

BARNSELY METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

This matter is a Key Decision within the Council's definition and has been included in the relevant Forward Plan

Report of the Executive Director (People)
to Cabinet

29th November 2017

Penistone Grammar School Enlargement: Outcome Of Statutory Consultation

1.0 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To consider the outcome of consultation on the proposal to enlarge Penistone Grammar School from September 2018 and agree the proposal subject to the granting of planning permission under Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (a) by 31 August 2018.

2.0 Recommendation

- 2.1 **That Cabinet approve the proposal for the enlargement of Penistone Grammar School from 1400 to 1650 places with effect from September 2018. This approval is subject to the granting of planning permission under Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990(a) by 31 August 2018.**

3.0 Introduction

3.1 Context

- 3.2 On 6th September 2017, a report was submitted to Cabinet which identified a significant shortage in secondary school places in the west of the Borough from 2018 onwards.

- 3.3 Secondary school places are organised across four planning areas which reflect attendance patterns across the borough (as at Appendix 1). The analysis of projected number on roll across these four areas indicates that the greatest pressure will be felt in the Penistone and Central areas.

- 3.4 On 6th September Cabinet agreed to

- i) publish a Statutory Notice to enlarge Penistone Grammar School by 250 places with effect from September 2018 and
- ii) fund the estimated £2.011M capital cost of the extension.

- 3.5 A four week period of consultation then followed when all interested parties were consulted about the proposal to enlarge the school. The consultation focused on the proposal to increase the schools capacity by 250 which will allow for an additional 50 Year 7 places each year from 2018 to 2023. This relates to the capacity for Years 7 to 11 and does not include the sixth form provision.

A list of consultees is attached at Appendix 2 and a summary of the responses to the consultation is attached at Appendix 3.

4.0 Proposal and Justification

4.1 It proposed that to meet the demand for additional school places in the west of the borough that a 250 place extension is built at Penistone Grammar School. Statutory consultation has been undertaken and the list of consultees and response can be found at Appendix 2 and 3 respectively.

4.2 The justification for the proposal is:

- 250 new school places are created to meet the shortage of school places in the area of need i.e. west of the borough
- The statutory duty to provide sufficient school places will be met
- The positive outcome of the statutory consultation
- Penistone Grammar was rated as good in all categories of inspection by Ofsted in October 2013 and again through a short inspection in October 2017. As such the school meets the Council's priority as set out in the Corporate Plan for 2017 – 2020 People Achieving Their Potential which is:

“Every child attends a good school and is successful in learning and work.”

4.3 Determination

The following is an extract from Schedule 3 of The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013

“*Consideration and determination by the local authority or adjudicator*

5-(1) In determining proposals the local authority may-

- (a) reject the proposals;*
- (b) approve the proposals without modifications ; or*
- (c) approve the proposals with such modifications as the local authority think desirable, having consulted the governing body.*

(2) Where proposals are approved by the local authority (with or without modifications), the approval may be conditional on the occurrence of an event prescribed within the Regulations (See Appendix 4 for conditions)

(3) Any determination under paragraph (1) must be made within the period of two months of the end of the representation period.

(4) where the local authority does not make a determination within the period prescribed by sub-paragraph (3) the proposals must be referred to the adjudicator.”

The increase in the net capacity of the school will be managed through internal remodelling to allow an increase of 50 pupils in September 2018 followed by an extension to the existing school building for a further 200 pupil in September 2019. Therefore in determining the proposals it is recommended that the local authority

approve the proposals subject to the grant of planning permission under Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990(a) relating to this extension. This condition to be met by 31 August 2018

4.4 Provision for notification of decisions

9- (1) *Within one week of making the determination, the local authority must publish their decision and the reasons for it on the website where the original proposal was published*

(2) *Within one week of making the determination, the local authority must notify the following persons of their decision together with their reasons:*

- (a) *the adjudicator;*
- (b) *the governing body;*
- (c) *the trustees of the school (if any);*
- (d) *the Diocesan Board of Education for any diocese of the Church of England any part of which is comprised in the area of the local authority;*
- (e) *the bishop of any diocese of the Roman Catholic Church any part of which is comprised in the area of the local authority;*
- (f) *where the school is a special school, the parent of every registered pupil at the school; and*
- (g) *any other body or person that the local authority think appropriate”*

4.5 The local authority will notify all interested parties within one week of the decision made by Cabinet.

5.0 Consideration of Alternative Approaches

5.1 Open a new school in the west of the borough

The shortage of places in the west of the borough is not sufficient to justify the build of a new school and is therefore not a viable option.

