

Notice of Meeting

Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement Decisions

**Date & time**

Thursday, 3 March
2016 at 10.00 am

Place

Members' Conference
Room, County Hall,
Kingston upon
Thames, KT1 2DN

Contact

Andrew Baird or Rianna
Hanford
Room 122, County Hall
Tel 020 8541 7609 or 020
8213 2662

Chief Executive

David McNulty

andrew.baird@surreyc.gov.uk or
rianna.hanford@surreycc.gov.uk



We're on Twitter:
[@SCCdemocracy](https://twitter.com/SCCdemocracy)

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 democratic.services@surreycc.gov.uk.

This meeting will be held in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact Andrew Baird or Rianna Hanford on 020 8541 7609 or 020 8213 2662.

Elected Members
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 ITEMS

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

The deadline for Members' questions is 12pm four working days before the meeting (26 February 2016).

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The deadline for public questions is seven days before the meeting (25 February 2016)

PETITIONS

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

3 AMALGAMATION OF THE WILLOWS PRIMARY AND WEY VALLEY COLLEGE

(Pages 1
- 6)

Surrey County Council (SCC) has consulted on a proposal to amalgamate The Willows Primary and Wey Valley College from 1 April 2016 so that the south west area has one single Pupil Referral Unit (PRU).

The consultation period was from 5 January to noon on 19 January 2016 and there was a public meeting during this time, held on 13 January. Statutory Notices were issued on 19 January, were displayed at each site and published in the local newspaper stating the intention to amalgamate the two PRUs.

The Cabinet Member is asked to review the proposal and comments received during the consultation and statutory notice periods.

4 PROPOSED EXPANSION OF FURZEFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL

(Pages 7
- 32)

Surrey County Council has consulted on a proposal to expand Furzefield Primary School by 1 form of entry from September 2016. The Education Consultation was conducted between 18 January and 15 February 2016.

The Cabinet Member is asked to review the education rationale for the project and summary of the consultation process/feedback provided within this report and associated Annexes and, on that basis, decide whether to determine the associated Statutory Notice.

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, SKILLS AND
EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT****DATE: 3 MARCH 2016****LEAD OFFICER: JULIE FISHER, DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE****SUBJECT: AMALGAMATION OF THE WILLOWS PRIMARY AND WEY
VALLEY COLLEGE****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Surrey County Council (SCC) has consulted on a proposal to amalgamate The Willows Primary and Wey Valley College from 1 April 2016 so that the south west area has one single Pupil Referral Unit (PRU).

The consultation period was from 5 January to noon on 19 January 2016 and there was a public meeting during this time, held on 13 January. Statutory Notices were issued on 19 January, were displayed at each site and published in the local newspaper stating the intention to amalgamate the two PRUs.

The Cabinet Member is asked to review the proposal and comments received during the consultation and statutory notice periods.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the Statutory Notice stating the Local Authority's intention to amalgamate the two PRUs is determined, such that there will be one PRU in the south west area from 1 April 2016. The single establishment will be based across two sites: the primary provision at the Pewley Hill site and the secondary provision at the Southway site.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

This will lead to streamlined PRU provision in the south west area of Surrey which replicates that in the south east area. All pupils at risk of permanent exclusion in the area will be supported under the same leadership team leading to a consistent approach to pupils' needs and working arrangements.

DETAILS:**Business Case**

1. The Willows is a PRU located in Guildford for pupils aged 5-11. The Willows was rated as Good by Ofsted during its last inspection in June 2015. Following a change to the age range of the PRU last year the school is funded for 11 full time primary aged places.
2. Wey Valley College is a PRU also located in Guildford for pupils aged 11-16. The last inspection visit by Ofsted in January 2015 rated the school as Good, with leadership and management rated as Outstanding.

3. Both The Willows and Wey Valley College offer provision for pupils that have been or are at risk of being permanently excluded from a school and who live in the south west area of Surrey.
4. Following the change of age range to The Willows, and in partnership with both The Willows and Wey Valley College's Management Committees, Wey Valley College has been providing interim leadership to The Willows with an Executive Headteacher overseeing both PRUs. The opportunity for close working arrangements between the PRUs started during the autumn term 2015 and has been further developed during the interim leadership period. The interim arrangements have led to the consideration of a formal amalgamation between the PRUs and the end of the financial year would provide a natural point for an amalgamation to occur.
5. The amalgamation of The Willows with Wey Valley College will form an all through 5 – 16 years of age statutory PRU which replicates arrangements that exist in the south east of the county. This will provide the schools in the south west area with a similar model of provision to support vulnerable pupils across all key stages that are at risk of permanent exclusion, under the same leadership team.
6. There will be no change to pupil admissions or transition arrangements. Pupils will continue to access the provision according to the processes that are currently in place. Wey Valley College and The Willows staff will continue to support the re-integration of pupils into mainstream schools at the appropriate time dependent on the individual pupil needs.
7. No changes to staffing are anticipated. There are permanent members of staff who will continue to work with either the primary or secondary pupils, as they do currently. With the amalgamation there will be opportunities for staff to gain experience, where appropriate, at a different phase of education enhancing the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) offer. With a larger organisation there are more opportunities for internal progression as a middle leadership level will be created to support the senior team.
8. The Management Committee and Senior Leadership Team at both PRUs are fully in agreement with the proposal to amalgamate.

