

Notice of Meeting

Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning Decisions

**Date & time**

Thursday, 24 April
2014 at 11.30 am

Place

Room 107 - County
Hall

Contact

Anne Gowing
Room 122, County Hall
Tel 020 8541 9938

Chief Executive

David McNulty

anne.gowing@surreycc.gov.uk

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 (18 April 2014).

2b Public Questions

The deadline for public questions is seven days before the meeting (17 April 2014).

2c Petitions

The deadline for petitions was 14 days before the meeting, and no petitions have been received.

3 ASHFORD PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL

(Pages 1
- 8)

Following a public consultation and statutory period for representations, the Cabinet Member is asked to approve the proposal to expand Ashford Park Primary School from 2 to 3 forms of entry. This will increase the total capacity of the school from 420 to 630 pupils. The school will continue to admit 18 pupils into its specialist Centre for Moderate Learning Difficulties. The decision will be subject to planning permission.

4 HURST PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL, WEST MOLESEY

(Pages 9
- 14)

School rolls have been rising steadily across Elmbridge Borough since 2002 and there is an immediate requirement for additional places in the Moleseys Primary Planning area. To ensure sufficient provision of primary school places in West Molesey, Surrey County Council is proposing the expansion of Hurst Park Primary School to two Forms of Entry (2FE) with effect from 1 September 2015. This proposal also recommends that the school is re-built on a new site.

David McNulty
Chief Executive
Published: 11 April 2014

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. To support this, County Hall has wifi available for visitors – please ask at reception for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings with the Chairman's consent. Please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that the Chairman can grant permission and those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to the PA or Induction Loop systems, or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

It is requested that if you are not using your mobile device for any of the activities outlined above, it be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with PA and Induction Loop systems.

Thank you for your co-operation

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING

DATE: 24 APRIL 2014

LEAD OFFICER: NICK WILSON, STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES

SUBJECT: TO DETERMINE WHETHER TO PROCEED WITH THE PROPOSED EXPANSION OF ASHFORD PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL



SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

Following a public consultation and statutory period for representations, the Cabinet Member is asked to approve the proposal to expand Ashford Park Primary School from 2 to 3 forms of entry. This will increase the total capacity of the school from 420 to 630 pupils. The school will continue to admit 18 pupils into its specialist Centre for Moderate Learning Difficulties. The decision will be subject to planning permission.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that:

1. The Cabinet Member approve the proposal that:
 - Ashford Park Primary School is enlarged by 1 form of entry (from 2 FE to 3 FE) on 1 September 2015
 - The school roll is increased by one form each year until September 2021 when its capacity will be 630 pupils
2. An associated building programme goes ahead in a single phase to provide appropriate new classrooms and some improvements to ancillary accommodation.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Surrey County Council is putting plans in place to ensure that its popular schools meet the increased demand for places.

Primary school places in Surrey are in high demand and Spelthorne Borough is an area that has experienced a significant increase in pupil numbers, particularly in the Ashford and Staines conurbations. This demand is initially in the primary sector but will follow into the secondary sector in due course. This scheme is part of Surrey County Council's wider planning for the borough in order to meet the demand for additional capacity.

During the last decade the birth rate has been rising steadily in Spelthorne. It has risen by 24.9% since 2002 which is the fourth highest borough rate in the county. This has affected school rolls and there is an immediate requirement for one additional form of entry (1 FE) in Ashford town. To ensure sufficient provision of primary school places in the area, Surrey County Council is proposing the expansion

of Ashford Park Primary School with effect from 1 September 2015.

The Governing Body of the school supports this proposal and in partnership with Surrey County Council held a public consultation from 4 September-16 October 2013, outlining the reasons for the proposal and inviting responses from stakeholders. Statutory Notices were published and a six-week public consultation was held, ending on 10 March 2014.

