments which raise the aspirations of children and young people, staff and the wider community.

4. THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

4.1 The Council has met the minimum requirements set out in the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 with regards to ensuring the views of all members of the community were listened to and their views are included in this report. The Council believes that this report accurately reflects the views of the community, which have been gathered through a range of engagement events and response mechanisms. It is for members of East Lothian Council to decide to adopt the proposal, withdraw it or seek to consult on another proposal.

4.2 On 24th February 2015, approval was given by East Lothian Council to undertake consultations relating to the school estate (i.e. schools, catchment areas, locations) as necessary to support the emerging LDP, where there is likely to be a need for new or re-provisioned facilities, without further reference to or approval by Council; and to report back to Council on the outcomes of such consultations in order that the Council can make a decision on any proposed changes.

4.3 Notification of the consultation was given to all statutory consultees prior to the commencement of the consultation.

4.4 The Consultation Proposal Document was published on East Lothian Council's website and paper copies distributed on 8th November 2016 to:

- Campie Primary School
- Loretto RC Primary School
- Stoneyhill Primary School
- Musselburgh Grammar School

- Brunton Hall, Musselburgh
 - Musselburgh Library
 - Almond Park Nursery
 - First Step Community Nursery
 - Fisherrow Community Nursery
 - Honest Toun Nursery
 - Links Nursery
 - Loretto Private Nursery
 - Musselburgh Private Nursery
 - Olivebank Child and Family Centre
 - John Muir House, Haddington
- 4.5 The consultation period commenced at 12.00am on **Tuesday 8th November 2016** and lasted until 12.00am on **Wednesday 21st December 2016**, being a period of six weeks, which also included the statutory minimum 30 school days.
- 4.6 The proposal on which consultation took place was to:
- Establish a new primary school catchment area for the Craighall area (MH1) and the removal of this area of land from the Campie Primary School catchment area;
 - Establish a new primary school with early learning and childcare provision for the proposed Craighall primary school catchment area; and
 - Establish the new primary school initially within Stoneyhill Primary School and relocate to its permanent site on the completion of the new building.
- 4.7 The requirements for consulting on a relevant proposal relating to schools are set out in the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010.
- 4.8 An information leaflet setting out details about the proposal and consultation meetings was issued to the consultees listed in the Consultation Proposal Document. Advice on where the complete Consultation Proposal Document could be obtained was included and was published on East Lothian Council's Consultation Hub <https://eastlothianconsultations.co.uk/education/craighall-catchment>
- 4.9 If requested, copies of the proposal would have been made available in alternative formats or translated for readers whose first language is not English.
- 4.10 A "Frequently Asked Questions" document was also prepared which was available at the same location on East Lothian Council's Consultation Hub: <https://eastlothianconsultations.co.uk/education/craighall-catchment>
- 4.11 An advertisement was placed in the local newspaper on **10th November 2016** and **1st December 2016**. A pre-announcement was also made on the Council's website and social media posts on the **7th November 2016**. In addition, there were announcements

related to the consultation process on East Lothian Council's website, linked via a Facebook page and Twitter feeds.

4.12 The public meeting was held in **Brunton Hall, Musselburgh** on **6th December 2016 at 7.00pm**.

4.13 In addition to specific meetings with statutory consultees, drop-in sessions were also held in respect of the proposal at the venues below, at which any members of the public and staff were welcome to attend:

Venue	Date	Time
Campie Primary School	21 November 2016	12:00pm – 5:00pm
Brunton Hall, Musselburgh	6 December 2016	6.15pm – 7.00pm

4.14 In accordance with statutory requirements, the following persons, including those indirectly affected, were consulted:

- The Parent Councils of Campie Primary School and Stoneyhill Primary School;
- The parents of pupils at Campie Primary School and Stoneyhill Primary School;
- The parents of any children expected to attend Campie Primary School and Stoneyhill Primary School within two years of the date of publication of the proposal paper;
- The pupils at Campie Primary School and Stoneyhill Primary School;
- The staff at Campie Primary School and Stoneyhill Primary School;
- Musselburgh Area Partnership;
- Musselburgh & Inveresk Community Council.

4.15 The following schools are **directly affected** by the proposal:

- Campie Primary School
- Stoneyhill Primary School

4.16 The following schools are **indirectly affected** by the proposal:

- Loretto RC Primary School
- Musselburgh Grammar School

4.17 Representations were sought from statutory consultees and the wider public in the following ways:

- An online questionnaire on East Lothian Council's Consultation Hub. The questionnaire asked specific questions and enabled general comments and views to be entered. The Consultation Hub stored all relevant consultation documentation for public viewing;

- Widely distributed paper copies of the same questionnaire, at Council buildings within the Musselburgh area. Sealed boxes were also located at questionnaire distribution points for their return;
- Paper and digital flyers, in addition to the press adverts and Council web and social media announcements linked to the Consultation Hub. These flyers also detailed a specific Education Consultations email inbox, to which any queries could be submitted during the consultation period;
- Flyer distribution to pupils at Campie Primary School, Stoneyhill Primary School, Loretto RC Primary School and Musselburgh Grammar School. Head Teachers used their established methods of communication to engage/remind parents about the consultation and the Education Scotland independent evaluation visit.
- In addition to the public meeting, staff at the affected schools were also invited to attend the public drop-in sessions to discuss the proposals;
- A representative group of pupils from Campie Primary School and Stoneyhill Primary School attended a workshop where they were able to express their views on the proposals;
- A joint Parent Council meeting held with representatives from Campie Parent Council and Stoneyhill Parent Council.

4.18 This Consultation Report is the Council's response to the issues raised during the consultation period on the Consultation Proposal Document.

4.19 This Consultation Report will be published for a period of three weeks before a final decision is taken by East Lothian Council on 28th March 2017.

5. THE PUBLIC MEETING

5.1 A public meeting was held in Brunton Hall on Tuesday 6th December 2016 which was attended by three members of the public and one elected member. A full note of the meeting is attached at Appendix 1 which details the questions and issues raised at the meeting. The points raised are addressed within the response to Frequently Asked Questions or within this report.

5.2 Additionally, drop-in sessions were arranged during the consultation period, enabling any member of the public and staff to ask questions and discuss the proposals, the consultation process and how they could make representations. The most commonly asked questions at the drop-in sessions also informed the content of the Frequently Asked Questions document to provide relevant stakeholders and members of the public with points of clarification or further information.

6. RESPONSES TO THE CONSULTATION EXERCISE

6.1 As part of the consultation process, the Council sought the views of a wide range of stakeholders. Information about the consultation was placed in a local newspaper, on

the Council's website and at the affected schools, as well as all Musselburgh Partnership Nurseries, libraries and other centres within the Musselburgh area.

- 6.2 The Council provided stakeholders with a short online or paper questionnaire and also made good arrangements for receiving additional written responses. The Council received twenty five responses to its questionnaire. Of the responses which provided an overall view about the council's proposal, almost all expressed support. In terms of the three individual elements of the proposal, a clear majority of respondents to the questionnaire (88%) support the proposal to establish a new school (8% oppose /4% have no opinion) and its associated catchment area (72% support/ 20% oppose/ 8% have no opinion). A greater proportion of respondents overall oppose the element to host initially at Stoneyhill Primary School before relocating until the new permanent facility is built (72% oppose/ 20% support/ 8% have no opinion).
- 6.3 Although the responses to the questionnaire capture the flavour of opinions regarding the consultation and are all valued, it is important to note that such a small sample size is not statistically significant.
- 6.4 A summary of all questionnaire responses has been included in Appendix 2. The comments made as part of these questionnaires are also included in Appendix 3, apart from submissions which consultees did not wish East Lothian Council to share publicly. Even if a submission is not shared publicly, it has still been included in the collation of stakeholder's views and informed the response as detailed in paragraph 6.8.
- 6.5 The Council did not receive any written submissions to its consultation during the consultation period. One written submission was made after the consultation period had ended by Stoneyhill Primary School Parent Council in support of the proposal to establish a primary school within the Craighall area, the realignment of the catchment areas accordingly and the "hosting" element. The views expressed by the group in this written submission were submitted to Education Scotland with all representations that had been made during the consultation period and any issues or concerns raised are also subject to the Council's response in this Consultation Report.
- 6.6 The summary of questionnaire responses to the individual elements categorised by demographic are as follows:

- **Parents of pupils currently at schools:**

A greater proportion of parents of pupils currently at school who responded, agreed with the proposals to establish a new school and its associated catchment area than disagreed, for all schools. In total, 95.2% supported the proposal for the new school (4.8% opposed) and 81.0% supported the proposal for its associated catchment area (19.1% opposed). A greater proportion of parents of pupils currently at school disagreed with the "hosting" element than agreed, for all schools. In total, 72.7% opposed the "hosting" element, 18.2% supported and 9.1%

had no opinion. The greatest proportion opposing were parents of pupils currently at Stoneyhill Primary School (88.9% opposed/11.1% supported). 44.4% of parents with current pupils at Campie Primary School disagreed/strongly disagreed with the “hosting” element, 33.3% agreed/strongly agreed and 22.2% had no opinion. All of the parents of current pupils in the “Other School” category disagreed/strongly disagreed with the “hosting” element.