5.2 Allocate secondary school places to schools in other parts of the borough.

It may be possible to allocate places to other schools in the borough; however this would mean pupils travelling long distances and the authority having to subsidise transport costs. This approach would also compound the issue of a rise in demand for places in the central area of the borough and it would be difficult to accommodate all pupils.

The current cost to the authority of transporting pupils to a school more than three miles away from the pupil's main place of residence is around £150 per annum. Therefore, if all 250 pupils were transferred from the Penistone area to another school in the borough (all of which are more than three miles away from the centre of Penistone) the cost per annum would be approximately £37,500. It is also worth noting that this cost is subsidised by the South Yorkshire Public Transport Executive (SYLTE) and if the authority increases the number of pupils travelling using this concession support for this would have to be agreed by the SYLTE board. It may also be necessary to provide additional buses to transport these children as existing transport arrangements may not be able to cope with this increase. Any cost

pressures as a result of this would likely need to be met from the transport levy, therefore increasing the Council's contributions towards SYPTE.

In addition, there is the potential effect it may have on pupils by isolating them from their immediate community due to not attending a local school.

Given the above this option is not viable.

6.0 Implications for Local People and Service Users

- 6.1 Local people and service users were consulted as part of the statutory consultation process. The response was mainly positive in that the proposal will ensure that the demand for additional school places in the West of the Borough will be met locally

7.0 Financial Implications

- 7.1 Consultations have taken place with representatives of the Service Director – Finance (S151 Officer).

The Cabinet report (6th September 2017) outlined the financial implications and sought approval for the funding of the anticipated capital cost of a 250 place extension of Penistone Grammar school.

7.2 Capital scheme costs

The initial estimated cost of the scheme based on a feasibility study was £2.011M. However detailed liaison with Penistone Advanced Learning Centre to ensure that the work meets educational curriculum requirements means that we need to re-examine the detail of this scheme and hence its cost. As such a separate report detailing the final proposed works and cost will be submitted to cabinet for approval. It is still intended that this scheme will be funded by the Council through a mix of capital programme (new start) funding and Building Schools for the Future (BSF) capital reserves. These reserves have been derived as a result of variations to the scope of works to the original BSF programme, reducing the original capital build costs.

7.3 Annual revenue costs

On completion of the extension there will be an increase in operating costs associated with Facilities Management and Lifecycle which will be reflected in the annual unitary charge paid to the PFI contractor. Such costs will be passed directly to the school and met from its core delegated budget. These costs cannot be quantified until the design stage / specification has been completed.

In addition, to the above operating costs, there is likely to be an increase in the contribution / payment currently made by the school towards the BSF programme - this would be met from the school's delegated budget. Under the current arrangement, all secondary schools make a contribution based on actual pupil numbers towards meeting the BSF affordability gap (currently £3.9m and equates to £385 per pupil). The amount per pupil will reduce annually as total pupil number rises

– based on pupil number projections it is estimated that the amount per pupil would be £311 by 2023/24. Therefore a 250 increase in PGS pupil numbers by this date would result in addition BSF contribution payment of £77,600 per annum.

Concerns have been expressed by the School (in response to the consultation) regarding the impact of the above on the school's sustainability situation and the fairness of the current arrangement. Firstly, the increase in the school's funding for the additional 250 pupil intake would be significant (in excess of £1M) under the new national funding formula and should be enough to cover the above / other associated costs (e.g. extra teachers / learning resources), as well as help address the school's in-year deficit. In respect of fairness, the current methodology or approach was intended to align the level of BSF contribution made by schools to the delegated formula funding received (which is mainly pupil driven). Any change in the methodology that excludes the additional 250 pupil increase will be unfair and inequitable for other schools.

