

Notice of Meeting

Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning Decisions



SURREY
COUNTY COUNCIL

Date & time

Wednesday, 11
September 2013 at
2.30 pm

Place

Room 107 - County
Hall, Kingston upon
Thames, Surrey,
KT1 2DN

Contact

Anne Gowing
Room 122, County Hall
Tel. 020 8541 9938
anne.gowing@surreycc.gov.uk

Chief Executive

David McNulty

If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, eg large print or braille, or another language please either call 020 8541 9122, write to Democratic Services, Room 122, County Hall, Penrhyn Road, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN, Minicom 020 8541 8914, fax 020 8541 9009, or email anne.gowing@surreycc.gov.uk.

This meeting will be held in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact Anne Gowing on 020 8541 9938.

Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning
Mrs Linda Kemeny

AGENDA

1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests from Members in respect of any item to be considered at the meeting.

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

2a Members' Questions

The deadline for Member's questions is 12pm four working days before the meeting (5 September 2013).

2b Public Questions

The deadline for public questions is seven days before the meeting (4 September 2013).

2c Petitions

(Pages 1
- 2)

The deadline for petitions was 14 days before the meeting, and one petition has been received petitioning Surrey County Council open a Secondary School in Molesey.

3 BROOKWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL

(Pages 3
- 8)

There is currently a considerable pressure for primary school places in Woking. In addition to the demand generated by an increasing birth rate, there is a need to provide more school places in the Borough as a result of additional housing and increasing numbers of families returning to Pirbright Barracks as part of the Ministry of Defence's basing plan.

4 LANGSHOTT INFANT SCHOOL, HORLEY

(Pages 9
- 16)

Surrey County Council, in cooperation with the Governing Body of Langshott Infant School, has consulted on a proposal to alter the upper age range of Langshott Infant School so that the School becomes a Primary School from September 2014. This proposal would provide an additional 240 additional junior school places within Horley.

5 ECHELFORD PRIMARY SCHOOL, ASHFORD: THE SPECIALIST SEN CENTRE

(Pages
17 - 28)

Following a statutory consultation process by Surrey County Council, permission is sought from the Cabinet Member to approve the publication of Notices in respect of the proposed closure of the Specialist Centre at The Echelford Primary School.

David McNulty
Chief Executive
Published: 30 August 2013

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY – ACCEPTABLE USE

Use of mobile technology (mobiles, BlackBerries, etc.) in meetings can:

- Interfere with the PA and Induction Loop systems
- Distract other people
- Interrupt presentations and debates
- Mean that you miss a key part of the discussion

Please switch off your mobile phone/BlackBerry for the duration of the meeting. If you wish to keep your mobile or BlackBerry switched on during the meeting for genuine personal reasons, ensure that you receive permission from the Chairman prior to the start of the meeting and set the device to silent mode.

Thank you for your co-operation

This page is intentionally left blank

Petition to: open a Secondary School in Molesey

We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to open a Secondary School in Molesey.

Submitted by: **Mrs Rebecca King of Parents in Molesey** – Deadline: **17 July 2013** –
Signatures: **443**

More details from petition creator

There is a huge shortage of Secondary schooling in Elmbridge, and specifically in Molesey. Primary schools are expanding to cater for the huge birth rate rise in recent years, and all these children will soon need to move on to secondary education.

Molesey sits within the official catchment area of Esher High School, which has a published admission number of 210 pupils, due to increase to 240. Molesey could fill these places entirely, as the 4 primary schools here are now catering for 240 children each year. Many Molesey children were sent to secondary schools outside the borough this year, in a trend that is due to continue unless something is done quickly.

Please show your support by signing this petition, which will be sent to the education department at Surrey County Council!

Council	Signatures
Surrey County Council	422
Ashtead	1
Banstead, Woodmansterne and Chipstead	1
Cobham	3
East Molesey and Esher	124
Elmbridge Borough Council	418
Hersham	5
Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Oxshott	2
Mole Valley District Council	1
Nork and Tattenhams	1
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	2
Spelthorne Borough Council	1
Sunbury Common and Ashford Common	1
The Dittons	35
Walton	23
Walton South and Oatlands	4
West Molesey	220
Weybridge	2
<i>Other</i>	14
<i>Unknown</i>	6

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING****DATE: 11 SEPTEMBER 2013****LEAD OFFICER: NICK WILSON, STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES****SUBJECT: PROPOSED EXPANSION OF BROOKWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL FROM ONE TO TWO FORMS OF ENTRY ON A SPLIT SITE****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

There is currently a considerable pressure for primary school places in Woking. In addition to the demand generated by an increasing birth rate, there is a need to provide more school places in the Borough as a result of additional housing and increasing numbers of families returning to Pirbright Barracks as part of the Ministry of Defence's basing plan.

There is an opportunity to secure new school provision on new land as part of the Brookwood Farm Housing development recently approved by Woking Borough Council.

The proposal is to expand Brookwood Primary School from a one form entry primary school (capacity of 210 pupils) to two forms of entry (capacity of 420 pupils) by building a junior school building on a new site adjacent to Bagshot Road / Corresbrook Way. Infant children would operate from the existing primary school site and junior age children would be located in new accommodation on the new site.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the expansion of the school to two forms of entry on a split site be agreed subject to planning permission.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Authority has a statutory duty to provide sufficient school places in the County. There are currently no Year R or 1 vacancies at schools in the local area and although there are some vacancies in other year groups they are not expected to be sufficient to meet the expected additional demand met by the housing development and returning service families.