<u>CONSULTATION:</u>

9. A consultation period started on 5 January and concluded at noon on 19 January 2016. A public meeting was held on 13 January. There were no attendees at the public consultation meeting.
10. A total of 5 written responses were received during the consultation period via the Surrey Says website, post and email:

Young Person attending The Willows	0
Young Person attending Wey Valley College	0
Parent/carer of a young person attending The Willows	1
Parent/carer of a young person attending Wey Valley College	0
The Willows staff or management committee	0
Wey Valley College staff or management committee	1
Healthcare professional	0
Social care professional	0
Other	3

11. Of the responses received 100% agreed with the proposal to amalgamate the two PRUs. Additional commentary was provided by four of the responders focussing on the benefit to pupils and staff at both PRUs, leading to shared expertise and better outcomes.
12. One responder, although fully supportive of the proposal, commented that economies of scale should not be overestimated and that there would be additional complexities and costs with a split site campus.
13. The Statutory Notice period ran from 19 January to noon on 17 February 2016 and generated no further responses to the proposal.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

14. If the amalgamation did not occur then there is a risk that different approaches would continue to be taken across the south west area dependent on age groups. By working with the same management team at the PRU an amalgamation would offer a continuity of service and consistent approach to all mainstream schools in the south west area of Surrey.
15. There is significant pressure on expenditure for Special Educational Needs and Disability provision and a duty for the authority to ensure that this funding is used to maximum effect. The amalgamation would create a larger more sustainable organisation, leading to more efficient use of public resources. If the amalgamation did not happen there is the risk that two smaller organisations would be unable to offer earlier help approaches to the mainstream sector for pupils prior to permanent exclusion, rather than only to those pupils that have been permanently excluded.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

16. There will be economies of scale obtained with an amalgamation of the two schools as there will be greater flexibility with a larger budget to deploy staff and curriculum resources effectively. There will also be opportunities to refine costs in relation to teaching and support staff by, for example, one whole school business manager and developing a leadership team that can work across all key stages.

Section 151 Officer Commentary

17. The proposed merger of the two pupil referral units does not create any new financial risks and the combined, larger, pupil referral unit can be expected to be more sustainable than the two existing, smaller units.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

18. In considering this Report, Cabinet must give due regard to the results of the consultation set out and the response of the Service to the consultation comments and conscientiously take these matters into account when making its final decision.
19. In coming to a decision on this issue the Cabinet needs to take account of all relevant matters. The weight to be given to each of the relevant matters is for the Cabinet to decide. Relevant matters in this context will include the statutory requirements under the School Organisation Regulations 2013, policy considerations, the impacts of the options on service provision, the medium term financial plan, the Council's fiduciary duty, any relevant risks, and the results of the consultation.
20. The best value duty is contained in Section 3 of the Local Government Act 1999 as a result of which the Council is under a duty to make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness. The relevant guidance states that Councils should consider overall value, including economic, environmental and social value when reviewing service provision.

Equalities and Diversity

21. No impacts have been identified as part of this proposal. The two PRUs will continue to offer provision as they have done previously, with no changes for children and young people or staff.

Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults implications

22. Safeguarding vulnerable children is a high priority in Surrey schools and PRUs. Schools and PRUs have considerable expertise in safeguarding vulnerable children and adhere to robust procedures. The PRU would continue to apply good practice in the area of safeguarding. Safeguarding is monitored when Ofsted carries out inspections.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

23. Subject to Cabinet Member approval of the Statutory Notice, the proposal will be confirmed for The Willows Primary and Wey Valley College being amalgamated to form one PRU for pupils aged 5 - 16, called Wey Valley College, across two separate sites from 1 April 2016.

Contact Officer:

Julie Beckett, School Commissioning Officer, Tel: 01483 518109

Consulted:

SCC County Councillors for the local area

All south west secondary schools

All south west primary schools

All special schools

All parents of young people at The Willows and Wey Valley College

All staff and the Management Committee at The Willows and Wey Valley College

Family Voice
SCC Officers
Unions
Babcock 4S Consultants

Sources/background papers:

School Organisation Consultation paper: Proposal to amalgamate The Willows Primary and Wey Valley College to form a single establishment

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS, SKILLS AND
EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT****DATE: 3 MARCH 2016****LEAD OFFICER: JULIE FISHER, DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE****SUBJECT: PROPOSED EXPANSION OF FURZEFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Surrey County Council has consulted on a proposal to expand Furzefield Primary School by 1 form of entry from September 2016. The Education Consultation was conducted between 18 January and 15 February 2016.

The Cabinet Member is asked to review the education rationale for the project and summary of the consultation process/feedback provided within this report and associated Annexes and, on that basis, decide whether to determine the associated Statutory Notice.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member determines the Statutory Notice, thereby bringing into effect the formal expansion of Furzefield Primary School by 1 Form of Entry (1 FE) for September 2016.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

There is an increasing demand for primary school places in Merstham as well as the wider Reigate and Redhill area, which reflects a rise in the primary-age population over recent years. In order to meet this demand, there is a need to expand school capacity in the area. The proposal to expand the capacity of Furzefield Primary School by 1 FE is a core element of Surrey County Council's (SCC) strategy in this respect. In line with this, SCC has undertaken the requisite statutory consultation to inform the decision making process and a single formal objection was received as part of this. For these reasons, it is recommended that the Cabinet Member determines the Statutory Notice (appended to this report as Annex 1), so as to bring the expansion of the school formally into effect.

DETAILS:**The Proposal**

1. On 18 January 2016, Surrey County Council (SCC) published a proposal to:
 - Enlarge Furzefield Primary School from two forms of entry (2 FE) at Reception to three forms of entry (3 FE) at Reception, to allow for a roll of 630, comprising three classes of 30 pupils in each year group.
 - Build additional permanent classrooms and ancillary space to facilitate this.

2. It was proposed that the above enlargement would be effective from 1 September 2016 and that the school would grow incrementally, year-on-year, as the higher intake of 90 pupils worked its way progressively through the age range. As such, the school would effectively reach its new capacity of 630 places in September 2022. The incremental expansion in capacity is shown in the table below (it is worth noting that the school presently has two bulge year classes working their way through later school years):

Year	YR	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	Total
2016/17	90	60	60	60	90	90	60	510
2017/18	90	90	60	60	60	90	90	540
2018/19	90	90	90	60	60	60	90	540
2019/20	90	90	90	90	60	60	60	540
2020/21	90	90	90	90	90	60	60	570
2021/22	90	90	90	90	90	90	60	600
2022/23	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	630

