

Notice of Meeting

Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement Decisions

**Date & time**

Monday, 14
December 2015 at
10.00 am

Place

Room 111, County
Hall, Kingston upon
Thames, KT1 2DN

Contact

Andrew Baird or Rianna
Hanford
Room 122, County Hall
Tel 020 8541 7609 or 0208
213 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 02085417609 or 02082132662.

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

2a Members' Questions

The deadline for Members' questions is 12pm four working days before the meeting (8 December 2015).

2b Public Questions

The deadline for public questions is seven days before the meeting (7 December 2015).

2c Petitions

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

3 EXPANSION OF ST PETER'S CATHOLIC SCHOOL

(Pages 1
- 10)

The Governing Body of St Peter's Catholic School (Voluntary Aided), in partnership with Surrey County Council (SCC) and the Roman Catholic Diocese of Arundel and Brighton have consulted on a proposal to expand the school by one form of entry from September 2017.

Following a public consultation, the Governing Body of the school voted on 2 December 2015 to proceed with the proposal.

As this is a prescribed alternation to the school, the final decision on whether to proceed with the expansion rests with the Local Authority. Therefore, the Cabinet Member is asked to review the education rationale for the project and the summary of the consultation responses provided within this report, to determine whether to proceed with implementing the proposal.

4 PROPOSED ALTERATION OF UPPER AGE LIMIT AT CLANDON C OF E INFANT SCHOOL

(Pages
11 - 18)

The Governing Body of Clandon CofE Infant School (Voluntary Aided), in partnership with Surrey County Council (SCC) and the Diocese of Guildford, have consulted on a proposal to extend the age range of the school from 4-7 (infant) to 4 to 11 years old (primary) from September 2017, and to reduce the published admissions number (PAN) from 25 to 15 from September 2017.

Following a public consultation, the Governing Body of the school voted unanimously on 17 November 2015 to proceed with the proposal.

As this is a prescribed alternation to the school, the final decision on whether to proceed with the extension of the age range rests with the

Local Authority. Therefore, the Cabinet Member is asked to review the education rationale for the project and the summary of the consultation responses provided within this report, to determine whether to proceed with implementing the proposal.

5 AMALGAMATION OF THE HOPE EPSOM AND THE HOPE GUILDFORD TO FORM THE HOPE SERVICE (Pages 19 - 24)

Surrey County Council (SCC) has consulted on a proposal to amalgamate The Hope Epsom and The Hope Guildford to form one single Hope Service across two separate sites from 1 January 2016.

The consultation period was from 23 September to 7 October and there were two public meetings during this time, held on 29 and 30 September 2015, one at each site. Statutory Notices were issued on 12 October 2015 and were displayed at each site and published in the local newspaper stating the intention to amalgamate the two centres.

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

6 PROPOSED EXPANSION OF THE PRIORY CHURCH OF ENGLAND (VA) SCHOOL (Pages 25 - 36)

The Governing Body of The Priory Church of England (VA) School, in partnership with Surrey County Council (SCC) and the Diocese of Guildford, has consulted on a proposal to expand the school by one form of entry from September 2017 and a further one form of entry in September 2019 (making a two form entry expansion, in total). The Education Consultation was conducted between 28 September 2015 and 26 October 2015.

On the basis of the education rationale for the expansion and in view of the comments received during the consultation period, the Governing Body of the school voted to proceed with the expansion project. The Cabinet Member is asked to review the summary of the consultation process provided within this report and associated Annexes and, on that basis, determine whether to ratify the decision made by the school from Surrey County Council's perspective.

7 PROPOSED EXPANSION OF DOWNS WAY SCHOOL (Pages 37 - 58)

Surrey County Council has consulted on a proposal to expand Downs Way School by half a form of entry from September 2016. The Education Consultation was conducted between 21 September and 19 October 2015.

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 Annex and, on that basis, decide whether to determine the associated Statutory Notice.

David McNulty
Chief Executive

Published: Friday, 4 December 2015

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

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS & LEARNING****DATE: 14 DECEMBER 2015****LEAD OFFICER: JULIE FISHER, DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE****SUBJECT: EXPANSION OF ST PETER'S CATHOLIC SCHOOL****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

The Governing Body of St Peter's Catholic School (Voluntary Aided), in partnership with Surrey County Council (SCC) and the Roman Catholic Diocese of Arundel and Brighton have consulted on a proposal to expand the school by one form of entry from September 2017.

Following a public consultation, the Governing Body of the school voted on 2 December 2015 to proceed with the proposal.

As this is a prescribed alternation to the school, the final decision on whether to proceed with the expansion rests with the Local Authority. Therefore, the Cabinet Member is asked to review the education rationale for the project and the summary of the consultation responses provided within this report, to determine whether to proceed with implementing the proposal.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that:

- St Peter's Catholic School expands by one form of entry from September 2017.
- A programme of capital works is provided to facilitate the change.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Demand for secondary school places is increasing in Guildford Town. It is recommended that St Peter's expands due the prior expansion of one of its feeder schools, St Joseph's Catholic Primary School, which expanded by one form of entry in 2010. These additional children will feed into St Peter's from 2017. Without expansion, St Peter's will no longer be able to provide places for children in all its feeder schools and will be unable to meet future demand for Catholic secondary places in the area.

DETAILS:**Background**

1. St Peter's Catholic School is a Voluntary Aided Catholic secondary school, established by the Roman Catholic Diocese of Arundel and Brighton. The school

currently provides 180 places per year from year 7, through to Year 11, aged 11 to 16. In addition, up to 175 places are available for each year in the sixth form (years 12 and 13).

The proposal

2. On 12 October 2015, the Governing Body of St Peter's Catholic School, in partnership with the Diocese of Arundel and Brighton and SCC, published the following proposal:
 - St Peter's Catholic School expands from a six form entry secondary school with a Published Admission Number (PAN) of 180, to a seven form entry secondary school with a PAN of 210 from September 2017.
 - The school will ultimately provide 1,050 places for ages 11 to 16, plus sixth form. It currently provides 900 places for ages 11 to 16, plus sixth form.
 - The school would grow incrementally from Year 7, with each new intake every academic year admitting 210 pupils.
3. The proposal will require the provision of some additional accommodation to enable the school to facilitate the expansion.