Surrey County Council is a signatory to the Military Covenant and is committed to ensuring that children from service families are not disadvantaged in any way and are fully able to access key public services. It is important that there are sufficient school places in the area for service families which this proposal will ensure.

DETAILS:

The Proposal

1. Surrey County Council, in partnership with the Governors of Brookwood Primary School is proposing that the school expands from a one form entry primary school with a Published Admission Number of 30 (total capacity of 210 pupils), to a two form entry primary school with a Published Admission Number of 60 (total capacity of 420 pupils). The school will operate as a 'split site' primary school with a new junior school building to be developed to the south of the Brookwood Farm Housing development. It is proposed for the school to open in September 2014.

Rationale

2. Demand for school places – Demand for school places has increased significantly in Woking in recent years. The County Council has commissioned over a thousand additional school places in the Borough in the last three years, permanently expanding primary schools including Westfield, Beaufort, St Dunstan's, The Marist and Goldsworth as well as temporary expansions at Sythwood, St John's and Pyrford (projects being in various stages of completion). Even with these additional places, most primary schools in Woking are expected to be full and to continue to be full in the future.
3. Given the level of applications that came in for 2011, 2012 and 2013 the Local Authority has been talking to primary schools in the Borough about commissioning further provision over and above the permanent expansions already identified above. The Council is planning on the basis that it will need three more forms of entry in Woking from 2014. Brookwood Primary Expansion is one of the projects that had been identified.
4. Housing development in the Borough - In January 2013 Woking Borough Council approved the development of 297 new homes on the Brookwood Farm site. Given that all primary schools in the Borough are currently full there will be a need for more school places arising from this development. The County Council welcomes the opportunity to create new school provision on new land, rather than having to expand existing schools on their existing sites and the County Council wishes to make additional school provision available to meet the future need arising from the Brookwood Farm community at Brookwood Primary School. Given the proximity of the land identified for new school provision to Brookwood Primary School, it makes good sense to expand the existing primary school rather than build a new stand alone school with separate Governing Body / Head Teacher and teaching staff. This will help reduce traffic in the area which is a key issue for local residents.
5. Returning families to Pirbright Barracks - In May 2012 the Army indicated that around 120 families of servicemen in two Yorkshire infantry units were expected to be returning to the UK from Cyprus next year (for a September 2013 start). At the time, the Local Authority proposed to expand Bisley Church of England Primary School to meet this demand (expansion on the existing Brookwood Site was not deemed possible). Following the national restructure of the Army, it was no longer planned for the two Yorks to return to Pirbright and in March 2013 the Ministry of Defence published a new basing plan indicating that the Welsh Guards would return to Pirbright Barracks instead. The expected number of returning pupils is expected to be lower but

the actual numbers and the dates of their return are still not yet clear. Expanding both Bisley Church of England and Brookwood Primary school would risk putting in too many additional places into the area and would be cost prohibitive. Given that there is an opportunity to secure land for new school provision, the County Council is committed to the expansion of Brookwood Primary School and it is envisaged that this will be sufficient to meet the demand arising both from the housing development and returning families to Pirbright Barracks in the future.

6. The proposal is to include a new junior school building as part of the community facilities being developed as part of the Housing Development on the Brookwood Farm site. Broadly speaking, a new single storey junior building with outdoor play facilities will be provided and delivered by the County Council in partnership with Woking Borough Council. This part of the site will be secure and for use only by the school. In addition, two junior size pitches, a Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) and a sports pavilion will be located on the site and will be provided on the site by the developer. The playing pitches and pavilion will be available for use by the school but will also be available for community use outside of school hours. A pathway and bridge will be constructed joining up the existing and new site across the Basingstoke Canal and open space between the sites. This is to reduce additional traffic in the area and to ensure that the school can link as 'one school' as effectively as possible. An outline planning application for the new school buildings was submitted and approved at the same time as the detailed planning application for the Brookwood Farm Housing development in January this year. A full planning application on the proposal is expected to be submitted to Woking Borough Council shortly.

CONSULTATION:

7. Full statutory consultation for a prescribed alteration has taken place. The following were consulted: the governing body of the School; the families of pupils, teachers and other staff at the school; the trade unions who represent staff in Surrey schools; all primary schools in the Borough; the local MP; the local Surrey County Council members; local borough councillors; Surrey County Council Early Years and Childcare Service.
8. The Cabinet Member considered the responses to the consultation on 11 July 2013 and determined to publish a notice indicating the Local Authority's intention to expand the school. A statutory notice was published on 18 July 2013. A four week period of representations was allowed for any further representations from the local community. No representations have been received.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

9. There are risks associated with this project and a project risk register has been compiled and is regularly updated. Given that the main community facilities and school buildings will be provided by two separate organisations but on the same site there are interface risks associated with the project. To mitigate the risk of these interface issues, the Local Authority has delegated the responsibility of managing the delivery of the school building to Woking Borough Council (who are working closely with CALA homes who are providing the community facilities) with County Council officers part of the project team. The other main risks relate to the capital budget and

programme for the scheme. Given that a full planning application will be submitted shortly the timetable for the delivery of the school is very tight. This risk has been mitigated by the choice of contractor (Wilmott Dixon) and the construction methodology employed. Woking BC has called off the 'Scape' framework avoiding the need for a lengthy procurement process. The building is 'pre-designed' with part of the building constructed off site resulting in greater cost certainty and shorter construction periods (24-28 weeks). Given this as well as some contingency being planned into the programme, the timetable for a September 2014 is considered achievable.