8.0 Employee Implications

8.1 There are no direct employee implications.

9.0 Communications Implications

9.1 All interested parties have been consulted on this proposal. Details of the consultees are included at Appendix 2 and the response to the consultation is included at Appendix 3.

10.0 Consultations

10.1 The authority has fulfilled its statutory duty to consult as set out in the Prescribed Alterations Regulations. The timescale for the statutory process is a period of consultation of at least 4 weeks. Consultation has taken place with Planning, Highways and Transportation on the proposed extension. A Traffic Assessment is being undertaken and this will be included in the Planning Application for the extension to the school building for 2019.

11.0 The Corporate Plan and the Council's Performance Management Framework

11.1 Penistone Grammar was rated as good in all categories of inspection by Ofsted in October 2013 and as such meets the Councils priority as set out in the Corporate Plan for 2017 – 2020 People Achieving Their Potential which is:

Every child attends a good school and is successful in learning and work.

11.2 The provision of additional places at a school rated good also indirectly supports the Thriving and Vibrant Economy 20:20 Outcome 5 of creating more and better housing as potential residents are more likely to move into an area that can accommodate future educational needs of their children. In turn this would increase the opportunity of potential income streams for the Authority from New Homes Bonus, Council Tax and Business Rates.

12.0 Promoting Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

12.1 Extending the existing school will bring the following benefits:

- Children will be accommodated within the locality of their homes thereby encouraging social inclusion. A shortfall in local school places is likely to have a greater impact on those with protected characteristics such as disabled people and people on low incomes.
- The school is a state of art facility which was built around the principle of inclusion.

13.0 Tackling the Impact of Poverty

13.1 There are no direct implications.

14.0 Tackling Health Inequalities

14.1 There are no direct implications.

15.0 Reduction of Crime and Disorder

15.1 There are no implications.

16.0 Risk Management Issues

Risk Detail	Probability and Impact	Score	Mitigation
Failure to complete project within agreed timescales and hence deliver sufficient secondary school places thus breaching statutory requirement.	Probability - low Impact - high	3 (Amber)	There is an agreed procurement route and the extension does not need completing until September 2019.
The initial budgeted cost may not be sufficient to meet the final tendered cost	Probability – medium Impact - high	2 (Red)	Tendered procurement exercise to establish Value for Money.
Cost escalation – Works/Other –There is a risk that the architectural requirements will result in a design that exceeds the project cost. Agreement also has to be reached with the school on the final design Also poor cost control and poor project management could lead to an escalation in cost.	Probability - medium Impact - low	5 (Green)	Responsibility for managing the project within the budget will lie with the BLEP. Authority working with school to ensure an acceptable design within budget is met
Insufficient pupil numbers to utilize extension.	Probability - low Impact - high	3 (Amber)	The forecast for additional school places shows a clear demand for school places in the west of the borough. The good Ofsted rating and good school reputation also means that pupils from other parts of the borough are likely to continue to apply to Penistone Grammar School.

Risk Detail	Probability and Impact	Score	Mitigation
Change in Ofsted rating of Penistone Grammar School which means that an extension is built at an under- performing school.	Probability - low Impact - high	3 (Amber)	Recent positive Ofsted inspection with good results.

17.0 Health, Safety and Emergency Resilience Issues

17.1 The project will be managed by the Barnsley Local Education Partnership who will be responsible for complying with Health and Safety Legislation.

18.0 Compatibility with the European Convention on Human Rights

18.1 There are no implications.

19.0 Conservation of Biodiversity

19.1 There are no implications.

20.0 Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

20.1 Not applicable.

21.0 List of Appendices

21.1 Appendix 1 - Year 7 projections 2017 - 2027 as at July 2017 including increased capacity at Penistone

Appendix 2 List of Consultees

Appendix 3 Consultation Response

Appendix 4 Regulatory Conditions

22.0 Details of Background Papers

22.1 The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013

Officer Contact: Nina Sleight

Tel. No: 01226 773692 or e-mail ninasleight@barnsley.gov.uk

Date: 19th October 2017

Financial Implications/
Consultation <i>(to be signed by senior Financial Services Officer where no financial implications</i>

Year 7 projections 2017 - 2027 as at July 2017 including increased capacity at Penistone