Reasons for the proposal

4. **Demand for secondary school places:** There is significant demand for new school places within Surrey resulting from increases in the birth rate and inward migration into the county. Demand for secondary places has increased in Guildford Town with additional school places required from 2017. A number of primary expansions in Guildford Town have taken place in recent years and now plans need to be put in place in order to ensure secondary places are provided to meet the increased need.
5. **Demand for secondary Catholic places:** Recent primary expansions in Guildford include St Joseph's Catholic Primary School, which expanded by one form of entry in 2010. This provided 210 additional places, 30 places per year over seven years. St Joseph's is a direct feeder school to St Peter's Catholic School. This extra form of entry per year will feed into St Peter's from 2017 onwards. Without expansion, St Peter's would be unable to meet future demand for Catholic secondary places in the area. The table below shows the number of places in feeder schools and how the expansion at St Joseph's directly increases the demand for places at St Peter's:

Feeder School	Previous PAN	Current PAN
St Cuthbert Mayne Catholic Primary, Cranleigh	30	30
St Edmund's Catholic Primary, Godalming	30	30
St Joseph's Catholic Primary, Guildford	60	90
St Thomas of Canterbury Catholic Primary, Guildford	60	60
Total	180	210

6. **Parental preferences:** The Local Authority has a duty to respond to parental preferences and, where possible, SCC seeks to expand popular and successful schools to meet additional demand as well as provide sufficient school places for families that would choose particular faith provision. St Peter's is consistently oversubscribed on first preferences and, with the recent expansion at St Joseph's, pressure for places at the school will be increased further in the future.
7. **Expanding good schools:** It is the ambition of SCC that all Surrey schools will be judged to be at least 'Good' by 2017. At its last OFSTED inspection in 2013, St Peter's Catholic School received an Outstanding (Grade 1) judgement. This proposal therefore meets the Government's guidance to local authorities that successful, popular schools are expanded where more places are needed.

Implementation

8. The table below shows the current number of places at the school, in line with its current Published Admissions Number (PAN):

Year Group	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Year 12	Year 13	Total
Number of Places	180	180	180	180	180	175	175	1,250

9. The table below shows proposed number of places at the school if these proposals are implemented:

Year Group	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Year 12	Year 13	Total
Places in 2017/18	210	180	180	180	180	175	175	1,280
Places in 2018/19	210	210	180	180	180	175	175	1,310
Places in 2019/20	210	210	210	180	180	175	175	1,340
Places in 2020/21	210	210	210	210	180	175	175	1,370
Places in 2021/22	210	210	210	210	210	175	175	1,400

The first expanded year will join the sixth form in the 2022/23 academic year and will increase the size of the sixth form proportionally. The Local Authority is currently reviewing all forthcoming proposed secondary school expansions and the correlating sixth form provision.

10. This proposal would not change the admissions criteria of the school, only the PAN, and therefore the number of places provided at the school.
11. **Impact on other schools:** There has been some concern whether this expansion will have an impact on other schools in Guildford. School Commissioning anticipate that the impact of this proposal on other schools would be very minimal due to the Catholic admissions criteria of St Peter's which will remain the same, and is set out below:
 1. Baptised Catholic LAC & PLAC
 2. Baptised Catholic children with a sibling at St Peter's at the time of admission.
 3. Baptised Catholic children currently attending one of the four named feeder schools (St Cuthbert Mayne, St Edmund's, St Joseph's and St Thomas').
 4. Other baptised Catholic children.
 5. Other LAC & PLAC.
 6. Other children with a sibling at St Peter's at the time of admission.
 7. Other children currently attending one of the four named feeder schools.
 8. Children of other Christian denominations.
 9. Children who are members of other faiths.
 10. Any other children.

St Peter's is consistently full up to its admissions criteria 6, children falling into criteria 7-10 rarely secure a place at the school. As such, St Peter's would admit a Catholic child from outside Guildford, before admitting a non-Catholic child from Guildford Town. Therefore, the likelihood of St Peter's affecting other schools in Guildford Town is very low.

The school and the Roman Catholic Diocese of Arundel and Brighton expressed the wish to expand by two forms of entry. Local Authority officers were concerned that higher level of expansion may be over and above demographic need and may impact local schools, and, therefore, recommended expansion of one form of entry to provide for the primary expansion at the feeder school St Joseph's, whilst continuing to provide sufficient places for children in the other three feeder schools.

12. **Provision of additional accommodation:** As a voluntary aided school, the project will be overseen by the Governing Body of the school and will be project managed by consultants appointed by SCC. Work is underway on a feasibility study to identify the accommodation required to facilitate the expansion. This is likely to be provided through a mixture of new build and remodelling of existing spaces.
13. **Traffic and parking:** It is recognised that the school is accessed from a residential road and that traffic and parking issues may be an area of concern. As part of the expansion, the Governing Body is intending to create additional parking spaces within the school site to meet the needs of additional staff and mitigate the impact on local residential roads. The school's travel plan will also be reviewed and updated as part of the future planning application.

CONSULTATION:

14. A consultation was undertaken by SCC. A consultation document was produced and circulated to all parents, carers, local residents, local borough and county councillors, other stakeholders and interested parties. A public meeting was held

at the school on 2 November. Statutory Notices were issued in line with the consultation.

Consultation responses

15. The public meeting was attended by nine parents, residents and other interested parties. 69 formal written responses were received during the consultation via the Surrey Says website, post and email.
16. Overall, 45 responses agreed with the proposal (approximately 65%), 21 responses disagreed (approximately 30%) and three responses neither agreed nor disagreed (approximately 4%).
17. The responses included 37 from parents whose children may attend the school in the future and 33 from parents of children currently attending the school. Ten responses were received from local residents. Some respondents have more than one relationship with the school.
18. Responses from parents whose children may attend the school in the future agreed most strongly with the proposal: 25 of the 37 (approximately 68%) responses agreed with the proposal; 12 of the 37 (approximately 32%) responses disagreed.
19. Responses from parents whose children currently attend the school also agreed strongly: 19 of the 33 (approximately 58%) responses agreed with the proposal; 13 of the 33 (approximately 40%) responses disagreed.
20. Ten parents with children currently attending the school and with children that may attend in the future agreed with the proposal and their comments for supporting the proposal included: more places for Catholic children and more places for siblings. Concerns raised included: the impact of the proposal on teaching, pastoral care and travel to school and how children from feeder schools are increasingly less likely to obtain a place at St Peter's.
21. Ten parents with children currently attending the school and with children that may attend in the future disagreed with the proposal. Concerns raised by these parents included the school becoming too large; loss of green space and playground; disruption during the building programme; additional traffic and parking problems; more pressure on facilities and staff; existing overcrowding and struggles providing school lunches being exacerbated.
22. Responses were received from ten local residents. Eight responses from residents disagreed with the proposal, and raised concerns regarding traffic on Horseshoe Lane (which is narrow and twisty and unsuitable for the level of traffic the school generates), the safety of children walking to school, parking and inconvenience for local residents, additional smoking, cigarette ends and general litter and loss of green space and sports facilities. One response recommended that the school should 'stop taking children from the London area'. Two responses from residents agreed with the proposal; their comments confirmed that they agreed in principle with the expansion of the school, but had concerns about the additional traffic and whether more parking would be provided.
23. The majority of comments raised in responses concerned traffic and access (18 in total), including more traffic causing wear and tear on road surfaces, local residents being inconvenienced by school traffic turning in their driveways, road

safety for children travelling to school and the need for more on-site parking facilities for sixth form students.