10. In terms of capital costs, there are a number of 'abnormals' which present some cost risks. These include the construction of the bridge and the pathway to join up the two sites. This work (and the school building and site) is being taken forward by a single contractor who are in the process of pricing the work based on surveys of the site. An appropriate level of contingency (5%) is included within the project budget as well as any costs associated with the buildings meeting a BREEAM very good rating which is likely to be a requirement by the Local Planning Authority. Full feasibility costs will be reported to Cabinet at an appropriate time in the future.
11. There is still a high level of uncertainty as to how many new pupils will actually present to the local schools as a result of the army moves and the new housing developments. The likely impact will be that the school will be simultaneously filling up several classes in different year groups and there is potential for unfunded vacancies causing a revenue funding pressure on the school. In the case of most primary school expansions the year groups fill up one at a time, usually starting with Reception or Year 3, therefore avoiding/minimising unfunded places. In this case, a contribution has been requested from Schools Forum to provide transitional funding to guarantee vacancies at the school for all year groups for three years in order to manage the turbulence of uncertain numbers. This reduces the risk to the school but puts a risk on the Dedicated Schools Grant from where 'Growing Schools Funding' is derived.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

12. The additional basic need in the area of Woking was identified during 2013/14 and this scheme, along with several others, were added to the capital programme. These now have approved funding following the 2013/18 medium term financial plan (MTFP) review. All schemes are expected to remain within the funding which has been allocated to them in the MTFP. The development of the business case as the scheme progresses through its phases to completion is crucial to ensuring that costs are constantly reviewed and contained. In addition the scheme costs are monitored against the annual profiled budget on a monthly basis and variances reported to Cabinet.
13. It is acknowledged that there is a real need for additional school places, over and above those identified in the 2012/17 capital programme, especially in the Woking area.
14. A split site school does incur more revenue costs than a single site school. Alternative sites and schools have been reviewed and despite this potential revenue implication, Brookwood is still considered to be the most appropriate to meet the school basic need in that area.

15. The potential for simultaneously filling up classes across all year groups is high and there will be revenue implications to DSG for unfunded vacant places that will be guaranteed for three years until such time as all year groups are filled.

Section 151 Officer Commentary

16. The capital funding for this scheme has been approved as part of the reviewed 2013/18 MTFP. The Section 151 Officer expects the costs to be contained within the funding available and that partner organisations are aware of this requirement. A more detailed business case will be developed with more up to date costings following feasibility of the site.
17. The business case is also expected to address the potential revenue budget implications and outline the management action to be taken in order to minimise the funding risks.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

18. Section 13 of the Education Act 1996 places a general duty on local education authorities to secure that efficient primary education is available to meet the needs of the population of their area. Section 5 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 places a duty to promote high standards. Therefore, there is a duty to provide efficient education and sufficient schools to do so.

Equalities and Diversity

19. A full equalities impact assessment has not been undertaken on this proposal as it is unlikely that the proposal would have a negative impact on any groups with protected characteristics. The school does serve both traveller families and families from the armed services but this proposal ensures that there will be sufficient places for children from these groups to go in the future. The proposal does not change the nature of the admissions criteria for the school.
20. The new school building will comply with the Equality Act 2010. The expanded school will provide additional employment opportunities in the area.
21. The school will be for children in the community served by the school. If there is sufficient provision available, then it would be beneficial for all children, including vulnerable children.
22. The school will be expected to contribute towards community cohesion and will be expected to provide the normal range of before and after schools clubs as are provided in a typical Surrey County Council school.

Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications

23. No significant implications.

Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults implications

24. There are potential safeguarding issues arising from the split site nature of the school. The school intends to manage these issues by only allowing pupils to travel between sites accompanied by an adult and to instigate 'walking buses' to ensure that children can be dropped off at their most local school site and be accompanied across to the correct site by school staff before being registered.

Public Health implications

25. No significant implications.

Climate change/carbon emissions implications

26. The County Council attaches great importance to being environmentally aware and wishes to show leadership in cutting carbon emissions and tackling climate change. The new school building will meet BREEAM very good and will be providing additional energy saving measures such as improved lighting, solar thermals and point of use water heating systems. Photo Voltaic panels will be provided to provide a renewable source of energy. The new buildings will comply or exceed Building Regulations. The contractor will be required to provide a Site Waste Management Plan.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

27. The current programme identifies the key next steps:
- End of August 2013 – planning application submitted to Woking Borough Council
 - October 2013 – Cabinet to consider business case and costs of the scheme
 - November 2013 – Decision on planning application from Woking Borough Council.
 - January 2014 – Implement proposals

Contact Officer:

Kieran Holliday, School Commissioning Officer (North West), 020 8541 7383

Consulted:

All schools in Woking
Pupils and Parents of Brookwood Primary School
Local Residents and Local Resident's Associations
Local Members

Sources/background papers:

- Proposal to expand Brookwood Primary School by one form of entry by 2014. A copy of this report can be found here on the SCC website by navigating to, or clicking on, the following: [Learning > Schools > Education Consultation and Plans](#)
 - "Proposed expansion of brookwood primary school from 1 to 2 forms of entry on a split site" – Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning, Committee Papers, 11 July 2013
-

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING****DATE: 11 SEPTEMBER 2013****LEAD OFFICER: NICK WILSON, STRATEGIC DIRECTOR FOR CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES****SUBJECT: LANGSHOTT INFANT SCHOOL, HORLEY****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Surrey County Council, in cooperation with the Governing Body of Langshott Infant School, has consulted on a proposal to alter the upper age range of Langshott Infant School so that the School becomes a Primary School from September 2014. This proposal would provide an additional 240 additional junior school places within Horley.