- **Parents of future pupils at schools:**

A greater proportion of parents of future pupils overall agreed with the proposal to establish a new school than disagreed. In total, 66.7% supported the proposal for the new school, 16.7% were opposed and 16.7% had no opinion. 100% of parents with future pupils at Campie and “Other School” supported the new school, 50% of parents with future pupils of Stoneyhill opposed the new school while 50% had no opinion. A greater proportion of parents of future pupils overall disagreed with the proposed catchment area for the new school. In total, 66.7% were opposed and 33.3% supported the catchment area. 100% of future parents at Campie were opposed to the catchment area while 100% in the “Other School” category agreed with it. There were equal proportions of respondents of future pupils at Stoneyhill supporting/opposing the proposed catchment area (50%/50%).

A greater proportion of parents of future pupils disagreed with the “hosting” element than agreed, for all schools. In total, 83.3% opposed the “hosting” element, 16.7% had no opinion. The greatest proportions opposing were parents of future pupils at Stoneyhill Primary School and “Other School” with 100% disagreeing. 66.7% of parents of future pupils at Campie Primary School disagreed/strongly disagreed with the “hosting” element and 33.3% had no opinion.

- **Parent respondents (with stage banding of pupils):**

A greater proportion of parents of pupils in all age bandings supported the proposal for a new school, apart from parents of pupils no longer in education where there was an equal split. All parents of pupils currently at primary or secondary school were in support of the new school. A greater proportion of those parents in ‘pre-school education’ were opposed to the proposed catchment area (62.5% opposed/37.5% supported) while there were equal proportions of parents of pupils ‘Not yet in Education’ and ‘No longer in school Education’ supporting/opposing the proposed catchment area (50%/50%). A greater proportion of parents of pupils in all age bandings opposed the “hosting” element, apart from parents of pupils ‘No longer in school Education’ where there was an equal split (50%/50%). The greatest proportion opposing were those parents with pupils in ‘S1-S6’ and ‘Not yet in Education’.

- **Pupils currently attending school:**

There were no respondents within this demographic.

- **Members of Staff:**

Two respondents identified themselves within this demographic. Both supported the proposal to establish a new school and its associated catchment area but did not agree with the “hosting” element.

- **“Other” Respondents:**

These respondents included grandparents, other family member, members of the public etc. 80% of these respondents supported the proposal to establish a new school for the Craighall area, 20% were opposed. A greater proportion opposed the proposal for its associated catchment area (60% opposed/40% supported) and a greater proportion also opposed the “hosting” element (40% opposed/20% supported/40% had no opinion).

- **Catchment of Respondent:**

A greater proportion of respondents from all catchments supported the proposal to establish a new school: “Campie” (91.7% supported/8.3% opposed), “Stoneyhill” (81.8% supported/9.1% opposed/9.1% had no opinion), and “Other School” (100% supported). A greater proportion of respondents from all catchments also supported the proposal for its associated catchment: “Campie” (58.3% supported/14.7% opposed), “Stoneyhill” (81.8% supported/18.2% opposed), and “Other School” (100% supported). A greater proportion of respondents from the Campie and Stoneyhill catchments opposed the proposal to initially host the school at Stoneyhill Primary School: “Campie” (58.3% opposed/25% supported/16.7% had no opinion) and Stoneyhill catchment (90.9% opposed/9.1% supported). There were equal proportions of respondents supporting/opposing the “hosting” element who live in the ‘Other School’ catchment (50%/50%).

6.7 During the consultation period, Council officers visited Campie Primary School and Stoneyhill Primary School providing good opportunities for pupils to discuss their views. Overall, pupils showed support for the proposals. Notes of the pupil voice sessions are included as Appendix 4.

6.8 A number of common themes emerged from the written and oral responses and can be grouped as follows:

- Concerns about the level of new housing proposed for Musselburgh and preservation of heritage and community identity
- Transport Links & Safe Routes to Schools for Craighall area

- Concerns that pupils currently living in the proposed new catchment area will need to move school
- Concerns over increased traffic in Stoneyhill area during “hosting arrangements”
- Capacity at Stoneyhill Primary School for “hosting arrangements”
- Staff retention at Stoneyhill Primary School
- Consider a catchment area review for all Musselburgh schools

7. EDUCATION AUTHORITY RESPONSE TO WRITTEN AND ORAL REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 Concerns about level of new housing proposed for Musselburgh and preservation of heritage and community identity

7.1.1 These issues are addressed through the Local Development Plan process. The Council is formulating its responses to representations made to the Proposed Local Development Plan and any unresolved objections in respect of spatial strategy, site allocations and infrastructure requirements will be considered at examination.

7.1.2 While a new local centre will be introduced at Craighall (MH1) as part of the mixed-use development, those moving into the proposed housing developments at Craighall will be part of two communities, a new community at Craighall and the wider community of Musselburgh.

7.1.3 In terms of the school community, the Council will work closely with the children, young people and parents who move into the development to establish a new sense of school community within the context of the wider Musselburgh community. Increasing the early learning & childcare and primary education provision in the Musselburgh cluster area will provide opportunities for schools to work in a new wider learning community. The temporary hosting arrangements at Stoneyhill Primary School during the initial house build years, while the new primary school facilities at Craighall are being built, will help to develop links and integration across the existing Musselburgh community.

7.2 Transport Links & Safe Routes to Schools for Craighall area

7.2.1 The Council agrees that safe routes to school and other connectivity issues require to be addressed through the planning/design process. There is currently an ongoing process and dialogue within the Council with Planning and Road Services and others in terms of a Master Plan approach towards the site. Further discussions will take place before we arrive at the fundamental principles for the Master Plan which underpins movement around the site including transport and safe routes to schools, which is a critical part of the process, as well as linkages to Musselburgh town itself. Road safety will be a priority and measures needed to ensure there is sustainable travel to encourage people to walk and cycle and discourage vehicle trips during the school travel times and indiscriminate parking behaviour associated with the drop-off of children at the new school. Wider measures will also be needed to support, facilitate

and encourage active travel, linked with safer routes to school. Consideration of improvements in the wider catchment area to remove barriers to cycling and walking will be considered and developed accordingly.

7.3 Concerns that pupils currently living in the proposed new catchment area will need to move school

7.3.1 As stated in the Consultation Proposal Document there are currently no residential properties within the proposed new Craighall catchment area with the exception of the student residence flats at the Queen Margaret University campus. The proposed new Craighall catchment area will be defined by the boundary of the proposed Craighall development site (MH1) and does not include any existing properties to the east of the site at Old Craighall. Therefore, no current or future primary-aged pupils living within either the current Campie Primary School catchment area or the proposed revised Campie Primary School catchment area will be affected by this proposal and will continue to attend Campie Primary School as their catchment school. Similarly, those who live in the current Campie Primary School catchment area who attend another school in the area through a placing request will remain at their current school. Denominational pupils from the proposed revised Campie Primary School catchment area will continue to have option to attend Loretto RC Primary School if they wish to do so as per current arrangements.

7.4 Concerns over increased traffic in Stoneyhill area during “hosting arrangements”

7.4.1 It is the Council’s intention during the “hosting” period through planning conditions to provide a bus to transport pupils between the Craighall site (MH1) and Stoneyhill Primary School to help minimise additional traffic in the Stoneyhill area.

7.5 Capacity at Stoneyhill Primary School for “hosting arrangements”

7.5.1 Stoneyhill Primary School has been identified as the best location for the “hosting arrangement” as opposed to Campie Primary School based on its relative proximity to the proposed Craighall site (MH1) and its available capacity based on projected school rolls.

7.5.2 Campie Primary School has a planning capacity of 444 primary-aged pupils. While this capacity is sufficient to accommodate the projected pupil numbers arising from planned and committed housing developments in the Campie Primary School catchment area, excluding the proposed Craighall development (MH1), the Campie Primary School facility and site is constrained and does not have the ability to be physically extended to accommodate the additional pupils projected to arise from the Craighall site (MH1). The projected rolls at Campie Primary School are expected to increase over the next five years to circa 430 pupils as committed and planned sites are built out and a temporary “hosting” arrangement at Campie Primary School would

put the school's capacity under significant pressure if the Craighall site came forward during this time.