Reasons for the Proposal

3. Reigate & Banstead is experiencing a steady increase in demand for school places, reflecting both a rise in birth rate and increased house building and migration within the area. Births in the Borough in 2014 were 27.7% higher than births in 2002. A significant number of primary school places have been provided reflective of this demand and further growth is anticipated in the short- to medium-term, which needs to be accommodated via further expansions of school provision.
4. Within the Merstham Planning Area, there is presently provision for 90 places per year in Reception, composed of the following:
- Merstham Primary School (offering 30 Reception places per annum); and
 - Furzefield Primary School (offering 60 Reception places per annum).
5. Demand for primary school places has been rising in Merstham, in line with the general increase across the whole of the Reigate & Banstead Borough. Projections of future demand for school places are presented in the below table:

Year	YR PAN	YR Projection	Deficit
2015/16	90	96	6
2016/17	90	104	14
2017/18	90	105	15
2018/19	90	104	14
2019/20	90	103	13
2020/21	90	104	14
2021/22	90	105	15
2022/23	90	105	15
2023/24	90	106	16
2024/25	90	108	18

6. Due to the high degree of cross-area pupil movement, the above projected deficits should also be viewed in the context of projections of demand for school places across the wider Reigate & Redhill area (the numbers below incorporate the numbers above):

Year	YR PAN	YR Projection	Deficit
2015/16	870	944	74
2016/17	900	994	94
2017/18	900	979	79
2018/19	900	956	56
2019/20	900	945	45
2020/21	900	951	51
2021/22	900	957	57
2022/23	900	961	61
2023/24	900	966	66
2024/25	900	973	73

7. As can be seen from the above, there is a sustained need for additional Primary places within Merstham as well as the wider Reigate and Redhill area. Whilst SCC managed the immediate pressure for September 2015 in Merstham and the wider area via the delivery of a number of “bulge” year expansions (including 30 places at Mershtam Primary School), the need for permanent expansions remains. A core component of the strategy devised to meet this need is the proposed expansion of Furzefield by a Form of Entry, which (if approved) would reduce all of the above projected deficits by 30 places.
8. Where possible, SCC’s strategy is to expand high quality provision that meets parental demand, whilst also ensuring that there is a diverse pattern of provision, so as to provide families with some element of choice. The most recent Ofsted report on the school, from November 2012, rates the school as ‘Good’. In particular, this report noted that “pupils are keen and enthusiastic to attend school and show positive attitudes both to each other and to their learning. They enjoy their lessons and behave well in and around school”. The evident quality of education provision at Furzefield was a key reason underpinning the move to expand this school and thereby increase the provision of high-quality school places to the local community.

School Building Requirements

9. The school site has sufficient capacity to enable expansion in its existing location. Naturally, though, a building programme will be required to provide the permanent facilities to allow for the increase in pupil intake. To this end, SCC has allowed for an appropriate capital sum for this project, within the Basic Need Capital Programme element of its Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP).
10. Should the decision be taken to proceed with the expansion, design workshops will be undertaken in partnership with the school to develop the building proposal, on the basis of which a planning application will be submitted and consulted upon separately.

CONSULTATION:

11. As a Community school, the increase in admission numbers was the subject of a Council-led consultation process which was held for a 4-week period, between 18 January and 15 February 2016. This process engaged a range of interested stakeholders, including the school community, local residents, local admissions authorities and the Surrey School Admissions Forum. On 3 February 2016, a consultation evening was held at the school to which all interested parties were invited. A summary of the feedback from the consultation evening is appended to this report as Annex 2. In total, two formal responses to the consultation were received, with one of these being opposed to the proposed expansion.
12. As can be seen from Annex 2, the feedback from the consultation evening raised a number of issues, most of which were neutral in character. One core, common concern was raised in relation to the proposal, in terms of the perception that parking around (and access to) the site at peak drop-off/pick-up times was an issue. Whilst this concern could not be fully dealt with at this stage, it is an issue that will be comprehensively addressed through the design and planning process for the proposed new build. In this respect, should it be deemed that highways measures are required to mitigate the level of expansion proposed, these will be integrated into the wider scheme. As such, should the decision be taken to proceed with this proposal, this concern will be relayed to the project delivery team, to inform that phase of the project.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

13. As the education consultation has been completed in compliance with the relevant legislation governing such decisions, there is no outstanding risk in this respect.
14. There are naturally risks associated with the building project required to facilitate this expansion. Ultimately, these are in large part related to cost and programme i.e. the capacity to deliver the requisite project within the defined financial parameters, in line with the timeline for increased demand. A Risk Register is being maintained and updated on a regular basis by the Project Manager of the scheme and this should serve to both mitigate risk (in part) and to provide early foresight of any issues as they materialise. A contingency allowance appropriate to the scheme has been included within the project budget to mitigate for potential identified risks.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

15. The building project associated with this proposal is included in SCC's Basic Need Capital Programme element of its 2016-21 MTFP. A scheme of works will be developed and agreed by Property Services and this will subsequently go to Cabinet for approval. All schemes are expected to remain within the funding that has been allocated to them in the MTFP.

Section 151 Officer Commentary

16. The basic need expansion scheme for this school is included in the 2016-21 MTFP.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

Public Sector Equality Duty

17. The public sector equality duty (Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010) applies to the decision to be made by the Cabinet Member in this report. There is a requirement when deciding upon the recommendations to have due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity for people with protected characteristics, foster good relations between such groups, and eliminate any unlawful discrimination. These matters are dealt with in the equalities paragraphs of the report.

Pre-consultation

18. There is a clear expectation in public law that the Council should carry out a consultation process whenever it is considering making significant changes to service provision, particularly including the closure of any of its resources. There is a statutory requirement for consultation in this context as set out in the School Organisation Maintained Schools Guidance for Proposers and Decision Makers dated January 2014 and the School Admissions Code 2014.
19. Expansion of the capacity of Furzeffield Primary School by 1 Form Entry from two forms of entry (2 FE) at Reception to three forms of entry (3 FE) at Reception to allow for a roll of 630, comprising three classes of 30 pupils in each year group, is defined under Chapter 2 of the Guidance as a significant change. Such consultation thus needed to involve those directly affected by such changes together with relevant representative groups. It was important that the material presented to consultees provided sufficient information to allow for intelligent consideration and response in relation to the proposals. This information needed to be presented in a way that consultees understood. The responses to the consultation will need to be conscientiously taken into account when the Cabinet Member makes any future decision in relation to the expansion.