The Cabinet Member is asked to review the comments received during the consultation and to decide whether to proceed to the publication of statutory notices.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member approves the publication of Statutory Notices indicating the Council's intent to alter the upper age limit of Langshott Infant School so that it becomes a Primary School.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

This proposal is reflective both of an increasing demand for school places in the Horley area, resulting from an increase in birth rate and significant house building, and an opportunity to provide primary school structure throughout the town.

The provision of additional Junior places both meets the increased demographic pressures in the area and will allow the Council to admit those people who name the school as their preferred option thus, meeting the wider statutory duty to offer all applicants a school place.

It will enable a diversity of provision to be maintained within the Horley area and be part of a strategy that enables Horley residents to access to a local Primary School.

A programme of building works at the school will improve the general fabric of the school buildings and enhance the learning experience for pupils, parents and staff.

DETAILS:**The Proposal**

1. Currently Langshott Infant School has permanent accommodation for 180 pupils from Reception to Year 2. The school has a published admission number of 60 thus admitting 60 pupils each year in two classes.

2. Surrey County Council, in partnership with the governing body of Langshott School, Smallfield Road, is now proposing to;
 - enlarge the school from a 180 place Infant School, 60 places from reception to Year 2, to a 420 place primary school, 60 places from reception to year 6.
 - retain the Published Admission Number (PAN) at 60, with pupils already at the school transferring from Year 2 to Year 3 and continuing their education at the school until the end of Year 6
 - allow the school to grow incrementally year by year so that it would reach capacity in September 2017
 - provide the additional classrooms and ancillary space required through a building project
 - that the enlargement would be effective from 1 September 2014

Reasons for the proposal

3. Pupil numbers have been steadily rising across Reigate and Banstead Borough since 2006. Much of the increase is as a result of the rise in the local birth rate; a significant amount is also due to housing development and inward migration. This is specifically the case in Horley which has been identified for large-scale housing developments to the North East and North West of the Town. The North East sector development is being built with new houses being occupied. The Council needs to take account of these trends and provide more school places in the area where they are needed.
4. Historic birth rates for Reigate and Banstead and Surrey are included below.

Borough	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	% Change 2002-2010
Reigate & Banstead	1446	1572	1523	1491	1711	1754	1768	1775	1880	1,871	29.4
Surrey Total	11626	12304	12283	12303	13085	13628	13710	13626	14237	14,097	21.3

5. Langshott Infant and Nursery school is located in the Horley planning area which is served by six schools: Meath Green Infant and Junior, Horley Infant, Yattendon Junior, Manorfield Primary, and Langshott Infant.
6. The Council's pupil projections for the Horley planning area are shown in the table over leaf. The 'PAN' is the planned admission number for Reception Year. The 'spare' columns show the projected shortfall in Reception places and in Year 3 when children transfer into junior provision (Key Stage 2).

Year	PAN	1pref	InfPl	Spare	%	YR	Y1	Y2	JunP	JSpa	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	J	Total	Cap	Surplus	%
2010	240	241	240	5	2.1	235	229	241	240	16	224	191	203	198	816	1521	1590	69	4.3
2011	240	296	300	15	6.3	285	233	229	210	-1	211	216	194	207	828	1575	1590	15	0.9
2012	250	280	280	13	5.2	267	293	231	210	2	208	208	214	195	825	1616	1590	-26	-1.6
2013	250	261	250	-11	-4.4	261	250	269	210	13	197	188	190	196	771	1551	1590	39	2.5
2014	250		250	-14	-5.6	264	246	232	210	-21	231	180	174	176	761	1503	1590	87	5.5
2015	250		250	-24	-9.6	274	250	230	210	8	202	211	168	162	743	1497	1590	93	5.8
2016	250		250	-34	-13.6	284	260	235	210	9	201	186	197	158	742	1521	1590	69	4.3
2017	250		250	-45	-18.0	295	270	244	210	4	206	185	175	184	750	1559	1590	31	1.9
2018	250		250	-54	-21.6	304	279	252	210	-2	212	189	173	164	738	1573	1590	17	1.1
2019	250		250	-57	-22.8	307	287	260	210	-8	218	194	176	161	749	1603	1590	-13	-0.8
2020	250		250	-55	-22.0	305	288	265	210	-12	222	197	179	162	760	1618	1590	-28	-1.8
2021	250		250	-48	-19.2	298	285	264	210	-14	224	199	179	164	766	1613	1590	-23	-1.4