24. The adequacy of facilities, the size of the site and the impact of additional children was also raised in 16 responses and noted concern about loss of playground and open space, loss of green space, the impact on sports facilities, how the existing (already cramped corridors) would cope with more children and existing problems providing school lunches.
25. Concerns were raised regarding the size of the school and some responses were reluctant for the school to become a bigger 'sausage factory', to lose its community feel and to be daunting for younger, quieter and more shy children who benefit from attending a smaller school. Five responses felt the school was already 'big enough' or 'the right size'.
26. Responses that agreed with the proposal felt that it would provide more places to meet local demand, places for more Catholics, places for more children of Christian faith and would help ensure siblings could attend the same school. Other comments included that a 7 form entry secondary wasn't too large and that the proposal would provide opportunities for better funding and investment in what is currently inadequate and 'tatty' equipment.
27. Some responses suggested other options, that included providing a new school, and one suggested encouraging children to attend King's College Guildford rather than using public funds to expand another school. One comment felt that St Peter's, as a Catholic school, should not be expanded due to its admissions preference for Catholic children which results in places being provided for non local children. Another response queried what the plan would be once the increased capacity had filled up.
28. Some comments raised concern about feeder schools and in particular how children from St Cuthbert Mayne are disadvantaged by the distance to St Peter's and how children now attending the expanded St Joseph's take priority over schools further away. Some responses considered that a new school should be provided in the Godalming/Cranleigh area to accommodate children from St Cuthbert Mayne and St Edmund's.
29. Three of the responses received did not express agreement or disagreement with the proposal. Some of these expressed uncertainty about whether suitable teaching space would be provided, the impact of building works on the existing students and lack of information regarding the staff and resources that would manage the expansion.
30. Five members of staff provided responses; four of these were in agreement with the proposal and noted that the school provides a good standard of education and the proposal would enable more young people to benefit, that the expansion would provide better career opportunities for staff and that the school should expand if adequate reinvestment was made in the facilities. One staff response neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposal but expressed a concern regarding operating a timetable for seven classes, whether suitable teaching space would be provided and the impact on space and teaching and pastoral care.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

31. The education consultation has been completed in compliance with the relevant legislation governing such decisions. Therefore, there is no outstanding risk associated with this.
32. A programme of works to provide additional accommodation by September 2017 is required and, as such, there are risks associated with this proposal. There is a risk that the project will not be completed within the timescales outlined above and there may be site abnormalities not identified as part of the initial feasibility exercise. A risk register will be maintained and updated on a regular basis.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

33. The scheme is included in the 2015-20 Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP). The scheme will be implemented by the Governing Body of the school and in partnership with SCC and the Diocese of Arundel and Brighton. All schemes are expected to remain within the funding which has been allocated to them in the MTFP.

Section 151 Officer Commentary

34. The S151 officer confirms that the basic need expansion scheme for this school is included in the 2015-20 MTFP.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

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.

This report sets out how the Authority will meet its duties in response to the increasing demand for school places in Guildford.

The expansion has been proposed in accordance with the School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013 because a physical enlargement to the premises is required.

There is a statutory requirement for consultation in this context as set out in the above Regulations. Such consultation will need to involve those directly affected by such changes together with relevant representative groups. It will be important that the material presented to consultees provides sufficient information to allow for intelligent consideration and response in relation to the proposals. This information will need to be presented in a way that consultees will understand. The responses to the consultation will need to be conscientiously taken into account when the Cabinet makes any decision.

The consultation for this proposal has been completed, a summary of which is included in paragraphs 14 to 30 of this paper.

Equalities and Diversity

35. The expansion of the school will not create any issues that would require the production of an Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA), as no group with protected characteristics will be adversely affected as a consequence of its approval, or otherwise. Children of non-catholic faith will not be adversely affected as a consequence of extra places being available as there is no reduction in school places.

Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications

36. This proposal would be of benefit to Looked After Children who have the opportunity of attending this school. Baptised Catholic Looked After Children are the highest priority criterion within the school's admission arrangements and other Looked After Children are admitted under criteria 5.

Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults implications

37. Safeguarding vulnerable children is a high priority in Surrey schools. Schools have considerable expertise in safeguarding vulnerable children and adhere to robust procedures. The school would continue to apply good practice in the area of safeguarding. Safeguarding is monitored when Ofsted carries out inspections of schools.
38. Site access and security, both during the proposed building programme and afterwards, will be considered and addressed in the planning and design of this building project.

Climate change/carbon emissions implications

39. The additional accommodation would be built to the local planning authority's adopted core planning strategy, the design philosophy of which is to create buildings that will support low energy consumption, reduce solar gain and promote natural ventilation. The provision of additional school places is likely to have a limited impact on carbon emissions due to the intention to continue the school's current bus services for its pupils and thus reduce the number of car journeys that could otherwise be made.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

40. Subject to Cabinet Member approval of this proposal, the next steps are:
- To put forward a business case for the associated capital works to Surrey County Council's Cabinet. If approval is granted, and subject to planning permission, the project will move to implementation, with the aim of additional accommodation being in place by September 2017 to provide for the additional pupils.

Contact Officer: Melanie Harding, School Commissioning Officer (South West),
07966 636 780

Consulted:

St Peter's Catholic School Governing Body
Parents of pupils attending the school
Local residents
Diocese of Arundel & Brighton
Diocese of Guildford
Local Head Teachers
Graham Ellwood, Local County Councillor
Borough Councillors
Anne Milton, MP
Julie Fisher, Deputy Chief Executive
Peter-John Wilkinson, Assistant Director for Schools and Learning
Unions

Sources/background papers:

- The Education Act 1996; the Education Act 2002; the Education Act 2005; the Education and Inspections Act 2006.
 - Consultation document regarding the proposal to expand St Peter's Catholic school by one form of entry.
-

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS, SKILLS AND EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT****DATE: 14 DECEMBER 2015****LEAD OFFICER: JULIE FISHER, DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE****SUBJECT: PROPOSED ALTERATION OF UPPER AGE LIMIT AT CLANDON C OF E INFANT SCHOOL****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

The Governing Body of Clandon C of E Infant School (Voluntary Aided), in partnership with Surrey County Council (SCC) and the Diocese of Guildford, have consulted on a proposal to extend the age range of the school from 4-7 (infant) to 4 to 11 years old (primary) from September 2017 and to reduce the Published Admissions Number (PAN) from 25 to 15 from September 2017.

Following a public consultation, the Governing Body of the school voted unanimously on 17 November 2015 to proceed with the proposal.

As this is a prescribed alternation to the school, the final decision on whether to proceed with the extension of the age range rests with the Local Authority. Therefore, the Cabinet Member is asked to review the education rationale for the project and the summary of the consultation responses provided within this report, to determine whether to proceed with implementing the proposal.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that:

- Clandon C of E Infant School becomes a primary school from September 2016 and reduces its PAN from 25 to 15 in September 2017.
- Two modular classrooms are provided to facilitate the change.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

There is an increasing need to provide a secure route to junior phase education for families in Clandon. With junior places in North Guildford becoming increasingly in demand, provision of junior places for children leaving Clandon at the end of Year 2 is a key concern for parents and carers. As a primary, the school would better serve its local area providing all through education for ages 4 to 11.