- 7.5.3 The temporary "hosting" arrangement at Stoneyhill Primary School is predicated on the school's capacity to accommodate the projected pupil numbers arising from the proposed Craighall housing development (MH1) in the first two to three years of house build. Stoneyhill Primary School has a planning capacity of 309 pupils. There are currently no committed or planned housing developments for the Stoneyhill Primary School catchment area. Based on current demographics and historical intake trends in the Stoneyhill catchment area, school roll forecasts for the next 20 years show that the school roll is not projected to exceed 220 primary-aged pupils. This would suggest that there is sufficient capacity at the school for the Craighall pupils to be temporarily hosted. Due to legislation, the "hosting" period can only last up to a maximum of 36 months, allowing a viable pupil roll to develop while the new permanent school facility is being built. The agreed house development phasing for Craighall (MH1) would be such that the school would be ready for the children over that period of time.
- 7.5.4 Stoneyhill Primary School's capacity will be continually assessed (as is the case with all schools), in comparison to roll projections from the catchment area it provides for, and all new house building (of 5 units or more) which occurs within this area. Non-catchment placing requests will continue to be considered in line with East Lothian Council's Pupil Placement Policy.
- 7.5.5 In terms of nursery capacity, as there are no designated catchment areas for nursery, parents of eligible pre-school children moving into the proposed housing in the affected area (MH1) would apply for early learning and childcare provision at a nursery of their choice through the Council's existing Nursery Admissions processes.
- 7.5.6 The commencement of the "hosting" arrangement is dependent on when the first houses in the proposed Craighall development (MH1) are built and ready for occupation and families with primary-aged pupils move in. The timescale for the "hosting" period and the new primary school facility to be built is to be finalised as part of a detailed master planning exercise for the Craighall site (MH1) as a whole. Any master plan proposal will be subject to statutory pre-application procedures, including public consultation, in line with the requirements of the Town and County Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended). Based on indicative phasing provided for the Proposed LDP 2016 technical work, the number of pupils projected to arise from new housing in the proposed Craighall allocation (MH1) during the first three years of house completions is expected to grow from a single figure within the first year that houses are ready for occupation to 22 primary-aged pupils by the start of the third year of house build completions growing to circa 40 pupils by the end of the third year of house build.
- 7.5.7 A key priority for officers is the development of the "hosting" arrangement at Stoneyhill Primary School and a comprehensive transition programme to support the

transition from Stoneyhill Primary School into the proposed permanent Craighall primary school facility once it is complete. We are aware of authorities elsewhere in Scotland who have hosting arrangements in place and will communicate with them and learn from their experiences.

7.5.8 Specific details on the hosting arrangements themselves will depend on the numbers, stages and ages of the children moving into the new housing developments. It is not possible to predict the exact numbers, ages and stages moving into the new housing and there will need to be a degree of flexibility in terms of the approach that is taken to be responsive to the particular needs of individual children. The Council will work with the Head Teacher, who would be the temporarily shared Head Teacher for both Stoneyhill Primary School and Craighall primary school during the transition period, and other staff to discuss where children should be based and the composition of class groups as individual pupils start to move into the Craighall area. The appropriate statutory maximum class size – P1 maximum of 25, primary two and three maximum of 30 and primary four to seven maximum of 33 - will apply to the class organisation for both schools in line with current legislation and policy. A Transitional Leadership Team will also be established and in place in the January before the move to the new Craighall permanent facility to look at the arrangements needed in terms of staffing, class organisation etc.

7.5.9 For those children with Additional Support Needs there are well established procedures to identify particular learning needs and provide the required support measures. Such work involves close liaison with parents and carers, and where relevant, Community Planning Partners. Pupil Support staff and teaching staff will work closely to ensure that the learning, pastoral and social needs of children are fully supported during the transition process, including enhanced arrangements for children and young people with Additional Support Needs.

7.5.10 The Council will continue to consult and engage with affected stakeholders through the development and implementation of the hosting and planned transition arrangements. Timescales of the construction of the new permanent school facility at Craighall will be closely monitored by East Lothian Council and one year's notice of the opening date will be communicated to parents and the public to assist transition preparation. This date would be the expected opening date, subject to ongoing construction timescales. The opening of the facility would not be before this date, and any amendments to this timescale would likewise be communicated as soon as possible.

7.6 Staff Retention at Stoneyhill Primary School

7.6.1 The hosting arrangements and establishment of the new school should not have a detrimental impact on the retention of staff, staff numbers and the recruitment of new staff for Stoneyhill Primary School given the level of staffing required will reflect the school roll and maximum class sizes.

7.6.2 The new Craighall primary school would be staffed in line with current East Lothian recruitment procedures, appointing the best candidates for each vacancy. Recruitment would be open to all appropriately qualified staff from East Lothian and beyond. Whilst this will provide career opportunities for many of our existing staff, the staffing will be phased in over a number of years and should not have a detrimental impact on the teaching and learning in neighbouring schools. In line with the Council's risk management processes, the Education Service has measures in place to monitor current national recruitment problems.

7.7 Consider a catchment area review for all Musselburgh schools

7.7.1 Existing catchment areas not affected by the Proposed LDP operate well for the families and children living within these communities. In line with current legislation and Council policy, parents have the ability to make a placing request for a non catchment school.

8. EDUCATION SCOTLAND REPORT

8.1 In accordance with the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010, a report was produced by Education Scotland on the educational aspects of the proposal. A full copy of the report can be found in Appendix 6.

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

- consideration of all relevant documentation provided by the Council in relation to the proposal, specifically the educational benefits statement and related consultation documents, written and oral submissions from parents and others; and
- visits to the site of the proposed new school, Campie Primary School and Stoneyhill Primary School, including discussion with relevant consultees.

8.3 The Education Scotland consideration of the proposal is summarised as follows:

- Education Scotland stated that almost all parents, pupils and staff who met with HM Inspectors or responded to the Council's questionnaire supported the proposal.
- Education Scotland stated that stakeholders who met with HM Inspectors felt that the council had provided good opportunities for being consulted and for giving their views.
- Education Scotland stated that the proposal to establish a new catchment area for the planned Craighall Primary School has clear educational benefits. It identified that the proposal has the potential to provide children who will reside in the Craighall housing development with modern, purpose built accommodation designed to meet the needs of its learners. The Education Scotland report also stated that the new school will provide a range of leisure and learning facilities which will

potentially benefit the wider community. In the medium term, the proposal will also reduce the possibility of overcrowding at both Stoneyhill and Campie primary schools. Almost all stakeholders who met with HM Inspectors support the proposal.

- Education Scotland also stated that the Council should ensure that interim transition arrangements apply to both children living in the new Craighall housing development who will be initially 'hosted' at Stoneyhill Primary School and children who attend Stoneyhill Primary School. During the interim 'hosting' period the council should provide both groups of children with a high quality education.

8.4 In taking its proposal forward, the Council should continue to engage with stakeholders over its planned transition arrangements for children who will attend the new school and those children who attend Stoneyhill Primary School.

8.5 **East Lothian Council's Response to Education Scotland's Report**

East Lothian Council welcomes the report from Education Scotland and accepts its findings. The points raised by Education Scotland within the Education Scotland Report were also key themes identified through the consultation process and are addressed in Section 7 of this report.

9. **TRANSITION ARRANGEMENTS**

9.1 As stated in the Consultation Proposal Document, at present the affected area of land at Craighall (MH1) contains only student residence flats at Queen Margaret University and there are no pupils resident and attending East Lothian schools in any of the student flats within the affected area.

9.2 Pupils currently attending Campie Primary School will not be significantly affected as the proposed changes to the catchment areas, if approved, would be dependent on the adoption of the emerging LDP in a format that would require these new education catchment arrangements and facilities to be delivered.

9.3 In respect of the new early learning & childcare and non-denominational primary school provision, it is intended that the Craighall primary school will be established initially at Stoneyhill Primary School under a temporary "hosting arrangement" in sufficient time to accommodate primary aged pupils from the proposed new housing developments at the Craighall site (MH1).

9.4 An effective transition programme will be put in place to ensure continuity and progression in learning for those pupils attending Stoneyhill Primary School as part of the "hosting" arrangement. The inclusion of children and families in the development of the new school from the outset should minimise any disruption to children's learning.

- 9.5 Parents of eligible pre-school children moving into planned housing in the affected area (MH1) would apply for early learning and childcare provision through the Council's existing Nursery Admissions processes.
- 9.6 Secondary pupils moving into planned housing in the affected area (MH1) following implementation of the proposal, if approved, will attend Musselburgh Grammar School. Denominational primary pupils will have the option to attend Loretto RC Primary School if they wish to do so.