Appendix 1

	AN	Jan-17 Census	estimates based on current primary population							Estimates based on birth data			
			2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027
<i>South West Area</i>													
Kirk Balk	270	246	257	250	243	259	241	253	268	260	244	267	231
Netherwood	320	242	245	263	271	256	280	285	293	277	287	298	258
The Dearne High	240	225	241	226	231	227	234	220	233	265	240	252	285
Sub Total	830	713	743	739	745	742	755	758	794	802	771	817	774

North East

Outwood Acad Carlton	220	185	219	173	172	167	181	209	198	188	181	192	190
Holy Trinity	140	138	138	139	142	138	145	146	142	139	143	147	139
Outwood Acad Shafton	300	241	268	236	234	224	257	247	267	255	233	251	238
Sub Total	660	564	625	548	548	529	583	602	607	582	557	590	567

Penistone Area

Penistone Grammar	320	271	293	312	318	340	302	339	350	340	342	293	352
-------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Central Area

Darton College	240	240	245	233	260	227	257	269	248	229	180	214	196
Horizon	400	399	418	439	463	493	522	542	489	469	506	531	512
Barnsley Academy	180	147	157	188	202	192	188	216	207	196	196	152	175
Sub Total	820	786	820	860	925	912	967	1027	944	894	882	897	883

Total NOR Secondary	2630		2481	2459	2536	2523	2607	2726	2695	2618	2552	2597	2576
surplus(+)/deficit(-)			149	171	94	107	23	-96	-65	12	78	54	54
shortage of places in central and Penistone areas			0	40	105	112	129	226	154	94	84	50	95

AN - Admission Number

Cumulative (5 year) figure - 726

NOR - Number on Roll

Cumulative (5 year) figure - 715

List of consultees

Details of the proposal and information on how to submit comments or objections to this proposal were sent to the following groups/organisations:

1. Parents, staff and governors at Penistone Grammar School and the following feeder primary schools:
Cawthorne
Hoylandswaine
Millhouse
Oxspring
Penistone St Johns CE
Silkstone
Silkstone Common
Springvale
Thurgoland CE
Thurlstone
2. Penistone East and Penistone West Councillors
3. Angela Smith, MP for Penistone and Stocksbridge
4. The Diocese of Sheffield
Diocese of Hallam
5. Sheffield Council
6. Unions:
Unison
GMB
NASUWT
NAHT
ATL
7. Regional Schools Commissioner
8. School Organisation - Department of Education
9. South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYLTE)

Summary of responses

	No of consultees	Responses to the proposal	
		Supports	Objects
Parents	3519*	6	1
Governing Body	11**	1	0

*consultation letters were sent to 1588 parents of pupils at Penistone Grammar School and 1931 parents of pupils at the 10 primary schools in the area.

**consultation letters were sent to the governing bodies of Penistone Grammar School and the 10 primary schools in the area.

A statement from South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive has also been received which is included within this Appendix.

Issues raised by parents

		No. of parents raising issue
1	Impact on dining facilities	5
2	Staffing levels/class sizes	4
3	Will allow children in Penistone to attend local school	3
4	Pressure on highways in local area	2
5	Quality of provision and Parent View survey	2
6	Home to school transport	1
7	Budgetary implication	1
8	Building work in school and impact on pupils	1

Responses to issues raised by parents

1. Dining Facilities

The expansion of the school will include an extension to the dining facilities to incorporate an external balcony area which will be closed in with glazing. It is for the school to determine how to manage the service period and whether to introduce staggered lunch hours for pupils

2. Staffing levels/class sizes

This will be determined by the school in light of pupil numbers and the budget allocation.

3. Penistone children able to attend local school

Forecasts of pupil numbers had indicated a significant shortage of school places in the Penistone area. Without the increase of 50 Year 7 places from 2018 onwards, the distance from where children were allocated a place would have decreased meaning that families in certain communities who had previously been able to access a place at Penistone Grammar school would not have been allocated a place.

4. Pressure on highways in local area

A Traffic Assessment is being undertaken and this will be included in the Planning Application for the extension to the school building for 2019.