7. As evidenced above, there is a demand for additional school places in the local area. This proposal, by providing 240 additional junior places within Horley, will enable the authority to meet the rising demand as part of a suite of school organisation changes in the area. This also includes supporting the establishment of a new one form entry primary school in the area from September 2014.
8. In addition this proposal will enable the benefits of primary education to be experienced in Horley and provide for an easier Infant and Junior transfer within the Town for all parents.
9. The proposal also supports the Council's preference for primary organisation. Whilst not denying the good points of separate Infant and Junior Schools, this proposal supports the specific advantages of primary organisation including:
 - a seamless transition from Key Stage 1 (Infants) to Key Stage 2 (Juniors)
 - greater opportunities for curriculum development
 - greater opportunities for staff development
 - greater flexibility with a larger budget to deploy staff and curriculum resources effectively
 - greater opportunities for staff recruitment and retention
10. Expanding the school will also allow the Governors and the Council to admit children whose parents who would like the school as their preferred option at Junior level. It will also enable more children to attend a local primary school and more closely match parental preference within the town.
11. A programme of building works will improve the general fabric of the school buildings and enhance the learning experience for pupils and the working environment for staff.
12. The school is a vital part of the Council's education offer in the local area. Retaining and expanding provision of the number of spaces within Horley is essential in ensuring that the County Council performs its statutory duty of educating all pupils who request a school place.

Planning and capital considerations

13. The school has capacity to expand in its existing location. A building programme will be required to provide the permanent facilities to allow for this increase. Appropriate capital has been approved to achieve this through the primary capital programme. Detailed work has been undertaken with the Governing Body, Surrey County Council Property Service and Consultants to develop a scheme of works to provide the additional accommodation needed in an appropriate manner and a separate planning application is being submitted pursuant to this.
14. The planning application will deal with the implications for school buildings and the management of traffic that result from this proposed expansion. This site adjoins Oakwood Secondary School, as part of the development improvements are being made to pedestrian access at both sites.
15. The programme of works is subject to business case approval from the Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration.

CONSULTATION:

16. A detailed consultation has been undertaken with relevant stakeholders that has included the issuing of a public consultation documentation and two public meetings, that were well attended.
17. School Governors, the local school community (through the Horley Local Partnership) and the local member have been regularly consulted both during the consultation process and throughout the development of proposals.

Comments Received

18. There has been a high level of support for the proposal from consultees. 14 formal written responses were received of which 12 (86%) agreed with the proposal one disagreed and one did not know. All respondents had children of school or pre-school age. Those supporting the school expansion referenced its existing positive outcomes and ethos. Acknowledgement was given to how this proposal will ease transfer within the town and prevent children having to change schools during their primary education.
19. Some themes and concerns were evident in the consultation process both in formal responses received and comments made at the public meetings. The issue raised by the highest proportion (29%) of respondents was whether appropriate consideration was being given to transport and access to the site as part of the programme of expansion. Respondents reported existing congestion at entrance and exit routes that should be addressed in the development.
20. Respondents expressed a desire that appropriate consideration is given to the development of the future Key Stage Two curriculum within the school and whether there was capacity with the existing Leadership and Governance structures to enable the change to progress effectively.
21. Respondents referenced the need to ensure that the programme of works included the necessary facilities to aid junior education. This included the provision of appropriate outdoor play space and specific Key Stage Two classroom space.

22. Specific concern was also raised by parents within the first cohort of children to go through the change that it would be appropriately managed with children receiving the necessary support.

Responses to comments

23. The development of the programme of building works has been undertaken in consultation with the planning Authority and Highways Department. The planning application will draw out specific responses to the access issues and proposed enhancements across the Langshott and Oakwood School sites. Appropriate provision within the programme has also been made to make reasonable adjustments to the existing school fabric and provide new permanent accommodation to meet the increased demands of the additional pupils and the Key Stage Two curriculum.
24. The existing school governors and Acting Head Teacher have been making use of the Surrey School Support Service to develop appropriate curriculum models. In addition the school has also been consulting with other junior providers to ensure that an effective curriculum, leadership and governance structure is in place to enable the expansion to take place effectively. The school will also use the expertise within the Horley Learning Partnership to ensure that plans are tested and refined.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

25. A project to deliver the new school buildings for September 2014 is required and as such there are risks associated with this proposal. There is a risk that the project will not complete within the timescales outlined above and there may be site abnormalities not identified as part of the initial feasibility exercise. A risk register is being maintained and updated on a regular basis by the school's consultants.
26. Should the approval of additional school places not be granted there is the risk that Surrey would fail to meet its statutory duty in providing sufficient school places, without mitigation at another site.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

27. The building project resultant from this proposal is included in the County Council's school basic need capital programme as part of the 2013/2018 Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP). A scheme of works is being developed by Property Services that is within the funding envelope for this project. When this scheme reaches its contract tendering phase then a more detailed business case will be compiled and the Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration will approve its progress towards contract award.

Section 151 Officer Commentary

28. The Section 151 Officer confirms that this scheme is listed in the approved 2013/18 MTFP capital programme. The full revenue and capital cost implications will be considered as part of the more detailed business case prior to contract tendering.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

29. Section 13 of the Education Act 1996 places a general duty on local education authorities to secure that efficient primary education is available to meet the needs of the population of their area. Section 14 of the Education Act 1996 places a duty on local education authorities to secure that sufficient schools for providing primary education are available in their area. Section 5 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 places a duty to promote high standards. There is a duty to provide efficient education and sufficient schools to do so.
30. The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 contains the regulations that apply to prescribed alterations. The former DCSF, now DfE published two pieces of Guidance relating to prescribed alterations: Expanding a Maintained Mainstream School or Adding a Sixth Form and Making Changes to a Maintained Mainstream School (Other than Expansion). These contain both statutory guidance (i.e. guidance to which proposers and decision makers have a statutory duty to have regard) and non-statutory guidance on the process for making changes to school provision.