10. ALLEGED OMISSIONS OR INACCURACIES

- 10.1 Section (10) (3) of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 also places a requirement on the Council to provide details of any inaccuracy or omission within the Consultation Proposal Document which has either been identified by the Council or raised by consultees. This section of the 2010 Act also requires the Council to provide a statement on the action taken in respect of the inaccuracy or omission, or, if no action was taken, to state that fact and why.
- 10.2 There were no inaccuracies or omissions within the Consultation Proposal Document either identified by the Council or raised by consultees during the consultation period.

11. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 9(1) OF THE SCHOOLS (CONSULTATION) (SCOTLAND) ACT 2010

- 11.1 Section 9(1) of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 states that:

After the Education Authority has received Education Scotland's report, the Authority is to review the relevant proposal having regard (in particular) to:

- (i) written representations received by the Authority (from any person) during the consultation period,*
- (ii) oral representations made to it (by any person) at the public meeting,*
- (iii) Education Scotland's report.*

- 11.2 Following receipt of twenty five questionnaire responses during the consultation period, one written submission received after the consultation period had ended, and consideration of oral representations made at a public meeting held during the consultation period, officers reviewed the proposal.
- 11.3 The feedback from the consultation was considered by relevant officers across a number of Council Services including Education, Planning, Property and Road Services. This ensured that the Council met the requirements of sections 9(1), 12 and 13(3) (b) of the 2010 Act.
- 11.4 Officers of the Education Authority have listened carefully to the points made at the public meeting and have considered equally carefully the written representations,

including the Education Scotland report. Having reviewed the feedback from consultees, officers conclude that the basis of the original proposal remained the best solution to provide appropriate and effective early learning & childcare and primary education provision for the Craighall area (MH1).

12. LEGAL ISSUES

12.1 The Council has complied in full with the requirements of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 throughout this statutory consultation.

12.2 The Council is mindful of its duties in respect of equality and the Equality Impact Assessment did not identify that any parent, child or young person would be treated less favourably as a result of this proposal.

12.3 Under the terms of the Schools (Scotland) (Consultation) Act 2010, it is a legal requirement that the Council should not reach any formal decision without having reviewed the relevant proposal having regard, in particular, to:

- a) relevant written representations received from any person during the consultation period;
- b) oral representation made to it by any person at the public meeting held on 6th December 2016;
- c) the Education Scotland report;
- d) preparing a Consultation Report; and
- e) waiting until a period of three weeks starting on the day on which this Consultation Report is published in electronic and printed form has expired.

12.4 As it is the intention that this Consultation Report should be published, both electronically and in written form, if required, on 27th February 2017, this meets the statutory requirement to publish this report more than three weeks before consideration of the proposal by East Lothian Council.

13. PERSONNEL ISSUES

13.1 No personnel issues have been identified with regard to this proposal.

14. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

14.1 The impacts of the proposals are assessed as set out above and the relevant technical and environmental information is published alongside the Proposed LDP. The interim environmental assessments, site assessments and other technical documents for the Main Issues Report and Proposed LDP are available on the Council's website.

15. CONCLUSION

15.1 The Council now has 3 options to consider, namely:

- a) adopt the proposal;

- b) withdraw the proposal and make no additional provision for primary education;
- c) undertake a further consultation exercise on a new proposal.

15.2 In withdrawing the proposal, the Council would not be able to accommodate the educational requirements of eligible pre-school and primary-aged children arising from planning housing developments in the Craighall area (MH1).

15.3 Education Scotland has identified that the proposal would lead to clear educational benefits for children. This includes providing a modern, purpose built accommodation designed to meet the needs of its learners as well as providing a range of leisure and learning facilities which will potentially benefit the wider community.

15.4 If the Council adopts the proposal, it would be on the basis that the educational benefits set out in the Consultation Proposal Document would materialise. There would also be a requirement that close joint planning with parents/carers, staff and pupils, is well managed in ways which are supportive to the pupils concerned, and in their long term interests.

15.5 The key messages deriving from the consultation period are as follows:

- A clear majority of respondents to the questionnaire (88%) support the proposal to establish a new primary school facility with early learning & childcare for the Craighall area (MH1). 8% of questionnaire respondents oppose this proposal and 4% have no opinion.
- A clear majority of respondents to the questionnaire (72%) support the proposed associated catchment area for Craighall and its removal from the Campie Primary School catchment area. 20% of questionnaire respondents oppose the proposed catchment and 8% have no opinion.
- A greater proportion of respondents to the questionnaire (72%) oppose the proposal to host initially at Stoneyhill Primary School before relocating until the new permanent facility is built. 20% support the “hosting” element and 8% have no opinion.
- Stoneyhill Primary School Parent Council support the proposal to establish a primary school within the Craighall area, the realignment of the catchment areas accordingly and the “hosting” element.
- During the consultation period, Council officers visited Campie Primary School and Stoneyhill Primary School, providing good opportunities for pupils to discuss their views. Overall, pupils showed support for the proposal.

16. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

16.1 On the basis of the feedback received and taking account of the educational and social benefits of the proposal, it is concluded that the following proposal is the most

suitable option and it is recommended that, subject to the adoption of the emerging LDP in a format that would require these new education catchment arrangements and facilities to be delivered, the Council approves the following:

- A new primary school catchment area will be established for the Craighall area (LDP Proposal MH1, hereinafter referred to as 'MH1'), currently in the Campie Primary School catchment area;
- A new primary school with early learning and childcare provision will be established for the proposed Craighall primary school catchment area;
- The new primary school will be established initially at Stoneyhill Primary School through a "hosting" arrangement until the new primary school building is complete; and
- The new primary school will relocate to its permanent site on the completion of the new building.

Fiona Robertson
Head of Education
February 2017

Appendix 1: Note of Public Meeting, 6th December 2016

STATUTORY PUBLIC CONSULTATION MEETING PROPOSAL – TO ESTABLISH A NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL AND ITS ASSOCIATED CATCHMENT AREA WITHIN THE LAND AT CRAIGHALL, MUSSELBURGH

**TUESDAY 6 DECEMBER 2016
BRUNTON HALL, MUSSELBURGH**

PRESENT:-

Fiona Robertson, Head of Education
Chris Webb, Independent Adviser, Chair of meeting
Liz McLean, Service Manager Strategic Asset
Iain McFarlane, Planning Service Manager, Development
Neil MacFarlane, Transportation Planning Officer
Paul Zochowski, Principal Planner (Policy and Project)
David Scott, Quality Improvement Officer
Fiona Brown, Principal Officer, Education
Pauline Smith, Principal Officer (Information & Research)
Rob Lewis, Senior Information Officer
Calum Murray, Business Support Officer (Education)
Anna Bennett, Business Support Officer (Education)
David Gilmour, Web Officer
Councillor John Williamson
3 members of the public (Ian Fullerton/Alison Elgin/Jill Robertson)

Chris Webb welcomed everyone to the meeting in relation to the proposed establishment of a new primary school and its associated catchment area within the land at Craighall, Musselburgh.

Chris Webb introduced himself and outlined the purpose of the meeting and introduced the Council Officers present. He informed the attendees that the meeting was being recorded to allow the Council to have an accurate record of any issues raised so they can answer any questions fuller at a later date. The views recorded will form part of the consultation exercise. He advised that the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act which governs the consultation the Council is currently going through came into force in 2010 and was amended in 2015. The Act, as amended, has established an open and transparent system for consulting changes to the schools.

Chris Webb advised that the purpose of the meeting is to give members of the public the opportunity to hear more about the proposal, ask questions about the proposal and have their views recorded and noted and taken account of as part of the consultation process.

Fiona Robertson reiterated that this evening's meeting was being held to discuss the following proposal:-


- The establishment of a new catchment area for the Craighall area around the proposed Land at Craighall development site (LDP Ref: "MH1", area "C" on map) and the removal of this area of land from Campie Primary School's catchment area.

- The establishment of a new school with primary education and early learning and childcare provision for the proposed Craighall primary school catchment area.
- Establishing the new primary school initially within Stoneyhill Primary School and relocating to its permanent site on completion of the new school facility.