5. Quality of provision and Parent View survey

One consultee highlighted an Ofsted Parent View survey as a concern in relation to current provision. This survey indicated that a proportion of parents who currently have children attending Penistone Grammar School would not recommend the school to other parents. Ofsted have recently undertaken a short inspection and whilst taking this survey into account have judged the school to be good.

One consultee raised issues relating to the behaviour policy and communication with parents. The school will respond directly with the parent to address this issue under their complaints procedure.

6. Home to School Transport

The authority has a statutory duty for children who live above 3 miles from Penistone Grammar School when this is their closest school. This group of children are eligible for a Zero Fare Pass (ZFP) and families may apply for ZFP's via the council website. Access to school for this group of children is by service buses on the network; these are not dedicated school services and may also have normal fare paying passengers accessing the service. These routes are controlled by South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYLTE).

Whilst there is one route that Home to School Transport carries out, there is no other dedicated school transport for pupils attending Penistone Grammar School.

Barnsley MBC does not have any control over this and parents are advised to consider how their child will get to school prior to applying for places at Penistone Grammar School. Consideration needs to be given that routes are changeable and may not continue throughout a child's time at the School.

7. Budgetary Implications

See section 6.1 Financial Implications in the body of the report.

8. Building work in school and impact on pupils

The authority will work closely with the contractor to ensure that any building work will cause minimum disruption to the staff and pupils in school, particularly during the exam period for all year groups.

Letter from Penistone Grammar School Governing Body received 13 October 2018:

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF PENISTONE GRAMMAR SCHOOL

Thank you for your letter dated 15th September 2017, seeking the views of Governors regarding the proposed extension to Penistone Grammar School.

At a meeting of the Governing Body held on 21st September 2017, I was tasked with making a response on behalf of all governors. This response is set out below.

Governors welcome the proposed extension to the school. It has long been our view that local children should have the opportunity to go to their nearest secondary school so that their formative years are spent within the community they grow up in. We believe the school offers a very good educational setting for the young people in our community and the proposed extension will ensure that this can be accessed by an increasing number of students over the coming years. The Governors applaud the Local Authorities' approach and recognition of the importance of extending the provision to provide access to secondary provision locally.

Whilst the Governors are very supportive of the proposed extension, they would like Cabinet to be aware of three key concerns as follows:

- i) Extending the school without altering the existing funding model could accelerate the financial unsustainability of the school. Delivery of the indicative Fair Funding amounts (or very similar) are critical to beginning to enable the school to become financially stable. Governors have welcomed reassurances offered to date but wish Cabinet to be clear that extending the school only makes sense if current inadequate funding is addressed as a matter of urgency. As the school with the largest projected % gain in funding following the Fair Funding process, it is hoped it is recognised that the school has been grossly underfunded for years and has been significantly disadvantaged at both the national and local level.*
- ii) Whilst the cost of the extension is to be covered by the LA, the nature of the BSF repayment agreement means that Penistone Grammar School will see an annual increase in real terms of around £70k once the extension is full. This is because the school will take a higher proportion of the "excess" students than of its current proportion of total secondary age students within the Borough. Furthermore, a school in the east of the borough not affected by the change in student numbers would see a reduction in its BSF payments. When this was initially pointed out to LA officers, the school was told it wouldn't make any material difference. For the reasons pointed out in point i), it is important that this issue is looked at and a fair solution found. It should also be noted that if a Free School is built to accommodate some of the additional students, this would exacerbate the situation and drive Penistone's repayment costs up further. We ask that Cabinet look to mitigate this issue.*
- iii) Finally, at the time of writing, no detailed drawings or timeline exists. Positive meetings are taking place with project managers and architects working on the proposed extension. The school requests Cabinet's assurance that works will not be allowed to interrupt students learning, avoid critical exam times and that health and safety considerations are given the highest priority particularly where internal remodelling is required.*

As stated the Governors are very supportive and want to see the project move forward. We ask that the concerns raised are acknowledged and plans are developed to address them.