As the representative of the responsible body for the planning of school places and the funding body for this scheme, the Cabinet Member is asked to give final approval for the proposal to proceed. This proposal is subject to a planning application which will be submitted in due course.

| |
|-----------------|
| DETAILS: |
|-----------------|

Business Case

1. Based on the most recent forecast of pupil numbers, which projects the requirement for school places up to 2020 and beyond, one additional form of entry in this planning area would meet the basic need. Expansion of an existing school is the logical and most financially prudent response to this issue.
2. Ashford Park Primary is fully subscribed with first preferences up to its Planned Admission Number (PAN). It is an improving 2 FE school with a roll of approximately 420 pupils in total. At its last Ofsted inspection (December 2012) it received a Grade 3 judgement in terms of the learning outcomes of pupils, although inspectors noted that the quality of teaching, behaviour and safeguarding was good. Since then it has received targeted support from the local authority. At its most recent monitoring visit by Her Majesty's Inspectorate it was noted that senior leaders had a clear vision of what needed to be done to improve pupil outcomes and HMI saw evidence that the leadership had secured improvements in both the quality of teaching and learning. The school continues on this upward trajectory and will be re-inspected in due course, certainly before the proposed expansion takes place. By this time it is anticipated that Ashford Park's performance will be judged by Ofsted as good or better.
3. Also on the same campus are a private pre-school and a Surrey County Council maintained specialist centre for primary age pupils with moderate learning difficulties. This proposal does not include the expansion of either of these facilities, both of which will be retained.
4. Ashford Park is currently the most suitable primary school for expansion in the area for a number of reasons:
 - 4.1 This planning area contains seven primary schools:
 - Ashford C of E Primary, which is a 2 FE school on a small site with no room to expand further; this school was also judged by Ofsted as requiring improvement in January 2013.
 - Clarendon Primary: this is currently a very popular 1 FE school which received a Grade 2 interim judgement by Ofsted in 2012, but is unable to expand further due to site capacity restrictions.

- Kenyngton Manor Primary: inspected in September 2012, placed in the 'special measures' category and subsequently converted to a sponsored academy within The Howard of Effingham Learning Partnership. The school is 2 FE and has no room to expand on its present site.
 - Spelthorne School: inspected in November 2012 and judged as 'good' Grade 2. This is a 2 FE primary that has taken an additional Reception ('bulge') class in both 2011 and 2013 and is due to permanently expand to 3 FE in 2014. This school has the site capacity to take more children as it was formerly a middle school and has a lot of land. However it has already planned to expand to 3 FE.
 - St Michael's RC Primary: a 2FE school that serves the local deanery and fills up to its Published Admission Number with catholic children who meet its admissions criteria. The school's last full inspection was in 2008 when it was judged as 'outstanding' and this standard was maintained at its last interim judgement in 2011.
5. The local authority has a statutory duty to provide sufficient school places and it is not currently possible to expand one of the other local schools in the immediate planning area; consequently Ashford Park is the most suitable school to increase by a single form of entry as it has the space, is popular and is improving standards.
 6. This proposal forms one part of a wider area strategy for the whole of the Spelthorne borough which will provide three additional forms (630 primary places overall) by 2021. The area strategy includes expansion of other schools; some of these are agreed and others are still at the proposal stage.

CONSULTATION:

7. A public consultation was carried out between 4 September and 16 October 2013. A consultation document setting out the facts and the proposal was produced and circulated to all parents and other stakeholders and interested parties. In addition two meetings were held at the school on 9 and 10 September 2013, which were attended by approximately 40 parents and residents. The consultation document was also published on the Surrey County Council website and the local borough and county councillors were sent copies.
8. The council received 22 written consultation responses. An analysis of the consultation response forms is given in the table below. (Please note that some respondents fit more than one category e.g. there are two parents who are also local residents, so the numbers may not always add up to 22.)

| Respondent | Number of forms received | Respondents For proposal | Respondents Against proposal | Respondents who Don't Know |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Total response forms received | 22 | 3 | 15 | 3 |
| Employee of the school | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| School governor | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Parent of child at Riverview | 11 | 1 | 9 | 1 |
| Resident | 14 | 2 | 9 | 2 |