Background to this proposal

- The Strategic Development Plan for South East Scotland (SDP) was approved by Scottish Ministers in June 2013.
- The SDP with its Supplementary Guidance on Housing Land requires the Local Development Plan (LDP) to ensure sufficient housing land is available to deliver 10,050 homes during the period 2009-2024 with 6,250 of those homes capable of being delivered across East Lothian in the period to 2019.
- To accommodate these strategic development requirements, East Lothian Council approved a Proposed LDP 2016 for representation on 6th September 2016.
- On 24 February 2015, approval was given by East Lothian Council to undertake consultations relating to the school estate (schools, catchment areas, locations) as necessary to support any emerging LDP.
- As part of the Proposed LDP 2016, the land at Craighall (LDP Ref: MH1, area “C” on map) is one of the main development proposals in the Musselburgh Cluster – with a proposed allocation of mixed use development including circa 1,500 homes.
- Significant additional education capacity at primary and secondary level will be needed to support the new housing development proposed in the Musselburgh cluster, including a new primary school for the site at Craighall (MH1, area “C”).

Proposed Catchment



“A” – Proposed amended Campie Primary Catchment

“B” – Stoneyhill Primary Catchment (no amendment proposed)

“C” – Proposed Craighall Primary Catchment

Education Provision

To accommodate the projected pupil population from the proposed allocations (LDP Ref: MH1, area "C" on map) the Council proposes to provide education capacity as follows:

- Permanent early learning & childcare and primary school capacity at the Craighall site.
- Craighall primary school will be established initially at Stoneyhill Primary School under a temporary "hosting" arrangement, for a period of up to 36 months, until the permanent Craighall primary school facility is delivered.
- Loretto RC Primary School would serve denominational pupils from the proposed Craighall primary school catchment area.
- Secondary school capacity will be provided at Musselburgh Grammar School, in accordance with the Council's proposed strategy for the delivery of additional secondary school education capacity in the Musselburgh area.

Projected Population Data

Craighall Primary School - The LDP projected pupil population for the proposed houses in the Craighall area (LDP Ref: "MH1", area "C" on map) requires a peak roll of 579 pupils primary pupils with 21 classes and pre-school provision of 110 places.

Stoneyhill Primary School - Current roll projections for Stoneyhill Primary School show there is capacity to temporarily "host" pupils from the Craighall site (MH1) for the first 2 to 3 years of house build.

Educational benefits


The establishment of a new primary school and its associated catchment area for the Craighall site (MH1) will have educational benefits through:

- Enhancement and improvement of the existing primary provision within the Musselburgh area.
- Providing a positive balance between the number of pupils in Musselburgh Grammar School and the proposed new secondary school at Wallyford.
- Addressing capacity constraints at Campie Primary School (if a new school is not built).

"Hosting" and transition

- Key priority for officers is development of "hosting" arrangement. *We are aware of authorities elsewhere in Scotland who have hosting arrangements in place and will communicate and learn from their experiences.*
- Comprehensive transition programme to support transition into new school.
- Hosting arrangement will last up to 36 months – until permanent Craighall primary school facility is delivered.

Project Timeline



Chris Webb invited questions from the public.

Councillor John Williamson advised that one of the reasons there were not many people at this public meeting is that not many people live in that area apart from there being a few cottages. He advised he had some concerns in relation to the creativity between both halves of Site C and how it will be integrated into the town of Musselburgh. He also expressed his concern in relation to the Consultation questionnaire and advised, in his opinion, the questionnaire was flawed. This is because people completing the questionnaire do not have to identify themselves on the consultation form, as the name and address field within the questionnaire is not mandatory. He felt that one person could, if they wanted to, could complete a number of responses.

Fiona Robertson commented on the question in relation to the questionnaire. She said that the Department do have quality assurance measures in place in relation to the completion of the questionnaires. It is not a requirement to have a questionnaire as part of the consultation process, but the Department did determine to have this as part of the consultation to encourage members of the community to respond. It would be far from her to suggest that members of the public would not fill these questionnaires in honestly in terms of providing a response to the consultation. The Department has already had approval from Council when preparing the relocation of Wallyford Primary School and at that point mentioned about Education Scotland saying the way by which the Wallyford Primary School consultation was conducted was commended by the stakeholders they had engaged with during the 3 week period. HMI who reviewed the consultation process gave this response to the Department. In relation to quality assurance measure arrangements in place, if you look at school consultations across Scotland and other authorities you will find they tend to remove the personal details if they do a questionnaire. But there are some school consultations far greater than this one and they have not included a questionnaire. This reflects how the Department has conducted this consultation as it has been opened up to the public. The Department feels it is an

appropriate questionnaire and have responded to the responses the public have made through the questionnaires.

Councillor Williamson went on to say it is not just school consultations he was referring to but all Council consultations are the same. There is no identification within the questionnaire and there could be a perception that everything is not a 100%, but he is not saying that there is.

Chris Webb thanked Councillor Williamson for his point.

Chris Webb asked Iain McFarlane and Neil McFarlane to respond to the questions asked by Councillor Williamson in relation to planning and transport issues. He thought that the intersection of the A1, the location and safe route school issues could be answered by Iain MacFarlane and Neil McFarlane and they could talk briefly about the principles that apply.

Iain MacFarlane said clearly there are some constraints on the site in terms of the railway line. There is currently an ongoing process and dialogue within the Council with Planning and Transportation and others in terms of a Master Plan approach towards the site. There are 2 key factors, where exactly within the site will the school be located from the perspective of neighbourhood compliant approach and from a transportation and planning approach and then, fundamentally linked with that is how we maximise the different parts of the plan and what would link the catchment. This is in the early stages and discussions have taken place with Council officers, Transportation and the respective developers so there is a significant piece of work on going. Further discussions will take place before we arrive at the fundamental principles for the Master Plan which underpins movement around the site including transport and safe routes to schools which is a critical part of the process. We are looking at the land use as it is allocated for mixed use purposes. There will be some business land, housing, residential and there will also be some community facilities within the site. What is absolutely critical to the Master Plan process is that the focus is very much on movement within the site, but also linkages to Musselburgh town centre. It is important to try and get people to use modes of transport other than the car and these issues will be addressed through the local plan process.

He went on to say the question asked is correct there are some movement issues around the site but one of the absolute fundamentals of the Master Plan process is to look at every opportunity there is to maximise how people can move around the site and that will be very much about creating a neighbourhood where people, as you know from the history of the local plan process, the site was an amendment to the plan. What is crucial about this is that the site has a substantial number of homes so you can create a neighbourhood which has its own sense of a neighbourhood but is also linked to Musselburgh. The location of the school will be a huge part in that. School and community facilities will be linked to the school as well and one of the first areas the Council will look at is the movement pattern tied in with where precisely the school will be located.

Neil McFarlane advised that the role of Transport Planning in this process is to ensure there is sustainable travel to minimise car use and encourage people to walk and cycle. The location of the school is crucial to minimising the distances people will have to walk and cycle to the school and shops and Transportation will contribute to the plan.

Chris Webb advised that he thought there was going to be a User Reference Group which would look at hypothetical situations. The Group would look at the area in which the school is going to be placed and he thought the Council would do this with the community rather than to the community. The Group would look at addressing the sort of issues being raised at this meeting in relation to sustainability and the diversity of the building of a community in that area. Fiona Robertson advised there would be a User Reference Group.

Alison Elgin, Depute Head Teacher, Campie Primary School said she is working hard to build, as part of a community group, a community. In her mind it feels like you are building a town within a town. Musselburgh people are proud of their heritage and what we would want to make sure is that our community is still a community. Musselburgh is a historical community and a place where people are very passionate about. She understands it is a creation within a neighbourhood, but we need to be very careful in that we already are a neighbourhood and a community. She said it is important work is done to ensure this is maintained. She went on to say there is a need to be very mindful that we are a neighbourhood and proud of our community and not become a segregate community.

Fiona Robertson went on to say some families will be aware of the hosting arrangements but the fact they are starting off as part of a community within Stoneyhill will actually help develop those links across communities. This is part of the 3 year phasing and it will help to develop links not separate them out. The hosting arrangements will depend on the numbers, stages and ages of the children. It is important they integrate well with the children from Stoneyhill and across the Musselburgh Cluster. They will be starting out within their community in a sense and this will help to develop those links across the community.

Alison Elgin went on to say she is not just thinking about the children but people coming into the community who we already know, from experience, from the amount of people moving into the area will dilute the heritage and community of Musselburgh. Musselburgh people need to do more to inform them of what Musselburgh is about. She went on to say she was more concerned about making sure if we are creating a location of a new neighbourhood, as we don't know the people buying these houses in these places. We need to do all we can to welcome them and encourage them to support the traditions of the town. She felt the children are actually the least of our worries as we already, in Musselburgh, try very hard to engage children in our local history. It is the people coming in who know nothing about Musselburgh and also do not visit the town centre. We do not want them to be segregated.