DETAILS:**Background**

1. Clandon C of E Infant School is a small school that serves the communities of West and East Clandon to the east of Guildford. The school currently provides 25

places per year for Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 pupils. Children normally progress to junior provision in Guildford.

The proposal

2. On 5 October 2015, the Governing Body of Clandon C of E Infant School, in partnership with the Diocese of Guildford and SCC, published the following proposal:
 - Clandon C of E Infant School becomes an 'all through' primary school in September 2016 admitting pupils from 4 to 11 years of age. This will be done by extending the school's age range by one year from September 2016, then incrementally by one year each academic year thereafter until September 2019.
 - The school will reduce its PAN from 25 to 15 from September 2017. This will result in the total numbers of pupils on roll at the school increasing from 75 as an infant school to 105 as a primary school.
3. The proposal includes provision of some additional accommodation to enable the school to operate as a primary school on its present site. As the school does not have playing fields, sports facilities are provided locally through the school's existing relationships with local stakeholders enabling full access to the primary PE curriculum.
4. If the proposal goes ahead, all the current Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 pupils will be entitled to stay at the school until the end of Year 6. Consequently, numbers in the higher years will be permitted to exceed the Reception PAN of 15. The school will ultimately provide 105 primary places (4 to 11 years). It currently provides 75 infant places (4 to 7 years).

Reasons for the proposal

5. **Secure provision of junior places:** Numbers of primary children in Guildford are increasing. There are fewer junior places available in Guildford for Year 2 children leaving Clandon C of E Infant School. Therefore, provision of junior places in the local area is necessary.
6. **Clear progression route for infant children at Clandon:** Although a good school, parents are increasingly concerned of uncertain progression for their children beyond Year 2, resulting in a drop in the numbers on roll. Changing the school from an infant to primary will increase parental certainty of progression for their children and provide effective long-term provision to meet the needs of local children.
7. Educational advantages of a primary school versus an infant school include the following:
 - Seamless transition from Key Stage 1 (infants) to Key Stage 2 (juniors).
 - Greater opportunities for curriculum development.
 - Greater opportunities for staff development.
 - Greater flexibility with a larger budget to deploy staff and curriculum resources effectively.
 - Greater opportunities for staff recruitment.

- Embedding of friendships within a local community for children and their family.
- Role models for younger children, social skills in care and respect of younger children by the older ones.
- More sibling visibility in the school.

8. **Securing the sustainability of the school:** Pupil forecast data indicates that pupil yield in Clandon going forward will be less than the school's current PAN of 25. Therefore, reducing the PAN to 15 and converting to primary secures the school's future whilst providing certainty of junior places for the local community. The intention is that the school will alter its admission number to 15 but increase its age range so that places are offered to all year groups from Reception through to Year 6. This will be a resultant increase in capacity of 30 places, from 75 places to 105 places. The table below shows the maximum number of pupils in each year at the school and how the numbers will change over time as the school converts to primary status:

Primary from September 2016, with PAN of 15 in September 2017

Maximum number of pupils in each year, assuming current Number on Roll (NOR) + full PAN intake of 25 in September 16

Year group	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
R	19	25	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
1	16	19	25	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
2	7	16	19	25	15	15	15	15	15	15
3		7	16	19	25	15	15	15	15	15
4			7	16	19	25	15	15	15	15
5				7	16	19	25	15	15	15
6					7	16	19	25	15	15
Total pupils	42	67	82	97	112	120	119	115	105	105

NB: Pupil intake in 2016 likely to be less than the 25 indicated above. Numbers above are maximum number of pupils.

9. **Significant reduction in travel, including car journeys:** The proposal reduces the need for additional school journeys. Parents of junior aged children in West and East Clandon currently have to travel to Guildford. Provision of junior places at the school would shorten the travel time and distance for local parents. The proposal also reduces travel for parents with older siblings who currently transport children to the school and also transport older siblings to junior schools in Guildford. This proposal would enable more children to walk to school resulting in a reduction of school traffic in the area.

The school has an informal arrangement with the National Trust whereby parents are able to use the car park at Clandon Park for drop-off and pick-up which eliminates any congestion that might build up on the A247 at these times. This arrangement will continue under this proposal.

10. **Expanding good schools:** It is the ambition of SCC that all Surrey schools will be judged to be at least 'Good' by 2017. At its last OFSTED inspection in 2013 Clandon C of E Infant School received a Good (Grade 2) judgement. This proposal meets the Government's guidance to local authorities that successful

and popular schools are expanded where there is a need for more places through providing better continued primary educational provision for the local area.

Planning and capital considerations

11. The school has capacity to extend its age range in its existing location. Capital works will be required to provide two additional classrooms. This is likely to be a double modular building relocated from another school site where they are no longer required. This will be sited where the existing outdoor swimming pool currently resides, which although a resource for the school, is expensive to maintain, can only be used for a small part of the year and is limited in size for key stage 2 curriculum requirements. Detailed work is being undertaken by the Governing Body and the Diocese of Guildford with support from SCC's Property Service to develop a scheme of works to provide the additional accommodation needed in an appropriate manner and a separate planning application will be submitted pursuant to this.
12. The planning application will deal with the implications for school buildings and the management of traffic that result from this proposed expansion. This is anticipated to be minimal due to the increase in capacity of 30 pupils and the parking arrangements at Clandon Park. In addition, the proposal hopes to reduce the number of lengthier car journeys families currently make to junior provision further afield.

<u>CONSULTATION:</u>

13. A consultation was undertaken by Surrey County Council between 5 October and 6 November 2015. A consultation document was produced and circulated to all parents, carers, local residents, local borough and county councillors, other stakeholders and interested parties. In addition, two public meetings were held at the school on 12 October 2015, one in the afternoon and one in the evening. Statutory Notices were issued in line with the consultation.

Consultation responses

14. The public meetings were attended by 32 parents, residents and other interested parties. A total of 57 formal written responses were received during the consultation via the Surrey Says website, post and email. The responses included 27 from local residents and 19 from parents. This is very high considering the size of the school (currently 42 pupils are on roll).
15. There was consensus through the consultation responses that the village would benefit from having an all through primary school. Respondents felt that the uncertainty for parents having to find a new school for their children at Year 3 would be removed and local families would be more likely to name the school as their first choice when applying for Reception places, thereby securing the school's long term future. Responses indicated that children would benefit both socially and educationally by remaining in the same primary school from Reception to Year 6: four responses cited the opportunities for social friendships and five considered that children would benefit from being able to attend the same school as siblings. Two responses thought the proposal would make everyone's life better and six believed that parents would need to make fewer car journeys as a result of the change.