9. The governing body plus three respondents are in agreement with the proposal. Three people state that they do not know whether or not they are in favour or they have submitted a qualified or unclearly expressed view; 15 respondents who sent in individual forms are against the proposal. This is a very low number of responses received, given the potential for many more parents, residents and staff to have expressed an opinion.
10. The main concern raised by respondents opposed to this proposal is the volume of additional traffic that an expansion would generate. The school is situated in a cul de sac and residents and some parents are concerned that there are inadequate parking facilities for parents to drop off and pick up their children from school. Residents note the dangerous parking and discourtesy of drivers currently parking outside the school and they highlight their fears of accidents involving children if the situation is exacerbated by more traffic. One respondent has suggested that an alternative entrance to the school is considered.
11. Other respondents noted the perceived effect on the pupils' emotional and educational needs if the school were to expand. There was a feeling expressed by a number of people that a larger school would affect individual children's potential to do well; and the Head and staff's ability to forge meaningful relationships with a greater number of pupils was brought into question.
12. There were concerns expressed about the size of the school hall and the requirement to share other facilities between more pupils. Some parents say they chose Ashford Park because it was a smaller primary school and they felt that this is what their child needed. Some people also highlighted the disruption a building project would cause. One person put forward an alternative suggestion to expand another school in the area but the specific suggestion would have prohibitive costs attached to it and would involve purchasing another building and relocating the private pre-school and the Specialist Centre for Moderate Learning Difficulties to other sites.
13. Officers are aware of the strength of feeling in this respect and a traffic survey has been undertaken with a view to reviewing traffic management issues at the school. This aspect of the proposal is being reviewed and will be fully addressed in the planning stages with pupil safety considerations being of paramount importance. The council's policies on safeguarding, site security and environmental issues are being factored into the final design for the new building and remodelling works.

14. Statutory Notices were published and a six week public consultation was held, ending on 10 March 2014. No further responses were received.
15. Those people in support of the proposal, including the Governing Body, recognise the need for more places and welcome the opportunity to provide these at Ashford Park Primary in order to benefit the immediate local community and potentially cut down on the number of people having to drive their children to school. Some qualified their support for expansion on the understanding that adequate resourcing of the project and traffic management measures would be assured.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

16. The key risk to this proposal is the dependency on a successful planning application to develop the site which includes mitigation of the impact of additional school traffic as far as possible.
17. If permission to expand the school is denied then there will be insufficient school places in Ashford and some parents living in relatively close proximity to Ashford Park will have to travel further to obtain a school place for their primary age children. This is likely to cause the satisfaction rating based on first preferences to fall.
18. There is currently only one other school in the area capable of expansion (Spelthorne School) and this has already undertaken to expand to 3FE. Our only option would be to make this even larger.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

19. This scheme is included within the 2014/19 Medium Term Financial Plan. A detailed business case will be developed for each construction phase prior to tendering for works.

Section 151 Commentary

20. There is approved funding for this scheme in the current 2014/19 Medium Term Financial Plan. Detailed costings will be developed for the business case and each case will be subject to Investment Panel approval.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

21. The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 contain the regulations that apply to prescribed alterations. The Department for Education has 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.
22. This Guidance has been followed by the School Commissioning Officer in the development of this proposal.

Equalities and Diversity

23. There are no direct equalities implications arising out of the proposal. The increased provision will be open to all applicants irrespective of race, gender, faith, ethnicity or ability. The admissions arrangements will give the highest priority to Looked After Children and pupils on the SEN register and/or those who would benefit from a statement of educational need, thus supporting provision for our most vulnerable children. Children with siblings will receive the next priority, followed by those children living closest to the school. There is no proposal to amend the admissions criteria.

Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults implications

24. The school has a robust Safeguarding Policy which is monitored by the designated Child Protection Lead Officer, is regularly reviewed by the governing body and is subject to Ofsted inspection. Site access and security, both during the proposed building programme and afterwards, have been considered and addressed in the planning and design of this building project.

Climate change/carbon emissions implications

25. The county council attaches great importance to being environmentally aware and wishes to show leadership in cutting carbon emissions and tackling climate change. A safe walking route to the school has been identified for use by children and families and a rear pedestrian entrance to the campus may be re-opened as part of this scheme. A traffic survey will be done and the School Travel Plan will be updated prior to any planning application. Facilities are already provided on campus for children cycling or using scooters to come to school.
26. The location of additional school provision at Ashford Park is centred close to the demographic demand and as a result will enable parents and children to attend a local school and thus should reduce either the need for, or length of, school journeys.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- Subject to Cabinet Member approval and planning approval the building programme will commence.
- The Cabinet Member's decision will be published on the Surrey County Council website and parents of pupils at the school will be notified by letter from the Governing Body.