Fiona Robertson then said this is when you involve beyond the school and you involve the community because you are not just building a school you are building a new community that is part of the wider community. When we talk about our primary schools we talk about the wider community and the wider learning community. She accepted the point that it is not just about the children but it gives a good focus for getting that community engagement.

Jill Robertson, Parent Council member Stoneyhill Primary School, asked in terms of the hosting arrangement at Stoneyhill Primary School, how will that look, will there be separate classes or integrated within the classes, for example if the child is in primary 1 will they be in the existing primary 1 class?

Fiona Robertson advised it can be a mix of both and there will be a need to look at the stages and ages of the children coming from the development and it will be about establishing an actual class in

a sense, but because of numbers. Basically you would look at the numbers, if you had a group of P1, P2 and P3 and one P7 it would make sense to integrate the P7 into P7. It will depend on the numbers coming through and that is why there is a need to have a transitional leadership team early in order that we work with the school and look at the arrangements needed in terms of staffing. They will have their identity as part of the Musselburgh cluster and we are really encouraging a badge that will be part of the whole cluster which will identify the children as Craighall Primary School children. We will look again at the stages and ages of the children and if you have one P7 pupil you will look at the appropriate way to deliver that education.

Jill Robertson then said historically over the last few years at Stoneyhill Primary School there have been a number of inter catchment applications which have been accepted because the roll is falling but it doesn't make sense for these children to be fully integrated.

Fiona Robertson replied that all of the work you would undertake with the parents would be at the earliest stage possible. We would look very carefully if there was, for example, one P7 and you would take a sensible approach. With hosting you will never know the ages and stages of the children that will come in. We have to make our decisions based on that as we move forward. We would need to be flexible and would work with the Head Teacher who will be the temporarily shared Head Teacher for both Stoneyhill Primary School and Craighall Primary School. The Head Teacher, along with staff, will be involved in that whole dialogue. Parents would hope that a sensible approach/decision is taken in relation to integrating the children.

Chris Webb added from an external perspective any discussions he has had with the Chief Executive and Fiona Robertson and other officials within the Council is that East Lothian Council is committed to putting the child at the centre of what it does and as soon as you put the child at the centre of anything the solution you come up with will not be the one that is pre planned. It will be one which is responsive to the needs of those individual children and the solution will be the one that is child centred and child focused.

Councillor Williamson asked if there would be flexibility? For example if a child in P6 or P7 goes to Stoneyhill Primary School and parents want them to stay at Stoneyhill Primary School and move on to Musselburgh Grammar School from there. Would that be an option?

Fiona Robertson responded by saying if it was a P7 pupil then they would move on with that group to Musselburgh Grammar School. We will have to look at the stages because ultimately we need to have a viable roll at the new school, as we do need the children to transition back to the new build. We will be looking at the numbers but the plan will be that they would be going to the new school and anyone moving into the catchment area knows that at first they may be hosted but will be moving into the new school. We do need a viable roll at the new school.

Pauline Smith said in terms of Stoneyhill Primary School the roll has fallen in recent years and birth rates are now fairly stable. The projected Craighall roll in the early years of the build is looking at single figures in the first few years and then grows from there.

Chris Webb drew the meeting to a close and thanked everyone who attended the meeting.

Appendix 2:

This is a summary of each category of respondent, in relation to the extent to which they agree/disagree for each question asked. Please Note: A respondent can identify as more than one category - therefore the totals in the tables below do not add up to the total number of responses received via questionnaire (25)

Q1 - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to establish a new primary school at Craighall?

Table 1

All responses:	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
	8	14	1		2	25		88.0%	8.0%

Table 2

Parent of Pupil at:	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
TOTAL	7	13			1	21		95.2%	4.8%
Campie Primary	1	8				9		100.0%	0.0%
Stoneyhill Primary	5	4				9		100.0%	0.0%
Other School	2	1			1	4		75.0%	25.0%

Table 3

Parent of Future Pupil at:	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
TOTAL	1	3	1		1	6		66.7%	16.7%
Campie Primary		3				3		100.0%	0.0%
Stoneyhill Primary			1		1	2		0.0%	50.0%
Other School	1					1		100.0%	0.0%

Table 4

Member of Staff at:	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
TOTAL	1	1				2		100.0%	0.0%
Campie Primary									
Stoneyhill Primary									
Other School	1	1				2		100.0%	0.0%

Table 5

"Other" Category	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
All "Other" Categories	1	3			1	5		80.0%	20.0%

Table 6

Parent of Pupil Aged:	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
TOTAL	7	14	1		2	24		83.3%	8.3%
Not yet in Education	1	2			1	4		75.0%	25.0%
Pre-school Education (3-5 year old)		7	1			8		87.5%	0.0%
P1 - P3	4	8				12		100.0%	0.0%
P4 - P7	3	5				8		100.0%	0.0%
S1 - S6	1	1				2		100.0%	0.0%
No longer in school Education		1			1	2		50.0%	50.0%

Table 7.../

Table 7

Catchment	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
TOTAL	8	14	1		2	25		88.0%	8.0%
Campie Primary	4	7			1	12		91.7%	8.3%
Stoneyhill Primary	4	5	1		1	11		81.8%	9.1%
Other School		2				2		100.0%	0.0%

Q2 - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to create a new catchment at Craighall and remove this land from the current Campie Primary School catchment?

Table 1

All responses:	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
	5	13	2		5	25		72.0%	20.0%

Table 2

Parent of Pupil at:	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
TOTAL	5	12		1	3	21		81.0%	19.1%
Campie Primary	1	4		1	3	9		55.6%	44.4%
Stoneyhill Primary	4	5				9		100.0%	0.0%
Other School	1	3				4		100.0%	0.0%

Table 3

Parent of Future Pupil at:	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
TOTAL		2		2	2	6		33.3%	66.7%
Campie Primary				1	2	3		0.0%	100.0%

Parent of Future Pupil at:	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
Stoneyhill Primary		1		1		2		50.0%	50.0%
Other School		1				1		100.0%	

Table 4

Member of Staff at:	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
TOTAL		2				2		100.0%	0.0%
Campie Primary									
Stoneyhill Primary									
Other School		2				2		100.0%	0.0%

Table 5

"Other" Category	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
All "Other" Categories		2		1	2			40.0%	60.0%

Table 6

Parent of Pupil Aged:	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
TOTAL	5	13		2	4	24		75.0%	25.0%
Not yet in Education		2			2	4		50.0%	50.0%
Pre-school Education (3-5 year old)		3		2	3	8		37.5%	62.5%
P1 - P3	3	6		1	2	12		75.0%	25.0%
P4 - P7	2	6				8		100.0%	0.0%
S1 - S6	1	1				2		100.0%	0.0%
No longer in school Education		1			1	2		50.0%	50.0%

Table 7.../

Table 7

Catchment	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
TOTAL	5	13		2	5	25		72.0%	28.0%
Campie Primary	3	4		1	4	12		58.3%	41.7%
Stoneyhill Primary	2	7		1	1	11		81.8%	18.2%
Other School		2				2		100.0%	0.0%

Q3 - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to initially establish a new Craighall primary school at Stoneyhill Primary School (via a “hosting” arrangement), until the new primary school is complete?

Table 1

All responses:	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
		5	2	8	10	25		20.0%	72.0%

Table 2

Parent of Pupil at:	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
TOTAL		4	2	7	9	22		18.2%	72.7%
Campie Primary		3	2	2	2	9		33.3%	44.4%
Stoneyhill Primary		1		3	5	9		11.1%	88.9%
Other School				2	2	4		0.0%	100.0%

Table 3.../

Table 3

Parent of Future Pupil at:	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
TOTAL			1	3	2	6		0.0%	83.3%
Campie Primary			1	1	1	3		0.0%	66.7%
Stoneyhill Primary				1	1	2		0.0%	100.0%
Other School				1		1		0.0%	100.0%

Table 4

Member of Staff at:	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
TOTAL				1	1	2		0.0%	100.0%
Campie Primary									
Stoneyhill Primary									
Other School				1	1	2		0.0%	100.0%

Table 5

"Other" Category	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
All "Other" Categories		1	2	1	1	5		20.0%	40.0%

Table 6.../

Table 6

Parent of Pupil Aged:	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
TOTAL		5	2	7	10	24		20.8%	70.8%
Not yet in Education				2	2	4		0.0%	100.0%
Pre-school Education (3-5 year old)			1	3	4	8		0.0%	87.5%
P1 - P3		1	2	5	4	12		8.3%	75.0%
P4 - P7		3	1	2	2	8		37.5%	50.0%
S1 - S6					2	2		0.0%	100.0%
No longer in school Education		1			1	2		50.0%	50.0%

Table 7

Catchment	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE	% STRONGLY DISAGREE/DISAGREE
TOTAL		5	2	8	10	25		20.0%	72.0%
Campie Primary		3	2	3	4	12		25.0%	58.3%
Stoneyhill Primary		1		4	6	11		9.1%	90.9%
Other School		1		1		2		50.0%	50.0%

Appendix 3 Comments from Questionnaire responses

Of the 25 questionnaire responses, 7 declined permission to publish their comments. However, their representations have been taken account of and responded to in this Consultation Report. The summary of comments below, were made from the remaining 18 responses who gave permission to share their comments.