16. There was overwhelmingly strong support for the proposal with 56 of the responses agreeing (approximately 98%). There was also a strong assent that the Head Teacher and staff provide a caring environment (11 responses) and that pupils enjoy school and make good progress (6 responses). There was agreement that the proposal would be a positive step for the school to take (11 responses) and that the school would thrive as a result (10 responses). Eighteen responses endorsed the school as a 'great' school, and eight responses thought that the proposal was a 'good idea'.
17. The consultation also asked whether respondents agreed with the proposal to reduce the published admissions number (PAN) from 25 to 15 in 2017, which would enable the school to accommodate children in Key Stage 2. Again, there was overwhelming support for the proposal with 50 responses agreeing with the proposal (approximately 88%), two disagreeing and five not answering.
18. The one person that disagreed with the proposal to change to an all through primary school also disagreed with the proposal to reduce the PAN. Their reasons included the possible negative impact on other schools in the area that are not oversubscribed; a disinclination to believe that data evidenced a need for additional capacity and a concern that the proposal would increase traffic congestion.
19. Although there was an overwhelming agreement with the proposal, some concerns were raised, including general lack of space and facilities (in particular to deliver the Key Stage 2 curriculum, sport and extra curricular activities); and concern as to how there would be space for young and older children to play safely together in a small playground. There was also some reluctance to lose the school swimming pool which is a popular asset; although this view was not shared by all.
20. Unusually, there was minimal concern raised regarding traffic and parking. The responses indicate that parents driving to school tend to park in the Clandon Park visitors' car park, although one respondent indicated that they would like this arrangement formalised. The proposal was popular with residents, and many responses expressed that the proposal would be good for the village and would encourage more families to move there which would strengthen the local community.
21. Although in agreement with the proposal, some responses raised other areas for consideration. These are summarised below:
 - **Implementation of project and transition arrangements:** One response raised concern about mixed year classes; another response feared that the quality of education and ethos of the school might be compromised if transition wasn't well managed. Another response considered whether there was a management team in place to deliver the project (it was unclear what aspect was being considered, ie the management team within the school, the project management team to deliver the infrastructure or the governing body, Diocese and Surrey County Council team to ensure stakeholder management and effective implementation).
 - **Size of school:** One concern was raised as to how children would make the transition to large secondary school having attended such a small primary school.

- **General:** Reference was made to the lack of male staff, and the lack of a nursery school in the village.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

22. The education consultation has been completed in compliance with the relevant legislation governing such decisions. Therefore there is no outstanding risk associated with this.
23. A project to deliver two new classrooms by September 2017 is required and as such there are risks associated with this proposal. There is a risk that the project will not be completed within the timescales outlined above and there may be site abnormalities not identified as part of the initial feasibility exercise. A risk register will be maintained and updated on a regular basis by the school's and Diocese of Guildford's consultants.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

24. The scheme is included in the 2015-20 Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP). The scheme will be implemented by the Governing Body of the school and the Diocese of Guildford in partnership with SCC. All schemes are expected to remain within the funding which has been allocated to them in the MTFP.

Section 151 Officer Commentary

25. The Section 151 Officer confirms that the basic need expansion scheme for this school is included in the 2015-20 MTFP.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

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.

This report sets out how the Authority will meet its duties in response to the demand for school places in this area.

The alteration has been proposed in accordance with the School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013 because there will be a change to the age range of more than two years.

There is a statutory requirement for consultation in this context as set out in the above Regulations. Such consultation will need to involve those directly affected by such changes together with relevant representative groups. It will be important that the material presented to consultees provides sufficient information to allow for intelligent consideration and response in relation to the proposals. This information will need to be presented in a way that consultees will understand. The responses to the consultation will need to be conscientiously taken into account when the Cabinet makes any decision.

The consultation for this proposal has been completed, a summary of which is included in paragraphs 13 to 24 of this paper.

Equalities and Diversity

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

Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications

27. This proposal would provide all through primary provision in the local area which would be of benefit to the community served by the school. Therefore, this would also be of benefit to any Looked After Children who the opportunity of attending this school. Look After Children are the highest priority criterion within the school's admission arrangements.

Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults implications

28. Safeguarding vulnerable children is a high priority in Surrey schools. Schools have considerable expertise in safeguarding vulnerable children and adhere to robust procedures. The school would continue to apply good practice in the area of safeguarding. Safeguarding is monitored when Ofsted carries out inspections of schools.
29. Site access and security, both during the proposed building programme and afterwards, will be considered and addressed in the planning and design of this building project.

Climate change/carbon emissions implications

30. It is likely that this proposal will have a positive impact on reducing car journey times and therefore carbon emissions.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

31. Subject to Cabinet Member approval of this proposal, the next steps are:
- To put forward a business case for the associated capital works to SCC's Cabinet. If approval is granted and subject to planning permission, the project will move to implementation, with the aim of the two additional classrooms being in place by September 2017 to accommodate the expanded age range.
-

Contact Officer: Melanie Harding, School Commissioning Officer (South West),
07966 636 780

Consulted:

Clandon Cof E Infant School Governing Body
Parents of pupils attending the school
Local residents
Diocese of Guildford
Diocese of Arundel & Brighton
Local Head Teachers
Keith Taylor, Local County Councillor
Borough Councillors
Anne Milton, MP
Julie Fisher, Deputy Chief Executive
Peter-John Wilkinson, Assistant Director for Schools and Learning
Unions

Sources/background papers:

- The Education Act 1996; the Education Act 2002; the Education Act 2005; the Education and Inspections Act 2006.
 - Consultation document regarding the proposal to change Clandon CofE Infant School to a primary school.
-

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS, SKILLS AND EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT****DATE: 14 DECEMBER 2015****LEAD OFFICER: JULIE FISHER, DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE****SUBJECT: AMALGAMATION OF THE HOPE EPSOM AND THE HOPE GUILDFORD TO FORM THE HOPE SERVICE****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Surrey County Council (SCC) has consulted on a proposal to amalgamate The Hope Epsom and The Hope Guildford to form one single Hope Service across two separate sites from 1 January 2016.

The consultation period was from 23 September to 7 October and there were two public meetings during this time, held on 29 and 30 September 2015, one at each site. Statutory Notices were issued on 12 October 2015 and were displayed at each site and published in the local newspaper stating the intention to amalgamate the two centres.

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 centres is determined, such that there will be one service across two sites only from 1 January 2016.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

This will lead to streamlined Pupil Referral Unit provision in Surrey and the aligning of organisational arrangements with current working operations.

DETAILS:**Business Case**

1. The Hope Service is registered as a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) and is a multi-agency service for young people aged 11-18 who have complex mental health, emotional, social and educational needs which cannot be met by one agency alone. It is a joint partnership between SCC and the Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (SABT). Health Services, Children's Services and education work in partnership to provide support to young people in the community and through day programme provision. There is a dedicated team of social workers, nurses, teachers, psychologists, art/drama therapists, psychiatrists, occupational therapists, dieticians and activity workers.