Contact Officer:

Melanie Harris

School Commissioning Officer NE Surrey tel. 020 8541 9556

Consulted:

Parents of pupils and prospective pupils of Ashford Park Primary School

Local Councillors

Local residents

Annexes: None

Sources/background papers:

School Organisation Consultation Proposal

Consultation responses

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING****DATE: 24 APRIL 2014****LEAD OFFICER: NICK WILSON, STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES****SUBJECT: TO DETERMINE WHETHER TO PROCEED WITH THE PROPOSED EXPANSION TO RELOCATE, REBUILD AND EXPAND HURST PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL, WEST MOLESEY****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

School rolls have been rising steadily across Elmbridge Borough since 2002 and there is an immediate requirement for additional places in the Moleseys Primary Planning area. To ensure sufficient provision of primary school places in West Molesey, Surrey County Council is proposing the expansion of Hurst Park Primary School to two Forms of Entry (2FE) with effect from 1 September 2015. This proposal also recommends that the school is re-built on a new site.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that:

1. The Cabinet Member approve the proposal that:

- Hurst Park Primary School is enlarged by 1 form of entry (from 1 FE to 2 FE) on 1 September 2015;
- The school is relocated to the former John Nightingale School site on Hurst Road, West Molesey;

2. An associated building programme goes ahead to provide a new Hurst Park Primary school.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Based on the most recent forecast of pupil numbers, which projects the requirement for school places up to 2020 and beyond, two additional forms of entry in this planning area would meet the basic need. Expansion of existing schools is the logical and most financially prudent response to this issue.

Hurst Park Primary School is a popular and successful school which delivers a high quality education. It was rated as a good school by Ofsted at its last full inspection (May 2013). The provision of additional places at Hurst Park Primary therefore meets the government's policy position to expand successful and popular schools in order to provide quality places and meet parental preferences.

DETAILS:

Business Case

1. There is a clear need for additional primary school places in the Moleseys planning area. This area is served by five schools: Chandlers Field Primary, St Alban's Catholic Primary School (which has also recently secured agreement to expand by 1 FE in order to meet the needs of catholic residents in the wider deanery); Orchard Infant, St Lawrence Junior (due to be rebuilt under the government's Priority Schools Building Programme) and Hurst Park.
2. Hurst Park Primary School has previously expanded temporarily by taking additional reception 'bulge' classes in 2012 and 2013 to help relieve the pressure for places in the area. It therefore already has two cohorts of 60 pupils in the present Reception and Year 1.
3. Hurst Park Primary School is willing to permanently expand in the longer term and is keen to do so with the expectation of new accommodation which is designed to enhance the quality of the educational opportunities on offer. The staff and governors have been working closely with Surrey County Council to agree a design for the new school on the John Nightingale site. The governing body is also keen to improve the access to the school for pedestrians and vehicles in response to parents' and residents' concerns about the volume of traffic and safety on Hurst Road. Advice has been taken from Surrey County Council's Highways Department in this regard and a full traffic survey has been undertaken.
4. A number of residents living adjacent to the proposed new school site have raised concerns about the location of the new school's main entrance and the impact this will have on residents due to parental parking at key times. Advice on traffic calming measures and parking arrangements has been incorporated into the planning application.
5. The local authority has a statutory duty to provide sufficient school places and it is not currently possible to expand one of the other local schools in the immediate planning area or to increase the size of Hurst Park on its present site. Building a new school on land already owned by the council seems to be the best option and affords the best educational opportunity, since the new school will benefit from the existing leadership and expertise of a Headteacher and staff with a proven track record for success.
6. Based on the most recent pupil projections, the county council is forecasting a need for two additional forms of entry in The Moleseys in the immediate future. This proposal therefore forms one part of a wider area strategy with a further form of entry planned for St Alban's.

CONSULTATION:

7. A public consultation was carried out between 2 December 2013 and 6 January 2014. A consultation document was produced and circulated to all parents and other stakeholders and interested parties. In addition, two meetings were held at the school on Tuesday 3 December 2013, which were attended by approximately sixty parents and residents. On 27 November 2013 the school held an open presentation meeting for stakeholders to view

the draft plans for the design of the new school. This was also well attended. The consultation document was also published on the Surrey County Council website and the local borough and county councillors were sent copies.

8. The council had received 33 written responses in total by the close of the consultation; five responses arrived soon after the deadline and so have been included in this analysis. A summary of all the consultation response forms is given in the table below. **Please note that some residents are also parents of pupils on roll at Hurst Park so will be counted in both categories, therefore the numbers in the individual columns won't always total 38:**

| Respondent | Number of Forms /emails received | Against | For | Don't Know/undecided |
|--|----------------------------------|---------|-----|----------------------|
| Total Responses received | 38 | 5 | 22 | 12 |
| Employee of the school | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HP School governor | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Parents of children on roll | (5) | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Other parents or reps of other schools | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residents | 37 | 5 | 20 | 12 |