Post-consultation

20. In considering this Report, the Cabinet Member must give due regard to the results of the consultation as set out in Annex 2 – Summary of Consultation, and the response of the Service to the consultation comments and conscientiously take these matters into account when making its final decision.

General Decision-Making

21. In coming to a decision on this issue, the Cabinet Member needs to take account of all relevant matters. The weight to be given to each of the relevant matters is for the Cabinet Member to decide. Relevant matters in this context will include the statutory requirements, the policy considerations, the impacts of the options on service provision, the medium term financial plan, the Council's fiduciary duty, any relevant risks, the results of the consultation and the public sector equality duty.

Fiduciary Duty

22. The Council owes a fiduciary duty to its Council tax payers, analogous to that owed by trustees responsible for looking after property belonging to other people. Accordingly, in deciding to spend money a local authority must take account of the interests of Council taxpayers who have contributed to the Council's income and balance those interests against those who benefit from the expenditure. It will also need to act in a prudent way having regard to the short and long term consequences of the decision.

Best Value Duty

23. The best value duty is contained in Section 3 of the Local Government Act 1999 as a result of which the Council is under a duty to make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness. The relevant guidance states that Councils should consider overall value, including economic, environmental and social value when reviewing service provision.

School Expansion

24. Section 13 of the Education Act 1996 places a general duty on the Council to secure that efficient primary and secondary education is available to meet the needs of the population in its area. In doing so, the Council is required to contribute to the spiritual, moral, mental and physical development of the community. Section 14 of the Education Act 1996 places a duty on the Council to secure that sufficient schools for providing primary and secondary education are available in its area. There is a legal duty on the Council therefore to secure the availability of efficient education in its area and sufficient schools to enable this.
25. This report sets out how the Authority will meet its duties in response to increasing demand for school places in Merstham, in line with the general increase across the whole of Reigate and Banstead Borough.
26. As the school's capacity and published admission number will be increased, a consultation and publication of notices was required. Responses to the consultation were considered carefully and the School Organisation Guidance and Admissions Code 2014 were duly followed.

<u>Equalities and Diversity</u>
--

27. The expansion of the school will not create any issues that would require the production of an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA), as no group with protected characteristics will be adversely affected as a consequence of its approval, or otherwise.
28. The new school building will comply with Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) regulations.
29. As a Community school, admissions to Furzefield are governed by Surrey County Council's Determined Admissions Arrangements. These admissions arrangements give the highest priority to Looked After Children (LAC) and children with exceptional medical or social needs, thus supporting provision

for the county's most vulnerable children. The next order of priority employs the "sibling rule", following which priority is given to children for whom the school is the nearest to their home address. Remaining applicants are then sorted on the basis of distance from home to school. There is no proposal to amend the admissions criteria which are fully compliant with the Schools Admissions Code.

Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications

30. This proposal would provide increased provision for primary places in the area, which would be of benefit to the community served by the school. This would therefore also be of benefit to any Looked After Children who have the opportunity of attending the school, with this grouping of children receiving the highest priority ranking within the school's admission arrangements.

Climate change/carbon emissions implications

31. The design philosophy is to create buildings that will support low energy consumption, reduce solar gain and promote natural ventilation. The school will be built to the local planning authority's adopted core planning strategy. Furthermore, the provision of additional school places to meet local demand is likely to have a positive impact on reducing journey times (and therefore carbon emissions), relative to the scenario of not so doing.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

32. Subject to Cabinet Member approval of the recommendation of this report, the next steps are:
- To implement the proposed expansion from September 2016.
 - To take a Business Case for the associated capital works scheme to SCC's Cabinet at a future date.
 - If approval to the above referenced Business Case is granted, the project will move to delivery, with a view to having the expanded school facilities ready to accommodate the new cohort, in line with the timeline for increased demand. At present, it is expected that the school can accommodate the forecast growth for September 2016 within its existing facilities and that, consequently, the new facilities will need to be available for September 2017.

Contact Officer:

Oliver Gill, School Commissioning Officer, Tel: 020 8541 7383

Consulted:

Furze field School Governing Body
Parents of pupils attending the school
Local residents
Local Headteachers
Julie Stockdale, Head of School Commissioning & Admissions
Bob Gardner, Local County Council Member for Merstham & Banstead South
Reigate & Banstead Borough Council
Unions (NUT, NASUWT, NAHT, ATL, GMB, UNISON)
School Admissions Forum

Annexes:

Annex 1 – Furzefield Primary School Statutory Notice (Full)

Annex 2 – Summary of Consultation Feedback

Sources/background papers:

- Furzefield Primary School Consultation Document
-

Annex 1 – Furzeffield Primary School Statutory Notice (Full)

PROPOSALS FOR PRESCRIBED ALTERATIONS OTHER THAN FOUNDATION PROPOSALS:

Notice is given in accordance with section 19(1) of the Education and Inspections Act 2006, as amended by the Education Act 2011, that Surrey County Council intends to make a significant change to **Furzeffield Primary School**.

In respect of a Governing Body Proposal: School and governing body's details

1. The name, address and category of the school for which the governing body are publishing the proposals.

N/A

In respect of an LEA Proposal: School and local education authority details

1. The name, address and category of the school.

Furzeffield Primary School, Delabole Road, Merstham, Redhill, Surrey, RH1 3PA
(Community School)

Implementation and any proposed stages for implementation

2. The date on which the proposals are planned to be implemented, and if they are to be implemented in stages, a description of what is planned for each stage, and the number of stages intended and the dates of each stage.

From September 2016, it is proposed to enlarge Furzeffield Primary School from two forms of entry (2FE) at Reception to three forms of entry (3FE) at Reception. The school will expand incrementally year on year, as the higher intake of 90 pupils works its way progressively through the age range. As such, the total capacity of the school would be permanently increased from 420 to 630 pupils and it would reach its full capacity in 2022.