2. The day programme offers structured therapeutic, educational and personalised recreational activities to young people. The programme is flexible to ensure that it meets individual needs in a safe, supportive and therapeutic environment. In addition to education, there is a focus on individual and group therapy, art therapy, drama therapy, psychology, cognitive behavioural therapy, anger and anxiety management, assertiveness training and practical social and living skills.
3. Education is planned and delivered to young people according to their ability and need both individually and in small groups. Emphasis is placed on supporting each young person to enjoy their learning and to celebrate their achievements. Hope staff work closely with other education establishments to ensure a smooth transition for each young person back into education, employment or training upon discharge. The programme runs daily during term time and continues with therapeutic work and activities in the school holidays.
4. Hope is based over two sites; West Park in Epsom which was set up in October 2004 and Worplesdon Road, Guildford that started in January 2005. Currently the service has one Management Committee, one Teacher in charge of education and a number of teaching, medical and support staff that work across both sites. However, the sites are registered individually as PRUs and are therefore subject to separate OFSTED inspections. Their last OFSTED inspections were Epsom in 2013 and Guildford in 2012; both outcomes were 'Good'.
5. When Hope was established originally it was envisaged that this would be one service based across two sites. However, during the initial set up period there were some transition difficulties. It was decided to proceed with a single registration for each centre so that the service could begin at Epsom sooner with Guildford following at a later date. It would be beneficial to bring the two PRUs together so that they are registered as one PRU and Service as originally envisaged.
6. One Management Committee oversees Hope Epsom and Guildford and there will be no change to existing staffing structures or staff working arrangements, some of whom already work over both sites. With the service being registered as one PRU across two sites they would be subject to one single OFSTED inspection rather than two as they are now.
7. Admissions and access to the service for young people will continue unchanged.
8. The Management Committee and senior leadership team at the PRU are fully in agreement with the proposal to amalgamate the centres.

<u>CONSULTATION:</u>

9. A consultation period started on 23 September and concluded on 7 October 2015. Two public meetings were held on 29 September at the Guildford site and 30 September 2015 at the Epsom centre. There were no attendees at either of the public consultation meetings.

Consultation responses

10. A total of four written responses were received during the consultation period via the Surrey Says website, post and email:

Young Person attending Hope	0
Young Person previously attending Hope	0
Parent/carer of a young person attending Hope	1
Parent/carer of a young person previously attending Hope	0
Hope staff or management committee	0
Healthcare professional	1
Social care professional	0
Other	2

11. Of the responses received 100% agreed with the proposal to amalgamate the two Hope centres to become one service. Additional commentary was provided by two of the responders both of which noted the benefit to staff with a reduced number of Ofsted inspections.
12. The Statutory Notice period ran from 12 October to 16 November 2015 and generated no further responses to the proposal.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

13. One risk has been identified with this proposal which relates to a financial factor. Currently, Devolved Formula Capital (DFC) for existing PRUs is £4000 for the each site plus £3.75 per single registered pupil each. If the PRUs were amalgamated then the combined PRU would only receive one lump sum of £4000, therefore with the amalgamation there would be a loss of £4000 per year. PRUs do not attract split site funding in the same way that schools are able to.
14. The Management Committee has accepted this reduction in funding and believes that the benefits of the formal amalgamation outweigh the loss of £4000 per year of DFC funding.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

15. One small financial risk has been identified as above.

Section 151 Officer Commentary

16. The two HOPE PRUs are largely funded on the basis of the number of places so the amalgamation will have no significant impact on funding levels other than the small reduction in DFC capital funding described above. It is felt the advantages of amalgamation far outweigh this small funding reduction which can be managed within the Centres' overall budget.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

17. 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, or has a made a commitment to, or has a practice of consulting on the matters under consideration. Such consultation will need to

involve those directly affected by such changes together with relevant representative groups. It will be important that the material presented to consultees provides sufficient information to allow for intelligent consideration and response in relation to the proposals. This information will need to be presented in a way that consultees will understand. This appears to have been done.

18. The responses to the consultation will need to be conscientiously taken into account when the Cabinet makes any future decision in relation to the issue.
19. 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.
20. The best value duty is contained in s3 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 provision will continue as it has done previously with no changes for staff, young people that access the service or members of the community.

Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults implications

22. Safeguarding vulnerable children is a high priority in Surrey schools. Schools 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 of schools.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

23. Subject to Cabinet Member approval of the Statutory Notice, the proposal will be confirmed for The Hope Epsom and The Hope Guildford being amalgamated to form one single Hope Service across two separate sites from 1 January 2016.

Contact Officer:

Julie Beckett, School Commissioning Officer, Tel: 01483 518109

Consulted:

SCC County Councillor for the local area
All Surrey secondary schools
All Surrey special schools
All parents of young people at the PRU

All staff and the Management Committee at the school
Family Voice
SCC Officers
Health and Therapy Providers
Unions
Babcock 4S Consultants

Sources/background papers:

School Organisation Consultation paper: Proposal to amalgamate Hope Epsom and Guildford to a single establishment

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS, SKILLS AND
EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT****DATE: 14 DECEMBER 2015****LEAD OFFICER: JULIE FISHER, DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE****SUBJECT: PROPOSED EXPANSION OF THE PRIORY CHURCH OF
ENGLAND (VA) SCHOOL****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

The Governing Body of The Priory Church of England (VA) School, in partnership with Surrey County Council (SCC) and the Diocese of Guildford, has consulted on a proposal to expand the school by one form of entry from September 2017 and a further one form of entry in September 2019 (making a two form entry expansion in total). The education consultation was conducted between 28 September 2015 and 26 October 2015.

On the basis of the education rationale for the expansion and, in view of the comments received during the consultation period, the Governing Body of the school voted to proceed with the expansion project. The Cabinet Member is asked to review the summary of the consultation process provided within this report and associated Annexes and, on that basis, determine whether to ratify the decision made by the school from Surrey County Council's perspective.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the formal decision of the Governing Body of The Priory Church of England (VA) School to expand by 2 Forms of Entry (2FE) be ratified by the Cabinet Member.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

There is an increasing demand for primary school places around the Dorking area which reflects a rise in the primary-age population over recent years that is beginning to transition into the secondary sector. In order to meet this demand, Surrey County Council (SCC) is overseeing an ongoing school expansion programme designed to increase the capacity of the school estate. The proposal to expand the capacity of The Priory Church of England (VA) School by 2FE is a core element of SCC's strategy to deliver additional places in this area. In line with this, the Governing Body of the school have undertaken the requisite statutory consultation process and, on this basis, have made the formal education decision to expand the school. For these reasons, it is recommended that the Cabinet Member formally ratify the decision of the school in this respect so as to provide the necessary platform on which to proceed with the project.