Equalities and Diversity

31. The proposal would enhance educational provision and be open to all children in the community served by the school. No group with any protected characteristics under Equalities legislation will be affected by this proposal as increased provision for all children is proposed to be made. As a result no EIA has been produced. However, with the increase in provision being open to all applicants with the highest priority given to Looked After Children and pupils on the SEN register and/or who would benefit from a statement of educational need, this proposal will support our most vulnerable children.

Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications

32. The proposal is key to ensuring that the appropriate numbers of school places are provided to meet the demand of our residents. All places provided have the highest priority given to children in the care of the local authority.

Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults implications

33. The Council has a duty to promote and improve educational outcomes for all children, particularly for vulnerable and disadvantaged children. The provision of school places is essential in meeting this duty.

Climate change/carbon emissions implications

34. The County Council attaches great importance to being environmentally aware and wishes to show leadership in cutting carbon emissions and tackling climate change. The provision of Junior Provision on the site will reduce the number of journeys required by parents and children who would otherwise need to travel to a different site for junior education.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

35. The next steps are:

- Subject to Cabinet Member approval Statutory Notices outlining the change will be published and displayed publically for a period of four weeks.
- Any responses to the Statutory Notices will be collated and reported to the Cabinet Member.
- A further report will be submitted to the Cabinet Member so that the Statutory Notices can be determined.
- Should the Cabinet Member determine the Statutory Notices positively the proposal will be confirmed and the Langshott Infant School upper age limit would be raised as per the proposal from September 2014.

Contact Officer:

Nicholas Smith, School Commissioning Officer 020 8541 8902

Consulted:

Nick Wilson, Strategic Director for Children Schools and Families
Dorothy Ross-Tomlin, County Councillor for Horley East
Horley Learning Partnership
Public and Parents

Sources/background papers:

- Langshott Consultation Document.
-

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING****DATE: 11 SEPTEMBER 2013****LEAD OFFICER: NICK WILSON, STRATEGIC DIRECTOR FOR CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES****SUBJECT: TO DETERMINE A PROPOSAL TO CLOSE THE SPECIALIST CENTRE FOR SPEECH, LANGUAGE AND COMMUNICATION AT THE ECHELFORD PRIMARY SCHOOL IN ASHFORD****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Following a statutory consultation process by Surrey County Council, permission is sought from the Cabinet Member to approve the publication of Notices in respect of the proposed closure of the Specialist Centre at The Echelford Primary School.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that:

1. The Specialist Speech, Language and Communications Needs (SLCN) Centre is closed in January 2014.
2. No further admissions are made to the Specialist Centre with effect from September 2013.
3. Suitable alternative educational provision will be arranged for pupils currently on roll at The Echelford Specialist Centre. This will be done in conjunction with their parents/carers and the Local Authority maintaining Special Educational Needs (SEN) provision in order to enable their transition in January 2014 or sooner.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

There are a number of unfilled places at this Centre and it has not been full for a number of years. This is partly due to fewer SLCN pupils in Surrey requiring this sort of provision. There is also another more popular and successful Centre locally. The Echelford Governing Body has been unable to secure appropriate specialist teaching and leadership of the Centre and standards there are judged as being unsatisfactory at present. The proposed closure will enable the Headteacher and Governing Body to concentrate on raising standards in the mainstream school which currently also requires special measures and is becoming an academy. More suitable and effective alternative provision has been identified for the six pupils currently on roll.

DETAILS:**Business Case**

1. The Echelford Primary School is currently in an OFSTED category of concern as it needs to improve the quality of its educational offer to all pupils. The Head of the SLCN Centre resigned in 2012 and the Head Teacher of the school resigned in the spring of 2013. An executive Head Teacher from

another school has been appointed to oversee the rapid improvements required. It is very likely that The Echelford will become an academy as part of a Trust established with the Executive Head's own outstanding school.

2. The Executive Head has had great difficulty in recruiting suitable specialist staff for the SLCN centre, including a Head of Centre; and the roll has dwindled to only six pupils, four of whom are transported there from Hounslow Local Authority. The Centre was opened in 2006 with 12 places available but it has never been full. There is another SLCN Centre in the Spelthorne Borough at Spelthorne School, and so provision is available should the numbers of pupils requiring this type of support rise in the near future.
3. A consultation with stakeholders was held according to Department for Education (DfE) guidelines and this included a meeting at the school for parents and other interested parties. A number of individual meetings have also been held with parents of children attending the centre and with SEN officers of Hounslow Local Authority. The County Council has received no opposition to the proposed closure of the centre. The Head Teacher and the Governing Body of The Echelford School initially requested this closure and are in full support of this proposal.