Objections and comments

3. A statement explaining the procedure for making representations, including —

- (a) the date prescribed in accordance with paragraph 29 of Schedule 3 (GB proposals)/Schedule 5 (LA proposals) of The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended), by which objections or comments should be sent to the local education authority; and
- (b) the address of the authority to which objections or comments should be sent.

This is a four week consultation, which begins on Monday 18 January 2016 and concludes at midday on Monday 15 February 2016. Any person may object to or make comments on the proposals by sending representations to:

Oliver Gill, Surrey County Council, Room 326, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey, KT1 2DN

Alternatively, representations can be made by email to:

schoolorg@surreycc.gov.uk

The consultation can also be accessed from the Surrey County Council website:

www.surreysays.co.uk

Alteration description

4. A description of the proposed alteration and, in the case of special school proposals, a description of the current special needs provision.

To enlarge Furzefield Primary School from two forms of entry (2FE) at Reception to three forms of entry (3FE) at Reception, from September 2016.

School capacity

5.—(1) Where the alteration is an alteration falling within any of paragraphs 1 to 4, 8, 9 and 12-14 of Schedule 2 (GB proposals)/paragraphs 1-4, 7, 8, 18, 19 and 21 of Schedule 4 (LA proposals) to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended), the proposals must also include —

- (a) details of the current capacity of the school and, where the proposals will alter the capacity of the school, the proposed capacity of the school after the alteration;

The school would be enlarged from a 420-place Primary School, 60 places per year from Reception to Year 6, to a 630-place Primary School, 90 places per year from Reception to Year 6. The school also has a 16-place Specialist Resource Centre for children with Moderate Learning Difficulties. It is not proposed to alter this provision as a consequence of this proposal. As such, from 2016, the school would have a maximum capacity of 646 pupils.

- (b) details of the current number of pupils admitted to the school in each relevant age group, and where this number is to change, the proposed number of pupils to be admitted in each relevant age group in the first school year in which the proposals will have been implemented;

The current Published Admission Number (PAN) for the school is 60. Under this proposal, the PAN would be increased to 90, from 2016 onwards.

- (c) where it is intended that proposals should be implemented in stages, the number of pupils to be admitted to the school in the first school year in which each stage will have been implemented;

90 pupils would be admitted into the Reception Year in September 2016 and in each subsequent Reception year thereafter.

- (d) where the number of pupils in any relevant age group is lower than the indicated admission number for that relevant age group a statement to this effect and details of the indicated admission number in question.

N/A

(2) Where the alteration is an alteration falling within any of paragraphs 1, 2, 9, 12 and 13 of Schedule 2 (GB proposals) /paragraphs 1, 2, 8, 18 and 19 of Schedule 4 (LA proposals) to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended), a statement of the number of pupils at the school at the time of the publication of the proposals.

There are currently 504 pupils on roll at Furzeffield Primary School, which comprises 50 in Nursery and 454 in YR to Y6.

Implementation

6. Where the proposals relate to a foundation or voluntary controlled school a statement as to whether the proposals are to be implemented by the local education authority or by the governing body, and, if the proposals are to be implemented by both, a statement as to the extent to which they are to be implemented by each body.

N/A

Additional Site

7.— (1) A statement as to whether any new or additional site will be required if proposals are implemented and if so the location of the site if the school is to occupy a split site.

No additional site is required in order to facilitate these proposals.

(2) Where proposals relate to a foundation or voluntary school a statement as to who will provide any additional site required, together with details of the tenure (freehold or leasehold) on which the site of the school will be held, and if the site is to be held on a lease, details of the proposed lease.

N/A

Changes in boarding arrangements

8.—(1) Where the proposals are for the introduction or removal of boarding provision, or the alteration of existing boarding provision such as is mentioned in paragraph 8 or 21 of Schedule 2 (GB proposals)/7 or 14 of Schedule 4 to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) —

the number of pupils for whom it is intended that boarding provision will be made if the proposals are approved;

N/A

(a) the arrangements for safeguarding the welfare of children at the school;

N/A

(b) the current number of pupils for whom boarding provision can be made and a description of the boarding provision; and

N/A

(c) except where the proposals are to introduce boarding provision, a description of the existing boarding provision.

N/A

(2) Where the proposals are for the removal of boarding provisions or an alteration to reduce boarding provision such as is mentioned in paragraph 8 or 21 of Schedule 2 (GB proposals)/7 or 14 of Schedule 4 (LA proposals) to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) —

(a) the number of pupils for whom boarding provision will be removed if the proposals are approved; and

N/A

(b) a statement as to the use to which the former boarding accommodation will be put if the proposals are approved.

N/A

Transfer to new site

9. Where the proposals are to transfer a school to a new site the following information—

- (a) the location of the proposed site (including details of whether the school is to occupy a single or split site), and including where appropriate the postal address;

The school will remain on its existing site.

- (b) the distance between the proposed and current site;

N/A

- (c) the reason for the choice of proposed site;

N/A

- (d) the accessibility of the proposed site or sites;

N/A

- (e) the proposed arrangements for transport of pupils to the school on its new site; and

N/A

- (f) a statement about other sustainable transport alternatives where pupils are not using transport provided, and how car use in the school area will be discouraged.

N/A

Objectives

10. The objectives of the proposals.

The proposal to expand the school is in response to the local demand for primary school places at this school and a basic need for more school places in the wider Reigate & Redhill area. This is demonstrated by several years of demand, together with future pupil forecasts (based on birth, migration and housing development data), and forms part of a borough-wide expansion programme, aimed at providing sufficient school places to meet the projected levels of demand.

Consultation

- 11.** Evidence of the consultation before the proposals were published including—
- (a) a list of persons who were consulted;
 - (b) minutes of all public consultation meetings;
 - (c) the views of the persons consulted;
 - (d) a statement to the effect that all applicable statutory requirements in relation to the proposals to consult were complied with; and
 - (e) copies of all consultation documents and a statement on how these documents were made available.