9. Statutory notices were published, and a four week consultation concluded on Monday 24 March 2014 at 12 noon. No further responses were received
10. The governing body plus twenty-two respondents are in agreement with the proposal. Twelve people state that they do not know whether or not they are in favour, with a number stating that they want more information about the building development before deciding. Five respondents who sent in forms or emailed comments are against the proposal.
11. The main concerns raised by respondents is the anticipation of parking problems associated with the entrance to the new school building being located on the design plans on Freeman Road, within the Bishop Fox estate. They would prefer this to be on the main Hurst Road served by reinstating the old slip road that existed when the John Nightingale Special School was on this site.
12. The residents on the estate point out that the roads are too narrow to accommodate the volume of traffic and pedestrians a school may bring. Some residents also object to the potential noise, litter and intrusions to their properties from pupils at the school.
13. Unfortunately the postal delivery to the residents of the Bishop Fox estate did not arrive until after the public consultation meetings at the school. Although the primary purpose of these two meetings was to inform parents about the educational impact of this proposal, and was not to discuss the design or planning issues, some residents who were not parents of children currently on roll at Hurst Park Primary contacted the local authority expressing their dissatisfaction at not being able to attend a meeting and hear about the proposal first hand. The Governing Body and the School Commissioning Officer therefore convened a further meeting for the residents on 20 March

2014. Verbal comments were noted and residents were informed that they could still submit a representation to the Surrey County Council Planning Officer prior to the application being considered by the committee.

14. A number of residents supported the proposal to rebuild on the John Nightingale site; however many shared the concerns about traffic and road safety issues on Hurst Road.
15. Those people in support of the proposal recognised the need for more places and welcomed the opportunity to provide these at a purpose built primary school with more space for pupils to play. However even some of these people expressed reservations about the pedestrian entrance being on Freeman Drive. Some people qualified their support for expansion on the understanding that traffic management measures would be assured.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

16. The key risk to this proposal is the dependency on a successful planning application to develop the site which includes mitigation of the impact of additional school traffic as far as possible.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

17. The Hurst Park Primary School scheme is included within 2014/19 Medium Term Financial Plan. Detailed options and costings will be developed as part of the scheme business case at each phase of construction. Options for build solutions and delivery will be considered as part of the business analysis to ensure Value for Money.

Section 151 Commentary

18. The Section 151 officer confirms this scheme is included in the 2014/19 Medium Tern Financial Plan and a detailed business case is expected to be developed and will go to Investment Panel for approval.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

19. The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 contain the regulations that apply to prescribed alterations. The Department for Education has 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. This guidance has been followed.

Equalities and Diversity

20. There are no direct equalities implications arising out of the proposal. The increased provision will be open to all applicants irrespective of race, gender, faith, ethnicity or ability. The Admissions arrangements will give the highest priority to Looked After Children and pupils on the SEN register and/or those

who would benefit from a statement of educational need, thus supporting provision for our most vulnerable children. Children with siblings will receive the next priority, followed by those children living closest to the school. There is no proposal to amend the admissions criteria which is fully compliant with the Schools Admissions Code.

Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults implications

21. The school has a robust Safeguarding Policy which is monitored by the designated Child Protection Lead Officer, is regularly reviewed by the governing body and is subject to Ofsted inspection. Site access and security, both during the proposed building programme and afterwards, have been considered and addressed in the planning and design of this building project. Consultation responses will be taken into account when the final design is submitted.

Climate change/carbon emissions implications

22. The county council attaches great importance to being environmentally aware and wishes to show leadership in cutting carbon emissions and tackling climate change. A safe walking route to the new school site has been identified for use by children and families. In addition, the design for the new school will include facilities on campus to encourage children to cycle or use scooters to come to school.

23. The additional school provision is centred close to the demographic demand and as a result will enable parents and children to attend a local school and thus should reduce either the need for, or length of, school journeys.

24. The design of the new school is energy efficient and follows all local guidance and standards in this respect.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- Subject to Cabinet Member approval, planning approval will be sought.
- The outcome of the consultation and Cabinet Member’s decision will be published on the Surrey County Council website and parents of pupils at the school will be notified by letter from the Governing Body.

Contact Officer:

Melanie Harris
School Commissioning Officer NE Surrey tel. 020 8541 9556

Consulted:

Parents of pupils and prospective pupils of Hurst Park Primary School
Local Councillors
Local residents

Annexes: none

Sources/background papers:

School Organisation Consultation Proposal
Consultation responses to be tabled at the meeting

This page is intentionally left blank