CONSULTATION:

4. The consultation period ran from Monday 10 June 2013 for a period of six weeks up to Friday 26 July. This was publicised to parents of the children on roll in the mainstream school as well as to the parents and carers of children on roll at The Centre. A consultation document was drawn up outlining the reasons for the proposal and what alternative arrangements would be made for pupils requiring this kind of provision. This was sent to all stakeholders.
5. A public meeting was held at The Echelford School on 19 June at 5.30 pm. This was attended by approximately 10 parents. No written consultation responses were received and there was no opposition to the proposal. Parents of children attending the Centre have had individual consultations with Surrey County Council SEN officers and with Hounslow Officers, where appropriate, and they are generally satisfied with the alternative arrangements made for their children. Consequently their Statements have been revised to name other provision.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

6. There are no apparent educational risks involved in this proposed closure. However, if the closure is not approved there is the risk that the ongoing lack of specialist staff and experienced leadership in this Centre will impact negatively on the educational offer being made to the pupils on roll. This could also have an impact on the rate of general improvement in The Echelford School which is currently subject to HMI monitoring and an OFSTED re-inspection in due course.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

7. The DfE currently fund £10,000 per place for special education need provision. The place budget at Echelford is £100,000 (ten places). There is also an additional £18,000 income recouped from other local authorities. There is a risk that by closing the unit the County Council loses this £100,000

place funding. The guidance states that where a local authority is reducing place numbers and requesting that it should retain the funding released due to a re-organisation of provision, the criteria will be, that the local authority has demonstrated that:

- they will be providing for the same (or additional) number of places through other provision; or
 - that the re-organisation will bring medium term benefits in terms of increased choice, better outcomes or cost effectiveness.
8. Surrey County Council will therefore have to make a case to the DfE to retain the place funding by demonstrating one of the above criteria for the change..
9. These arrangements for annual review of place funding by the DfE are new and therefore their response to such proposals is unknown. If the place funding is lost then Surrey could still be faced with the need to fund additional in-school support for pupils who would otherwise have been placed in the unit, without retaining the funding previously allocated to the unit. However, given the high vacancy level at the unit and the current numbers for re-providing are small (two children) the financial risk may not be significant, but nevertheless the risk remains.

Section 151 Officer Commentary

10. The Section 151 Officer acknowledges that the school want the unit to close, so they can concentrate on other issues and that the unit usage is very low. However, there is a risk of the County Council losing the £100,000 place funding.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

11. The children attending The SLCN Centre at The Echelford each have a statement of Special Educational Need which has (or had) The Echelford named as the appropriate provision in part 4 of this document. Four of these statements are maintained by Hounslow Local Authority and two by Surrey County Council. As stated earlier in this report emergency statement reviews have been undertaken by the relevant Authority with parents and carers and the statements have been amended accordingly. Parents will retain their statutory right to appeal if they are dissatisfied with the new named educational provision.

Equalities and Diversity

12. All six pupils on roll have had suitable alternative educational provision made for them as part of this process in anticipation of the closure of this Centre. Four of the pupils are Hounslow residents and Hounslow Local Authority is therefore the responsible body in their cases. Negotiations between Surrey and Hounslow Officers have secured this provision in Hounslow in readiness for January 2014 or sooner. Of the two Surrey residents, one child will remain at The Echelford School to complete his primary education there with in class support. The other child has been allocated a place in an alternative Centre.

13. There are no specialist staff currently employed to work in the Centre, supply staff are being engaged at present on temporary contracts. Therefore no staff will lose their permanent post if the Centre closes.
14. No group with any protected characteristics under Equalities Legislation has been affected by this proposal as improved provision for the children with SENs has been made. The students are all covered by the general Equalities Impact Assessments (EIA) made by Surrey County Council in respect of its educational provision. No separate EIA has therefore been made.

Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications

15. All parents, including Corporate Parents, have been consulted about the general principle of closure of this centre and also the specific impact on their child's education. There have been no representations from the parents of Looked After Children to suggest that the centre does not close.

Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults implications

16. Safeguarding considerations have been taken into account in the proposal to close this Centre. It is believed that without sufficiently trained and experienced staff in post and without relocating the Centre to a more suitable place in the school, there was, and continues to be, a slightly elevated safeguarding risk which the staff have to mitigate.
17. The school has a Safeguarding policy in place which also covers the specialist Centre and the new Head Teacher has ensured that the six remaining children in the Centre are safe. The Centre, for example, has been moved from the top floor of the building to a more suitable classroom on the ground floor.

Climate change/carbon emissions implications

18. Closure of this Centre will reduce the daily taxi journeys into Surrey being made by the four Hounslow children. The nearest SLCN Centre is located in Stanwell which is close to Ashford and will serve this area of the county in future.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- Subject to approval, public notices will be published at the earliest opportunity for a period of 6 weeks. After this a final report will be brought to The Cabinet Member's November meeting recommending closure of the Centre with effect from January 2014.
- The Public Notices will be placed on the Surrey County Council website and on the School website. A paper copy of the statutory notice will be published on the school gate. Responses will be invited via the Surrey County Council School Organisation email in box. The outcome will be communicated to affected parents and to the school in writing. The decision will be recorded on the SCC website along with other delegated decisions made at the November meeting.

Contact Officers:

Beverley Clarke, Joint Head of Additional and Special Educational Needs

01372 832593

Melanie Harris Schools Commissioning Officer for NE Surrey 020 8541 9556

Consulted:

The School staff, parents of pupils on roll both at the school and at the Centre, Hounslow Local Authority, the local County Councillor

Annexes:

Annex 1 – The Consultation Document

Sources/background papers:

OFSTED report <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/inspection-reports/find-inspection-report/provider/ELS/125071>

HMI report on The Echelford Primary School

The Section 8 Inspection (first Monitoring) report by HMI (February 2013)

This page is intentionally left blank

School Organisation Consultation

On a proposal to close the Specialist Centre for Speech, Language
and Communication Needs at The Echelford Primary School in
Ashford, Surrey

The Proposal

Surrey County Council, in conjunction with the Governing Body of The Echelford Primary School, is proposing

- To close the specialist (SEN) centre at the school with effect from January 2014.
- To provide suitable alternative education for those pupils currently on the roll of the centre
- To continue to provide specialist places at other centres within mainstream Surrey Schools to meet future needs

The current position at The Echelford Primary School

The SEN Centre was established in 2006 and has accommodation for up to 12 pupils. It caters for the learning needs of pupils with speech, language or communication difficulties within a mainstream primary school setting.