An explanatory consultation document has been made available to the public via the Council's website: www.surreysays.co.uk

A public meeting will be held at Furzefield Primary School on 3 February 2016.

The following people have been made aware of the proposals: parents/carers of children attending the school; employees and Governors of the school; relevant unions; local residents; other local schools; local borough and county councillors; and the School Admissions Forum.

Project costs

- 12.** A statement of the estimated total capital cost of the proposals and the breakdown of the costs that are to be met by the governing body, the local education authority, and any other party.

The cost of the proposed project will be funded through Surrey County Council's Schools Basic Need Capital Programme and funding for this scheme is included in the current 2015-21 Medium Term Financial Plan.

- 13.** A copy of confirmation from the Secretary of State and/or local education authority that funds will be made available (including costs to cover any necessary site purchase).

Surrey County Council's Section 151 Finance Officer has approved the expenditure for this expansion project.

Age range

- 14.** Where the proposals relate to a change in age range, the current age range for the school.

N/A

Early years provision

15. Where the proposals are to alter the lower age limit of a mainstream school so that it provides for pupils aged between 2 and 5—

- (a) details of the early years provision, including the number of full-time and part-time pupils, the number and length of sessions in each week, and the services for disabled children that will be offered;

N/A

- (b) how the school will integrate the early years provision with childcare services and how the proposals are consistent with the integration of early years provision for childcare;

N/A

- (c) evidence of parental demand for additional provision of early years provision;

N/A

- (d) assessment of capacity, quality and sustainability of provision in schools and in establishments other than schools who deliver the Early Years Foundation Stage within 3 miles of the school; and

N/A

- (e) reasons why such schools and establishments who have spare capacity cannot make provision for any forecast increase in the number of such provision.

N/A

Changes to sixth form provision

16. (a) Where the proposals are to alter the upper age limit of the school so that the school provides sixth form education or additional sixth form education, a statement of how the proposals will—

- (i) improve the educational or training achievements;
(ii) increase participation in education or training; and
(iii) expand the range of educational or training opportunities for 16-19 year olds in the area;

N/A

(b) A statement as to how the new places will fit within the 16-19 organisation in an area;

N/A

(c) Evidence —

(i) of the local collaboration in drawing up the proposals; and

(ii) that the proposals are likely to lead to higher standards and better progression at the school;

N/A

(d) The proposed number of sixth form places to be provided.

N/A

17. Where the proposals are to alter the upper age limit of the school so that the school ceases to provide sixth form education, a statement of the effect on the supply of 16-19 places in the area.

N/A

Special educational needs

18. Where the proposals are to establish or change provision for special educational needs—

(a) a description of the proposed types of learning difficulties in respect of which education will be provided and, where provision for special educational needs already exists, the current type of provision;

The proposal will not change arrangements for pupils with Special Educational Needs.

(b) any additional specialist features will be provided;

N/A

(c) the proposed numbers of pupils for which the provision is to be made;

N/A

(d) details of how the provision will be funded;

N/A

(e) a statement as to whether the education will be provided for children with special educational needs who are not registered pupils at the school to which the proposals relate;

N/A

(f) a statement as to whether the expenses of the provision will be met from the school's delegated budget;

N/A

(g) the location of the provision if it is not to be established on the existing site of the school;

N/A

(h) where the provision will replace existing educational provision for children with special educational needs, a statement as to how the local education authority believes that the new provision is likely to lead to improvement in the standard, quality and range of the educational provision for such children; and

N/A

(i) the number of places reserved for children with special educational needs, and where this number is to change, the proposed number of such places.

N/A

19. Where the proposals are to discontinue provision for special educational needs—

(a) details of alternative provision for pupils for whom the provision is currently made;

N/A

- (b) details of the number of pupils for whom provision is made that is recognised by the local education authority as reserved for children with special educational needs during each of the 4 school years preceding the current school year;

N/A

- (c) details of provision made outside the area of the local education authority for pupils whose needs will not be able to be met in the area of the authority as a result of the discontinuance of the provision; and

N/A

- (d) a statement as to how the proposer believes that the proposals are likely to lead to improvement in the standard, quality and range of the educational provision for such children.

N/A

20. Where the proposals will lead to alternative provision for children with special educational needs, as a result of the establishment, alteration or discontinuance of existing provision, the specific educational benefits that will flow from the proposals in terms of—

- (a) improved access to education and associated services including the curriculum, wider school activities, facilities and equipment with reference to the local education authority's Accessibility Strategy;
- (b) improved access to specialist staff, both educational and other professionals, including any external support and outreach services;
- (c) improved access to suitable accommodation; and
- (d) improved supply of suitable places.

N/A

Sex of pupils

21. Where the proposals are to make an alteration to provide that a school which was an establishment which admitted pupils of one sex only becomes an establishment which admits pupils of both sexes—

- (a) details of the likely effect which the alteration will have on the balance of the provision of single sex-education in the area;

N/A

- (b) evidence of local demand for single-sex education; and

N/A

- (c) details of any transitional period which the body making the proposals wishes specified in a transitional exemption order (within the meaning of section 27 of the Sex Discrimination Act 1975).

N/A

22. Where the proposals are to make an alteration to a school to provide that a school which was an establishment which admitted pupils of both sexes becomes an establishment which admits pupils of one sex only—

- (a) details of the likely effect which the alteration will have on the balance of the provision of single-sex education in the area; and

N/A

- (b) evidence of local demand for single-sex education.

N/A

Extended services

23. If the proposed alterations affect the provision of the school's extended services, details of the current extended services the school is offering and details of any proposed change as a result of the alterations.

The proposal will not have a negative impact on the provision of the school's extended services.

Need or demand for additional places

24. If the proposals involve adding places—

- (a) a statement and supporting evidence of the need or demand for the particular places in the area;

Reigate and Banstead is experiencing a significant increase in the demand for school places, reflecting both a significant rise in birth rate and increased house building and migration within the area. Births in the Borough in 2014 were 27.7% higher than births in 2002. A significant number of primary school places have been provided reflective of this demand and further growth is anticipated in the short- to medium-term, which needs to be accommodated via further expansions of school provision. If approved, this proposal would provide 210 additional primary places within Merstham that would, in part, help to bridge the projected gap between the supply of and demand for school places.