DETAILS:

The Proposal

1. On 28 September 2015, the Governing Body of The Priory Church of England (VA) School, in cooperation with the Diocese of Guildford and SCC, published a proposal to:
 - Enlarge The Priory Church of England (VA) School from five forms of entry (5FE) at Year 7 to seven forms of entry (7FE) at Year 7, to allow for a roll of 1,050, comprising seven classes of 30 pupils in each year group.
 - Build additional permanent classrooms and ancillary space to facilitate this.
2. It is proposed that the above enlargement would be split into two phases. The first expansion of 1FE would be enacted from 1 September 2017. Following this, in September 2019, a second one form entry expansion would be enacted. It is proposed that the school would grow incrementally, year-on-year, as the higher intake works its way progressively through the age range. As such, the school would effectively reach its new capacity of 1,050 places in September 2023. The incremental expansion in capacity is shown in the table below:

Year	Y7	Y8	Y9	Y10	Y11	Total
2017/18	180	150	150	150	150	780
2018/19	180	180	150	150	150	810
2019/20	210	180	180	150	150	870
2020/21	210	210	180	180	150	930
2021/22	210	210	210	180	180	990
2022/23	210	210	210	210	180	1,020
2023/24	210	210	210	210	210	1,050

Reasons for the Proposal

3. Mole Valley is experiencing a significant increase in demand for school places, reflecting both a rise in birth rate and increased house building and migration within the area. Births in Mole Valley in 2013 were 6.4% higher than births in 2002. The increased pupil cohort is now starting to make the transition into the secondary sector. As such, there is now the need to accommodate increased demand, via the expansion of local secondary provision.
4. Within the Dorking Planning Area there is presently provision for 390 places per year in Year 7, composed of the following:
 - The Ashcombe School (offering 240 Year 7 places per annum); and
 - The Priory Church of England (VA) School (offering 150 Year 7 places per annum).
5. Demand for secondary school places in Dorking is projected to rise over the coming years, in line with the general increase across the whole of the Mole Valley District. Projections of future demand for school places are presented in the below table:

Year	Y7 PAN	Y7 Projection	Deficit
2015/16	390	405	15
2016/17	390	394	4
2017/18	390	419	29
2018/19	390	413	23
2019/20	390	461	71
2020/21	390	450	60
2021/22	390	462	72
2022/23	390	479	89
2023/24	390	458	68
2024/25	390	465	75
2025/26	390	460	70

6. As can be seen from the above, there is a sustained need for additional secondary places in the area. Whilst SCC has managed the immediate pressure for September 2015 in this and the wider area, the need for permanent expansions will remain. A core component of the strategy devised to meet this need is the proposed expansion of The Priory by two Forms of Entry which (if approved) would reduce all of the above projected deficits by 60 places.
7. 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 2014, rates the school as 'Good'. In particular, this report noted that "Teaching of all subjects, including literacy, reading and mathematics, is good and is continuing to improve. It is characterised by strong relationships between teachers and students. Many students describe their teachers as 'awesome' and 'inspirational'". The evident quality of education provision at The Priory 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

8. 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)
9. 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:

10. As a Voluntary Aided school, the increase in admission number was the subject of a school-led consultation process which was held for a four week period between 28 September and 26 October 2015. This process engaged a

range of interested stakeholders, including the school community, local residents, local admissions authorities and the Surrey School Admissions Forum. On 19 October 2015, the Governing Body held a consultation evening at the school, to which all interested parties were invited. A summary of the feedback from the entire consultation process is appended to this report as Annex 2.

11. Ultimately, as The Priory Church of England (VA) School is a Voluntary Aided School, the statutory decision in respect of the expansion proposal rests with the school Governing Body. On the basis of the education rationale for the expansion and in view of the comments received during the consultation period, the Governing Body of the school voted to proceed with the expansion project and this decision was published on the school's website on 24 November 2015. The record of this decision is appended to this report as Annex 1.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

12. As the education consultation has been completed and the associated decision made, in compliance with the relevant legislation governing such decisions, there is no outstanding risk in this respect. However, it should be noted that there was a degree of opposition to the proposals that manifested in the feedback to the consultation process, with half of the responses received being opposed to the proposal. The largest section of these concerns, however, was related to the building project and highways issues. These matters are properly considered as part of the planning consultation process when firm proposals have been developed in relation to the building. That said, these concerns have been relayed to the Project Team and attention will be paid to mitigation measures as the project moves forward.
13. 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

14. The building project associated with this proposal is included in SCC's Basic Need Capital Programme element of its 2015-20 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

15. The Section 151 Officer confirms that the basic need expansion scheme for this school is included in the 2015-20 MTFP.

Public Sector Equality Duty

16. 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.

General Decision-Making

17. 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 MTFP, the council's fiduciary duty, any relevant risks, the results of the consultation and the public sector equality duty.

Fiduciary Duty

18. The council owes a fiduciary duty to its council Taxpayers, 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 Tax payers 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

19. The best value duty is contained in s3 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

20. 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.
21. The School Organisation (maintained schools) Guidance for Proposers and Decision-makers January 2014 and the School Admissions Code 2014 set

out the requirements for governing bodies of Voluntary Aided schools in school expansions where PAN will increase. As there was no actual requirement to consult, the governing body have gone over and above the duties set out under these statutory documents.

22. This report sets out how the Authority will meet its duties in response to the increasing demand for school places in Dorking.

Equalities and Diversity

23. The expansion of the school will not create any issues that would require the production of an Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) as no group with protected characteristics will be adversely affected as a consequence of its approval, or otherwise.
24. The new school building will comply with Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) regulations.
25. The Admissions arrangements give the highest priority to Looked After Children (LAC), thus supporting provision for the county's most vulnerable children. Priority is then given (in order) to siblings; those who regularly attend a Church of England church; those who regularly attend another Christian church; those who regularly attend a place of another religious faith; and those with exceptional medical or social needs. 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 School Admissions Code.

Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications

26. This proposal would provide increased provision for secondary 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

27. 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. In addition, 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:

28. Subject to Cabinet Member approval of the recommendation of this report, the next steps are:
 - 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.

Contact Officer:

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

Consulted:

The Priory Church of England (VA) School Governing Body
Parents of pupils attending the school
Local residents
Diocese of Guildford
Local Headteachers
Peter-John Wilkinson, Assistant Director for Schools and Learning
Stephen Cooksey, Local County Council Member for Dorking South & the Holmwoods
Mole Valley District Council
Unions (NUT, NASUWT, ATL)
School Admissions Forum

Annexes:

Annex 1 – Governing Body Decision Letter
Annex 2 – Summary of Consultation Feedback

Sources/background papers:

- The Priory Church of England (VA) School Statutory Notice
 - The Priory Church of England (VA) School Consultation Document
-

This page is intentionally left blank



24th November 2015

Dear Parents

The Governors of The Priory School met on Wednesday 18th November 2015 and have passed the resolution to expand the school by one form in 2017 and 2018 (i.e. intake an additional 30 pupils, relative to present) and then two forms from 2019 onwards (i.e. intake an additional 60 pupils, relative to present). We think it is important that you are aware of how the decision was made and how the consultation influenced the process.

The Education Consultation

Consultation on this proposal was undertaken between 28th September 2015 and 26th October 2015. On the first day of this consultation, a Statutory Notice was published in the Dorking Advertiser and posted on the school gates, a letter was sent out to all parents/carers of children at the school and an email was sent out to other relevant stakeholders (including the Governing Body, relevant unions and the local admissions authority). All of these communications directed interested parties to the school's website where the full consultation document was available, together with a Consultation Response Form.