The Echelford Centre is one of 49 Specialist Resource Centres across Surrey covering a range of special educational needs. From time to time the viability of the centres, both collectively and individually, is reviewed in relation to the changing pattern of special needs in the county and the quality of the education being provided.

The demand for places at The Echelford Centre has been inconsistent since it opened in 2008. It nominally has 10 places available but in some years it has operated with a few as 4 students. It has never been full. As of June 2013 only 2 of the 6 children on roll will be Surrey residents, the other 4 children being transported from a London borough that maintains their Statements of SEN.

The recent decline in numbers may only partially be attributed to the changing pattern of special needs in the area for it is apparent that The Echelford Centre also faces a number of other challenges.

The site of the Centre was originally located on the second floor of The Echelford, which is a former secondary school building. It was felt by the staff and former Headteacher that the location of the Centre limited the opportunities of SEN students and consideration was given to re-locating it within the building; for this reason it was recently moved to the first floor to try and improve the integration of students with their mainstream peers. This location is still not ideal.

OFSTED's view of SEN provision within mainstream settings is that this is most successful where pupils 'typically spend some of their time taught by specialist teachers' as well as being taught in a normal mainstream classroom alongside

their peers. This inclusive model for delivering education is the basis of the best practice guidance given to schools maintained by Surrey County Council.

It is probably accurate to say that the popularity of the Centre with parents has been adversely affected by the ongoing concerns regarding the overall quality of the provision at the school. OFSTED inspected The Echelford in November 2012 and identified Serious Weaknesses in the quality of education both in the Centre and in the school more generally. These weaknesses are being addressed by the governors and the senior leadership team and progress is being closely monitored by both Surrey County Council and Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Schools (HMI).

Nevertheless since the departure of the Head of Centre the governors have faced particular difficulties in trying to recruit a suitably qualified and experienced teacher to direct and improve the work of the Specialist Centre. Without such a person in post it is difficult to anticipate standards improving for the children accessing the Centre.

What is being proposed

For all of the above reasons the newly appointed Executive Head Teacher and the Governing Body approached Surrey County Council and requested it review the viability of The Echelford Centre. We are considering whether to permanently close it and make better provision for the existing pupils elsewhere. This provision will be made in negotiation with the parents of the individual pupils in the Centre and the maintaining Local Authority, for out of county children. We welcome the views of all parents of children attending the school and the Centre and from other interested parties.

Why are we making these proposals?

It is clear that the numbers of children requiring this type of specialist provision is declining in this part of Surrey. It is also unrealistic to expect the standard of education in the Centre to rapidly improve without the leadership of an appropriately qualified teacher. The County Council believes that it can continue to offer good quality provision for children with speech, language and communication needs in other schools across Surrey as the need arises; this will be available within Spelthorne borough and elsewhere. Therefore the viability of this Centre is questionable.

Have Your Say

We would like to know what the people in the area think about this proposal. There is a consultation form on page 5 of this leaflet.



The consultation opens on **Monday 10 June** and runs for 6 weeks. We are also going to hold a public meeting at the school where you can express your views, obtain more information and have your questions answered. The meetings will be held at:

The Echelford School	on Thursday 13 June	At 5.30 pm
----------------------	---------------------	------------

Please come and share your views. Please also complete the Consultation Response Form on page 5. You can email your views to:
schoolorg@surreycc.gov.uk

The Consultation lasts until Monday 22 July

Next Steps

We will analyse the consultation responses and include them in a report to Surrey County Council's Cabinet Member for Children and Learning. If the case for closure is accepted Statutory Notices will be published in the local press, on the school's website and on the school's gates. There will be a further period of 6 weeks for anyone to comment.

The final decision

The responses to the Statutory Notices are analysed and a report is then prepared for the County Council's Cabinet Member for Children and Learning who will make the final decision on whether or not to close the Specialist Centre at The Echelford School in January 2014.

Consultation Response Form

Proposal to close the Specialist SEN Centre at The Echelford Primary School

Please give us your views. Please tick the box that best shows what you think of the following questions. Also give us any comments you have. You can write on the other side of this sheet if you want more space to write comments.

Do you agree with the proposal to close the SEN Centre at The Echelford from January 2014?

Agree

Don't know

Disagree

Comments:

To help with our analysis of responses please will you tell us something about yourself? Tick the boxes that best apply to you .

A resident of Spelthorne Borough

An resident of another part of Surrey or out of county

A parent/carer of a child attending The Echelford Primary school

A parent/carer of a child attending the SEN Centre

Someone who works at the school

A Governor of the school

Some other link to the school

Someone else with an interest – please give details

Please return by **Monday 22 July 2013** to:

Melanie Harris The Echelford Consultation, Room 326
County Hall, Kingston-upon-Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN

email: schoolorg@surreycc.gov.uk

Please tick if you have written comments on the other side