- (b) where the school has a religious character, a statement and supporting evidence of the demand in the area for education in accordance with the tenets of the religion or religious denomination;

N/A

- (c) where the school adheres to a particular philosophy, evidence of the demand for education in accordance with the philosophy in question and any associated change to the admission arrangements for the school.

N/A

25. If the proposals involve removing places—

- (a) a statement and supporting evidence of the reasons for the removal, including an assessment of the impact on parental choice; and

N/A

- (b) a statement on the local capacity to accommodate displaced pupils.

N/A

Expansion of successful and popular schools

25A. (1) Proposals must include a statement of whether the proposer considers that the presumption for the expansion of successful and popular schools should apply, and where the governing body consider the presumption applies, evidence to support this.

(2) Sub-paragraph (1) applies to expansion proposals in respect of primary and secondary schools, (except for grammar schools), i.e. falling within:

(a) (for proposals published by the governing body) paragraph 1 of Part 1 to Schedule 2 or paragraph 12 of Part 2 to Schedule 2;

(b) (for proposals published by the LA) paragraph 1 of Part 1 to Schedule 4 or 18 of Part 4 to Schedule 4

of the School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended).

Being rated 'Good' by Ofsted, the school has a strong reputation and is oversubscribed for school places. For September 2015, the school received 67 1st preferences, and 107 preferences overall. Expanding this school will promote parental preference, by allowing the Governing Body to admit further applicants who name the school as a preferred option.

Annex 2 – Summary of Consultation Feedback

Public Meeting – 3rd February 2016, 6pm

Held at Furzeffield Primary School

The consultation process ran from 18 January to 15 February 2016. As part of this exercise, on 3 February 2016, a consultation evening was held with interested parties. A summary of the meeting is provided below:

Public Meeting – 3 February 2016, 6pm

Held at Furzeffield Primary School

Present: Susan Chrysanthou (Headteacher), Gordon Cookson (Deputy Head), Melanie Roberts (Acting Deputy Head), Sharon Morgan (School Business Manager), Kelvin Webbe (Premises Manager), Rev Val Williams (Chair of Governors), Graham Jones (Vice Chair of Governors), Jan Knott (Governor), Oliver Gill (School Commissioning Officer, Surrey County Council)

5 members of the public also attended

Oliver Gill explained that SCC was proposing to expand the school and that this part of the process considers the educational implications of expanding Furzeffield to 3 forms of entry. The planning consultation is a separate process, although he would try his best to answer any questions relating to this.

Pupil forecasting is based on births, migration factors, and housing. Currently in Merstham there is a projected deficit of ½ a form of entry, and in the wider area of Redhill (incorporating Redhill, Reigate, Earlswood and Salfords), the shortage in available places increases to 2 forms of entry.

The educational consultation closes on 15th February 2016, and the cabinet decision will be made on March 3rd 2016.

Oliver Gill gave a short power point presentation showing estimated pupil numbers for future years in the relevant areas, clearly indicating the need for expansion.

The public were then invited to ask questions:

Q. What is the rationale for SCC's projected numbers when a new school (Lime Tree Primary) has just opened?

- A. The intake for Lime Tree Primary has been included within SCC's projected figures and there is still a shortfall of 60 places for September 2016 across the wider area, which is concentrated within the Redhill area.
- Q. Does this mean that children would be expected to travel to Furzeffield from areas outside Merstham?
- A. Yes, some pupils would likely have to travel from further afield. However, there is still projected increased demand local to Merstham and the fact that the school is both supportive of expansion, and capable of being expanded, are key assets. Surrey would not want to force schools to expand, on a permanent basis, if they didn't want to.
- Q. What happens if the PAN (pupil admission number) of 90 doesn't materialise for Furzeffield?
- A. We expect all places will be filled. Last year there were 107 applications.
NB: checking records today (4/2/16) there have currently been 110 application requests for Reception, September 2016.
- Q. If there is a shortfall in admission numbers this would affect the school's funding, (which has happened in other schools).
- A. Funding will be protected for KS1 places. Surrey can only use their best estimates. Last year's forecasts for the area were lower than the actual number that materialised.
- Q. How will the school accommodate an extra 30 students in September 2016? Is there enough time to recruit suitable staff?
- A. The current reception building can accommodate another 30 pupils as there are 3 classroom spaces already. We are lucky to have a stable staff and have had a very good field of candidates recently.
- Q. Will Forest Schools continue?
- A. Absolutely! Other staff are being supported to take on outdoor learning and another teacher is doing the Forest School training to become a leader like Mel Roberts.
- Q. What is the timescale re the expansion?
- A. Furzeffield would take on a bulge class in reception for September 2016 and then the new build would be ready for September 2017.
- Q. There is a concern about the safety of the pupils who will be on site during the build.
- A. Contractors will set clear site boundaries, and safeguarding is factored in to any school expansion. The whole project will be managed effectively. Members of the senior leadership team have already visited another school who had a similar expansion and the Headteacher was very happy with the project and the children used the build as part of their topic work, etc. and met various people involved and were fully informed all the way through – it was exciting for them!
- Q. Will pupils be consulted on the new building?