COMMENT
I understand the need for housing and a new school. However it concerns me deeply that after nearly 2 years of settling our son into nursery and developing his social skills, he may be now ripped from this learning environment. Can there please be an option for those children (and younger siblings) whom are already in the Campie system to remain there to ensure academic and social stability.
Children in nursery at present who are currently residing within the new build catchment area will have to be moved schools and I think this is out of order. It is difficult at such a young age to go through such drastic change. Although a new school may be needed- it should be up to the parents what school their children attend.
I have 3 children. Should these changes come in they could end up at different schools. My childcare arrangement and therefore my ability to work rely on them all being at the same school. I presume that we would be guaranteed placing requests should this happen.
Stoneyhill primary is already getting very full so much so there are a lot of composite classes at the moment and they already seem to struggle with the growing demand for space so using there as a temporary school in my opinion wouldn't work very well at all
Strongly disagree with the building of housing in the field next to the train & under the A1. This will effectively join Musselburgh & oldcraighall into one town. There needs to be some space between towns otherwise Musselburgh will just become an Extension of Edinburgh. We are a young family who live in monktonhall place and enjoy living out of the city with some countryside to explore this will be totally removed from us & our neighbours. It will effect our lifestyle. I appreciate that more houses are needed but surely just joining towns together isn't the answer.
My children current attend Campie primary school and as such will be unaffected by these school proposals. They will however be affected by the extra houses and traffic that such a large housing development will bring. We live right at the edge of Musselburgh in Monktonhall Place and currently enjoy having the field over the railway to walk through, explore nature and enjoy the open space. I fear that Musselburgh will be swallowed up by housing and there will be no separation of it from Edinburgh. It saddens me to lose so much of our open green space. I think Musselburgh/Wallyford has taken its fair share of new houses and more building should be done elsewhere in East Lothian.
Musselburgh is already at capacity. It is absolutely ridiculous to allocate this land for housing. Musselburgh is a car park, has bad air quality and this development is losing even more green space. Trying to get on to the bypass from the this side of Musselburgh is already a nightmare but I bet there's no councillors who live here and know this. Where do you think an extra 3,000 cars (2 cars per household) are going to go?! I've totally lost faith in this council. I love my home town of Musselburgh where I grew up and where I want to raise my family however my children won't enjoy clean air, green space or smaller classroom sizes. Shame on you East Lothian council.

COMMENT

Unsure how the hosting arrangement will work for stoneyhill with many composite classes wouldn't want to see this worsen or unsettle stoneyhill existing pupils further. Could hosting not be done at campie?

I think it would be of value to consider the catchment areas of all schools at this point. Sending children from the west end of New Street to the Burgh makes no sense in terms of community, child safety or geography. Similarly the catchment created around Stoneyhill is no longer fit for purpose. Given the impact of all these new houses the school must be at the heart of the geographic community and this is the perfect opportunity to redress the current problems.

There is very little information in the proposal to how the hosting agreement will be done. All you have indicated is that it will be for 36 months and that pupils will still be able to access the playground and dining hall. This is either deliberate or the result of lack of planning I want to know exactly how Stoneyhill primary will be affected and to what level. Why if you are suggesting small numbers of children are they being annexed rather than just being part of Stoneyhill. Reading between the lines is the suggestion to move kids from campie to Stoneyhill as soon as the catchment is area is decided. Regards

The proposal is that the current head at Stoneyhill would also be head of "hosted pupils and staff". There is an issue with staff retention at Stoneyhill Primary at the current time and I would be concerned that the issues this has already caused for current pupils would then be magnified should the school be expanded.

There is little space within the school for this hosting and I fail to see how this can have anything but a negative impact on the children currently within the school and the children that will be "hosted".

Currently Stoneyhill primary has a small catchment area yet parents still drive their children to the school. This causes traffic problems for residents in the 2 streets were the 2 school entrances are. (Clayknowes Way and Clayknowes Avenue)
Residents drives are regularly blocked by cars and when asked to move residents are given verbal abuse. In Clayknowes Way the parents also regularly park in the private parking bays that the street residents pay to repair/upkeep.
It is also dangerous for children who walk to school as cars speed into the street, ignoring speed bumps and also the area immediately in front of the school.

This has been reported to police and the council yet nothing has been done to alleviate the traffic/parking issue. Should Stoneyhill primary become a 'host school' for Craighall area, the traffic/parking will get worse. The council should designate Clayknowes Way and clayknowes avenue residents parking only, if they decide to go ahead with the 'host' school arrangement to try and alleviate the parking issue. (Infact this should be done regardless)

as long as the proposed intake doesn't disrupt the school too much and still allows for non catchment placing

It makes sense to host the children at the nearest existing primary school until the new school is completed. They will know that they will eventually be going to the new school which will hopefully remove any anxiety about moving. The proposed catchment area is "detached" to some extent from

COMMENT

Musselburgh and I hope that every effort will be made to ensure as much connectivity between the Craighall area and the rest of the town as possible. The existing road/footpath system does not make access to the town centre/rest of Musselburgh very easy. There is a danger that the Craighall houses could be a little enclave which has no connection to Musselburgh but looks more to Edinburgh - good planning should be able to address this. In future years there may be a requirement for the catchment area to be redrawn again to include the Old Craighall houses as the new school will be in much closer proximity to these houses than Campie is - especially as walking/cycling to school is something to be encouraged.

I think the children should be fully integrated with the children already attending Stoneyhill until the new school is ready, otherwise I fear there could be an 'us and them' situation. I also have concerns over where a nursery class/nursery children could be accommodated as numbers in nursery are already near capacity.

Appendix 4 – Written response from group

Group representation from Stoneyhill Primary School Parent Council

EAST LOTHIAN COUNCIL: LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH CRAIGHALL PRIMARY SCHOOL

CONSULTATION RESPONSE FROM STONEYHILL PRIMARY SCHOOL PARENT COUNCIL

This response has been prepared in consultation with members of the Stoneyhill Primary School Parent Council.

In order to ensure this response is as informed as possible, representatives of Stoneyhill Primary School Parent Council attended the public meetings on 21 November and 6 December; engaged in the Parent Council Cluster meeting on 21 November, and have sought advice from local councillors.

Overall, Stoneyhill Primary School Parent Council is in favour of the proposal to establish a primary school within the Craighall area, and to realign catchment areas accordingly.

Should this proposal be approved by the Council, the impact on Stoneyhill Primary School centres around the proposed "hosting arrangement". In that regard, we would like to make the following points:

- We are keen to support any school, especially those in our cluster, and acknowledge that Stoneyhill PS has capacity
- We are supportive of the hosting arrangement proposal, with the caveat that it must not impact negatively on Stoneyhill PS pupils or staff in any way. We have been encouraged by Council assurances that this will not be the case.
- We are supportive of the hosting arrangement on the basis of Council assurances that the arrangement would necessitate approximately one full class of Craighall PS pupils over a maximum of three years.
- We accept that Craighall pupils may be travelling to Stoneyhill PS by car and are concerned about the potential this has to worsen the existing traffic management issue around the school area. We recently submitted a list of suggested traffic calming measures to the Council, on behalf of the Parent Forum (attached at Annex A), and would like to work with East Lothian Council transport department in discussing implementation of these in advance of the hosting arrangement. We

consider that this would be part of the Safe Routes to School planning for Craighall PS pupils, as well as a solution to existing issues around Stoneyhill PS.

- We are concerned about the potential impact on availability of nursery places in Stoneyhill PS Nursery Class for children who live within the local area. Of course, nurseries do not have catchments but we would not like to see nursery aged children being denied a place at their first choice nursery due to an increase in the pool of children likely to request a place at Stoneyhill.
- As a knock-on effect of children potentially attending eg Campie or Burgh nursery if they didn't get in to Stoneyhill, we feel there would be potential for those children, having formed relationships and familiarity at those schools, to want to stay at those schools for their primary school years, instead of attending Stoneyhill. We are concerned that this could further diminish the projected decline in Stoneyhill's school roll.
- We are similarly concerned about the potential impact on availability of school places for children who may wish to make an out-of-catchment placing request i.e. children who may request, and otherwise be offered, a place at Stoneyhill, may not be successful because of the temporary placing of Craighall children.
- We see the opportunity and benefits of working with a new Craighall PS Parent Council and would be keen to make and maintain links.
- We are grateful to the Council for providing a Parent Council Cluster meeting. Details of the hosting arrangement in the consultation document were sparse, and led many parents to believe that the arrangement would be detrimental to Stoneyhill. The meetings were extremely useful in confirming the facts and allaying concerns.