Responses to issues raised by Governing Body

- i) It is the council's intention to align its local funding formula as closely to the national funding formula and to ensure that those schools expected to gain under the new NFF see an increase in their funding. Schools (and the schools forum) will be consulted on proposed changes we are looking to make to the local formula to achieve this desired outcome. Whilst the increased funding to the school under the new NFF is welcomed, it doesn't mean that the school has been grossly underfunded for years neither is it a vindication of the view held by the school that the local formula is unfair or inequitable. A review of the new NFF shows that there are no significant differences (in terms of applicable factors, unit values and weightings) to Barnsley local formula. What has made a difference to PGS funding is the inclusion of a minimum funding factor and changes to the funding floor both of which has been made possible via the injection of an additional £1.3 billion. This reinforces the message that we have consistently made, i.e. the issue of underfunded schools is not a consequence of the unfairness of the local formula but the inadequacy of funding by the Government (which has now been addressed).
- Under the current arrangement, all secondary schools make a contribution based on actual pupil numbers towards meeting the BSF affordability gap (currently £3.9m and equates to £385 per pupil). Whilst the amount per pupil will reduce annually as total pupil number rises, nevertheless the school's payment will increase due to the increased number of pupils on roll. However, this needs to be considered in the context of the additional funding that would accrue to the school as a result of the increased 250 pupil intake under the new national funding formula (likely to be in excess of £1m). It is envisaged that this would be enough to cover the increased BSF costs and other associated costs (e.g. extra teachers / learning resources). In respect of fairness, the current methodology or approach was intended to align the level of BSF contribution made by schools to the delegated formula funding received (which is mainly pupil driven). Any change in the methodology that excludes the additional 250 pupil increase will be unfair and inequitable for other schools.
- ii) The Authority will endeavour to ensure there is no disruption to teaching and learning. This issue was a key factor in deciding the best solution is to extend instead of installing floors into a triple height space because by extending the works will be isolated from the school and access to/from the existing building put in on completion when students are not in school. The final design should be available in the middle of November and the project will be professionally managed with full engagement with the school to ensure that when the internal re-modelling takes place critical exam times are avoided and health and safety considerations prioritized. The detailed drawings will require sign off by the school alongside a timeline which the school can then share with the Governing Body. It is expected that this will be available next month.

Statement by South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTTE) received 13 October 2017

SYPTTE welcome the opportunity to participate in the consultation on the proposed provision of additional school places at Penistone Grammar School. We are aware that the provision of public transport is a key consideration when parents choose a school for their children, working with our partners Barnsley Council and the Bus operators we are committed to provide a sustainable public transport network of commercial and contracted to meet the needs of the community, the school and parents of both statutory and none statutory pupils and mitigate the environmental impact of an increase in car journeys. We are aware the current services to Penistone Grammar school are at or close to capacity accordingly SYPTTE's priority will be to support Barnsley Council to meet their statutory obligations to provide transport for statutory pupils which may require changes in how the services SYPTTE current fund operate

Extract from Schedule 3 of The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013

Conditional approvals

8.—(1) The following events are prescribed as specified events which (if the approval is expressed to take effect only if they occur) must occur by the date specified in the approval

- (a) the grant of planning permission under Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990(a);
- (b) the acquisition of any site required for the implementation of the proposals;
- (c) the acquisition of playing fields required for the implementation of the proposals;
- (d) the securing of any necessary access to a site referred to in Paragraph (b) or playing fields referred to in Paragraph (c);
- (e) the entering into an agreement for any necessary building project supported by the Department for Education;
- (f) in the case of mainstream schools, the agreement to any change to the admission arrangements relating to the school or any other school or schools, as specified in the approval;
- (g) the making of any scheme relating to any charity connected with the school;
- (h) the formation of any federation (within the meaning of section 24(2) of the Education Act 2002(b)) of which it is intended that the school should form part, or the fulfilling of any other condition relating to the school forming part of a federation;
- (i) where the proposals are to alter the upper age limit of the school, the decision of the Secretary of State to establish a new further education institution under section 16 or 33C of the Further and Higher Education Act 1992(c);
- (j) where the proposals in question depend upon any of the events specified in Paragraphs (a) to (i) occurring by a specified date in relation to proposals relating to any other school or proposed school, the occurrence of such an event; and
- (k) where proposals are related to proposals for the establishment of new schools or discontinuance of schools, and those proposals depend on the occurrence of events specified in regulation 20 of the School Organisation (Establishment and Discontinuance of Schools) Regulations 2013(d) the occurrence of such an event.