- A. Due to standardisation of processes and functionality, flexibility is limited unfortunately for personalised design.
- Q. What happened re academy status?
- A. The DfE won't take single school applications at the moment, Furzefield would have to go academy as part of a multi academy trust. The 'status' of schools makes no difference to SCC re the need for expansion.
- Q. Will there be additional funding for resources?
- A. The standard allocation will be used.
- Q. Will the PAN of 90 be protected in KS1?
- A. Yes! School can try to negotiate to continue receiving protection in KS2 but at the moment SCC say this isn't likely.
- Q. Local residents have concerns over parking, traffic and access for emergency vehicles.
- A. This is a very common concern and SCC will try to reduce the situation where they can at source, (i.e. by looking to reduce traffic movements, through a revised Travel Plan). Highways Consultants will undertake detailed traffic assessments and provide recommendations which might include speed bumps, parking restrictions, etc. in accordance with the identified need, (although the report may equally state that no additional measures are required/possible). The flow of traffic and parents dropping off/picking up will also be considered. This will be looked at in detail at the planning stage.
- Q. Would there be a possibility of providing a bus which could bring in children from the wider Redhill area and thereby alleviate some of the traffic concerns?
- A. The provision of a bus service is inherently demand led and a shuttle service is provided for the very small number of children who are currently eligible for home-to-school transport. The Home-to-School Transport Department could consider the viability of a bus service, should sufficient need arise from pupils with longer journey times. Ultimately, this would be assessed in accordance with the annual intake of the school and it is possible that this need may emerge in the medium-to-long-term.

The meeting concluded at 7pm. Notes will be published on the school website and a copy will also go to the cabinet member on March 3rd 2016.

A number of questions were submitted by a member of the public who was unable to attend the meeting. These questions are presented below, along with the associated answers:

- Q. How much will the building work impact on the children whilst they are at school? How will the noise and general dust/pollution be kept to a minimum so as not to disturb their learning or playtime?

- A. All the contractors working on the Council's school expansions schemes have extensive experience of delivering buildings on school sites and are aware of the particular challenges this raises. We would expect the contractor to work closely alongside the school in devising their strategy for working on the site and this will be conscious of the need to avoid disruption to pupils' learning.
- Q. Will there be some sort of parking available for parents to drop off children? It is bad enough now around the local roads, it's an accident waiting to happen with the amount of parked cars. Much as we may like the idea of walking to and from school, many parents have to travel say 2 or more miles to the school; and it is impossible for a working parent to have time to walk back home from school then drive to work. We usually park 400-800m away from school, yet it's hard sometimes even then to find a parking space. More children equals more traffic.
- A. This is an issue that is common around school sites and is a challenge that is frequently encountered in respect of the schools expansion programme. At this stage, it is too early to comment on particular elements of the building project, as this will all be part of a separate design programme. This process will involve a consideration of all relevant planning and highways issues such as that referred to above. Ultimately, though, it is unlikely that dedicated parking would be established for parent for pick-up and drop-off, as this is not something that is typically encouraged through the planning process.
- Q. Will there be an additional hall built for PE etc.? At present classes miss PE of another class is using the hall for wither play rehearsals or assembly rehearsals, most of December is already a month without a PE lesson, so to have more classes would mean more use of the hall.
- A. As above, the proposals for the building project are not yet in place. However, once these plans have been sufficiently developed, they will be the subject of a separate consultation exercise, (again, at the school), to which all interested parties will be invited. The actual question of whether additional space for PE will be provided is ultimately determined by an assessment of the school's current provision, relative to the national area guidelines for schools indicated in *Building Bulletin 103*.

Formal Responses

In addition, all interested parties were invited to return formal responses to the consultation, via the completion of the online feedback form (supplied on both the school's and the Council's website), or otherwise. In total, two formal responses were received; one from a local resident and the other from a parent/carer of a child at the school. Of the responses received, one disagreed with the proposal and the other neither agreed, nor disagreed. The themes raised in the responses are summarised below, along with responses:

Issue1: Further concern was raised in relation to the impact that the increase in numbers would have in relation to inconsiderate parking in the vicinity of the site, during the school pick-up and drop-off period, and it was suggested that parking restrictions be introduced to the rear of the site. In addition, it was felt that the proposal would result in an increase in traffic

movements on the local highway network and that this was in conflict with SCC policy in relation to sustainability.

Res. 1: As referred to above, these highways matters are properly considered as part of the planning process. As part of this process, a survey will be undertaken of traffic movements to/from the site at peak times, with a view to assessing the potential impact of expanding the school and making recommendations as to mitigation measures that could be taken in this respect.

Although it was accepted at the meeting that not all of the additional demand was being generated in Merstham, the projections indicate⁴ that over 0.5FE of additional demand is being generated in this area specifically, with further significant demand projected for the wider Reigate & Redhill area. As the Council and its schools prefer to manage expansions in multiples of whole forms of entry, to expand another school instead of Furzeffield would result in at least as many vehicular journeys in the opposite direction, relative to the current proposal. In this respect, the expansion is being closely as closely aligned with local demand as practicable.

Issue 2: One respondent asked why Lime Tree Primary was not simply built with an additional form of entry, rather than expanding Furzeffield Primary School. This respondent felt that Lime Tree Primary School was in a preferable location to take the additional pupils.

Res. 2: Although the Council cannot comment on the question of whether it would have considered 3FE to be a suitable size for Lime Tree Primary School, the reason that this was not considered at the time was that the pupil forecasts were lower at the point of planning this new school than they are presently. Increasing birth rates in the area have resulted in the Council having to formulate a strategy for further expansions to the school estate, of which the proposed expansion of Furzeffield represents a key part.

Issue 3: One respondent felt that SCC had failed to take into account the impact of Lime Tree Primary School in terms of providing places to the locality. In addition, this respondent felt that the fact that Merstham Primary School's 2015 'bulge' class was not full was indicative of there being insufficient local demand to warrant the expansion of Furzeffield.

Res. 3: In planning school places, the Council works in terms of 'Planning Areas', within which schools' capacity and pupil demand are mapped against one another. Lime Tree Primary School is contained within the Redhill Planning Area and is, therefore, factored into the capacity vs. Forecast numbers provided for the wider Reigate & Redhill area, within the presentation provided at the consultation evening. As such, the impact of these places in providing for demand is very much included within the modelling undertaken in formulating this proposal. Whilst it is true that Merstham Primary School's 2015 'bulge' class is not full (the October census shows it having 50 of the available 60 places occupied), this is entirely in line with the projections. Ultimately, as the Council operates in terms of whole forms of entry, it was anticipated that the provision of a bulge at Merstham would create surplus

capacity. The alternative was to provide too few local places, which would conflict with the Council's statutory duty in this respect.