We are grateful for this opportunity to express our views on behalf of the Stoneyhill parent forum, and would be pleased to engage further in the process.

Lesley Coyle, Chair; Jill Robertson, Vice-Chair

December 2016

Appendix 5 – Pupil Voice Interviews

The Pupil Voice Interviews were a structured workshop session with a representative group of pupils from the school. The following are summaries of the discussions and questions/answers.

PUPIL VOICE

CAMPIE PRIMARY SCHOOL P1 –P7 PUPIL REPRESENTATIVES

21st November 2016

David Scott and Katy Johnstone met with a group of pupils. David Scott described the proposal and then there was a group discussion around the following questions, the responses are listed below.

What do you think of the idea of building a new school?

Brilliant – more space and people get to go to a new school and get new friends

Good because the teachers will get less hassle from too many people

Good because it gives children a chance to learn

Means more people can have a happy life

Better to have a school where people live rather than making them walk far

What worries you about it?

Dangers to the natural environment, could destroy the homes of plants and animals

Where should the school be?

The school should be in the middle of the proposed area

How could you welcome new children?

Say hello and ask them their name, give a speech for them and tell them to enjoy their stay

Look after them if they are shy.

PUPIL VOICE

STONEYHILL PRIMARY SCHOOL P1 –P7 PUPIL REPRESENTATIVES

21st November 2016

David Scott and Katy Johnstone met with a group of pupils. David Scott described the proposal and then there was a group discussion around the following questions, the responses are listed below.

What do you think about the building of a new school?

Good idea, no kid should go without education but on the wall, how is it going to turn out with one class of children from that school with all the other classes having to be taught in a different way

Good idea to build a new school but what happens if people decide they want to go to Stoneyhill instead?

I don't understand why there needs to be a new school or why they need new houses

Where will the resources come from, textbooks, chairs, desks etc?

The head teacher can't be going back and forward, if a school needs a head teacher then she should be at that school

Put banners outside to welcome the new children

The group of pupils at Stoneyhill were members of the Pupil Council, they returned to their classes to discuss the hosting proposal further. The feedback is listed below. Moving forward this information will inform the proposal to host.

Pupils comments have varied and changed over the period.

Lots of practical questions and concerns about:

- being able to access rooms,
- when their lunchtime would be,
- would they be able to sit with the other school
- where would they line up
- where they would be allowed to play

- concerns about them being in different uniforms and causing rivalries and fights
- Many would rather they were part of Stoneyhill and could move school if they wanted to when the new school opened.
- Accessing specialists and how it would affect them
- What if within the 22 there was only 1 or 2 children, they felt strongly they would feel separated and wanted them in the same class
- What would happen with camp? Again back to if only a few P7's how would that effect camp
- If we lose 1 or 2 rooms that would affect our Friday mornings where whole school clubs are organised and it utilises all the rooms, especially GP space
- Split decision about having/ NOT having same uniforms

Appendix 6: Education Scotland Report

Report by Education Scotland addressing educational aspects of the proposal by East Lothian Council to establish a new primary school and its associated catchment area within the land at Craighall, Musselburgh

1. Introduction

This report from Education Scotland has been prepared by HM Inspectors in accordance with the terms of the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010* and the amendments contained in the *Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014*. The purpose of the report is to provide an independent and impartial consideration of East Lothian Council's proposal to establish a new primary school and its associated catchment area within the land at Craighall, Musselburgh. Section 2 of the report sets out brief details of the consultation process. Section 3 of the report sets out HM Inspectors' consideration of the educational aspects of the proposal, including significant views expressed by consultees. Section 4 summarises HM Inspectors' overall view of the proposal. Upon receipt of this report, the Act requires the council to consider it and then prepare its final consultation report. The council's final consultation report should include a copy of this report and must contain an explanation of how, in finalising the proposal, it has reviewed the initial proposal, including a summary of points raised during the consultation process and the council's response to them. The council has to publish its final consultation report three weeks before it takes its final decision. Where a council is proposing to close a school, it needs to follow all legislative obligations set out in the 2010 Act, including notifying Ministers within six working days of making its final decision and explaining to consultees the opportunity they have to make representations to Ministers.

1.1 HM Inspectors considered:

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

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

- consideration of all relevant documentation provided by the council in relation to the proposal, specifically the educational benefits statement and related consultation documents, written and oral submissions from parents and others; and
- visits to the site of the proposed new school, Campie Primary School and Stoneyhill Primary School, including discussion with relevant consultees.

2. Consultation Process

2.1 East Lothian Council undertook the consultation on its proposal(s) with reference to the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010* and the amendments in the *Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014*.

2.2 The consultation process ran from 8 November to 20 December 2016. During this period the council held a public meeting at Brunton Hall which was attended by three parents or other members of the public. Statutory consultees, including Parent Councils of the schools directly involved and Musselburgh Community Council, were informed of the consultation in writing. Consultation documentation was published on the East Lothian Council website and copies were available for public consultation at several venues during the consultation period, including the schools concerned. A proforma questionnaire and an email address were made available for responses. The council received twenty-five responses. Of the responses which provided an overall view about the council's proposal, almost all expressed support. Stakeholders who met with HM Inspectors felt that the council had provided good opportunities for being consulted and for giving their views.

3. Educational Aspects of Proposal

3.1 This proposal involves a change to the existing catchment of Campie Primary School. A new primary school catchment area will be established for the Craighall area currently in the Campie Primary School catchment area. This school has still to be built but will serve planned housing developments in the Craighall area of the town of Musselburgh. The affected area of land currently contains a small number of residential properties. The new primary school will be established initially at Stoneyhill Primary School through a 'hosting' arrangement for up to thirty-six months until the new Craighall primary school building is complete. Upon completion, the new primary school will relocate to its permanent site.

3.2 The planned new Craighall primary school will accommodate the projected school roll arising from the proposal. It has the potential to provide children who will attend the new school with a purpose-built learning environment well-suited to their learning needs. East Lothian Council has successfully developed new schools in a number of its communities. At the same time, the proposal will reduce the possibility of overcrowding at both Campie Primary School and Stoneyhill Primary School as a result of the new housing development. The proposal, therefore, offers clear educational benefits to children in each of the three schools.

3.3 Almost all parents, pupils and staff who met with HM Inspectors support the proposal. There is a clear understanding that the rolls of both Campie and Stoneyhill Primary

Schools would outstrip capacity in coming years as a result of the significant housing developments in the area. However, given that the new housing development has not yet commenced, there were many areas relating to the practicalities of hosting the new Craighall primary pupils within Stoneyhill Primary School that were unclear at this time.

3.4 In taking forward its proposal, the council should continue to work with stakeholders and the Headteachers of the Musselburgh Grammar School cluster. The council should ensure that interim transition arrangements apply to both children living in the new Craighall housing development who will be initially 'hosted' at Stoneyhill Primary School and children who attend Stoneyhill Primary School. During the interim 'hosting' period the council should provide both groups of children with a high quality education. These transition arrangements relate to class arrangements and use of existing classroom space as the first groups of children from the new Craighall catchment begin to attend Stoneyhill Primary School. Parents, children and staff also wished to continue to be consulted about staffing, safe routes to school, enrolment in the Stoneyhill Primary School nursery and access to popular and well attended after school and school holiday programmes. These issues should be clearly addressed. The council should ensure that all transition arrangements are well planned and clearly communicated to all stakeholders to meet the needs of the children who attend Stoneyhill Primary School, Campie Primary School and the new Craighall school.

4. Summary

East Lothian Council's proposal to establish a new catchment area for the planned Craighall primary school has clear educational benefits. The proposal has the potential to provide children who will reside in the Craighall housing development with modern, purpose-built accommodation designed to meet the needs of its learners. The new school will provide a range of leisure and learning facilities which will potentially benefit the wider community. In the medium term, the proposal will also reduce the possibility of overcrowding at both Stoneyhill and Campie Primary Schools. Almost all stakeholders who met with HM Inspectors support the proposal. In taking its proposal forward, the council should continue to engage with stakeholders over its planned transition arrangements for children who will attend the new school and those children who attend Stoneyhill Primary School.

**HM Inspectors
Education Scotland
January 2017**