A consultation meeting was held at the school on Monday 19th October 2015. In all, 19 people were in attendance including School Governors plus the School Senior Leadership Team and Oliver Gill from Surrey County Council. Thank you to those of you who responded with the consultation form. We received ten responses to the consultation, mostly from local residents with five saying that they were against the proposal, two in favour and three "don't knows". The biggest concern for local residents was traffic.

At the Governors meeting on 18th November 2015 the Governors had a full and frank discussion focussing primarily on the concerns raised as part of the consultation. It was unanimously agreed by all Governors present that the expansion be approved.

The Next Steps

Approval must be sought from SCC Cabinet Members in December 2015. After this time, work on the design for the new building will begin in earnest and, once complete, there will be a public meeting held at the school which is where you will be able to have a pre-planning viewing of the proposals. The date and time will be confirmed in due course, along with who will be attending from Surrey County Council.

On a final note - this is a very exciting proposal, but we recognise that there are many challenges ahead. As a Governing Body and school we remain committed to ensuring that you are kept as informed as possible throughout the process.

In the meantime if you have queries please contact the school at enquiries@priorycofe.com

Yours sincerely

Andre Sohatski
Headmaster

This page is intentionally left blank

Proposal to enlarge The Priory C of E (VA) School
Consultation Meeting
Monday 19th October 2015

Summary of Consultation

The consultation process ran from Monday 28th September 2015 to Monday 26th October 2015 at noon. On 19th October 2015 a consultation meeting was held with interested parties. At the meeting the following issues were raised and discussed:

- Calculation of demand – Slide 3 of the presentation showed Surrey County Council projected figures year by year. Concern was expressed over the reliability of these figures and whether there was the possibility that the school may be left with empty places, if the expansion were to proceed. It was explained that there was a significantly high level of projected demand for this not to be of concern. The figures show a need for an additional 2 Forms of entry in the Dorking area from 2019/20.
- Traffic and Transport – concerns were raised with regard to the amount of increased traffic at the beginning and end of each school day. Concern over additional coaches and buses that would be needed. Traffic in Dorking is dreadful with the current one way system, suggestion as to whether a road way could be brought in from A25, Westcott Road. Permission from the Highways Department would be required. School transport issues would increase if the expansion were to proceed, so a review from the Highways Department would be required as part of the Planning process. Concern over the gridlock of cars could deter prospective parents from coming to the school. It was noted that primary school parents are a higher volume of car users, meaning that the relative impact at The Priory will not be as great as it had been at expanded primary schools. The School Travel Plan would be revised as part of the Planning Process for this school and this should address some of the concerns raised.
- Advantages of the Expansion – Local students would come to a local school. Local students are more likely to walk to school. Would still keep the appeal of a family school even with 2 additional forms, as for many years we have had 6 forms so only one actual form increase.

The Governors are behind this expansion proposal. The future will hold better facilities for students, so will become a more appealing school.

- One respondent objected to expansion as the school is a C of E school and would prefer a non C of E school to expand.
- Building – concern over the structure of a new building and the position of it. At this stage no decision on build had been made, a further consultation as part of the planning process would be required subject to the outcome of this education consultation being approved.
- Next Steps – It was confirmed that a decision on the expansion would be taken by Surrey County Council Cabinet Members in December 2015.

In addition, interested parties were invited to return responses to the consultation, via the Consultation Response Form found on the school website.

In total 10 such formal responses were received. All of these responses were from local residents of the school, with one being a staff member. Of the responses, 3 agreed with the proposal, 5 disagreed with the proposal and we had 2 'don't knows' in this respect. The responses raised issues in line with those set out above.

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS, SKILLS AND EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT****DATE: 14 DECEMBER 2015****LEAD OFFICER: JULIE FISHER, DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE****SUBJECT: PROPOSED EXPANSION OF DOWNS WAY SCHOOL****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Surrey County Council has consulted on a proposal to expand Downs Way School by half a form of entry from September 2016. The education consultation was conducted between 21 September and 19 October 2015.

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 Annex 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 Downs Way School by 0.5 Forms of Entry (0.5 FE) for September 2016.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

There is an increasing demand for primary school places in Oxted and Limpsfield 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 Downs Way School by 0.5 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 no objections have been 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 21 September 2015, SCC published a proposal to:
 - Enlarge Downs Way School from one-and-a-half forms of entry (1.5 FE) at Reception to two forms of entry (2 FE) at Reception, to allow for a roll of 180, comprising two 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 60 pupils worked its way progressively through the age range. However, it should be noted that, as the school has taken an additional bulge year half-class in the 2015/16 academic year, the school will effectively reach its new capacity of 180 places in September 2017.

Reasons for the Proposal

3. Tandridge is experiencing a steady increase in the demand for school places, reflecting both a rise in birth rate and increased house building and migration within the area. Births in Tandridge in 2014 were 9.2% higher than births in 2002. Additional primary school places have been provided reflecting 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 Oxted and Limpsfield Planning Area, there is presently provision for 165 places per year in Reception, composed of the following:
 - Downs Way School (offering 45 Reception places per annum);
 - Hurst Green Infant School (offering 30 Reception places per annum);
 - Limpsfield C of E Infant School (offering 60 Reception places per annum);
 - and
 - St. Peter's C of E Infant School (offering 30 Reception places per annum).
5. Demand for primary school places has been rising in Oxted and Limpsfield, in line with the general increase across the whole of the Tandridge District. Projections of future demand for school places are presented in the below table:

Year	Inf. PAN	Inf. Projection	Surplus	Jun. PAN	Jun. Projection	Surplus
2015/16	165	159	6	150	152	- 2
2016/17	165	170	- 5	150	129	21
2017/18	165	173	- 8	150	139	11
2018/19	165	160	5	150	139	11
2019/20	165	153	12	150	148	2
2020/21	165	153	12	150	150	0
2021/22	165	153	12	150	139	11
2022/23	165	153	12	150	133	17
2023/24	165	153	12	150	133	17
2024/25	165	153	12	150	133	17

6. As can be seen from the above, there is a need for additional Infant places in the area in the short- to medium-term. This is also a relatively popular area for admissions applications and, even in years where a projected surplus has existed, placing all children with a preference in the area has proved difficult. This ultimately culminated in the “bulge” year expansion of Downs Way School for the 2015/16 academic year. The proposed expansion of Downs Way School by a half a Form of Entry would reduce all of the above projected deficits by 15 places and add further surplus in other years, thereby augmenting the scope for parental preference. In this respect, it should be noted that a 0.5FE expansion neatly aligns with the profile of demand in the

area. This, coupled with the fact that the expansion would enable the school to operate on the basis of full forms of entry (which supports effective financial and curriculum planning), was provided as a key part of the rationale for proposing to expand Downs Way to meet demand in the area.

7. 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 2014, rates the school as 'Good'. In particular, this report noted that "[t]he headteacher, ably supported by other leaders and governors, has ensured that all staff have high expectations of pupils' learning and achievement. As a result, teaching staff focus strongly and effectively on ensuring that pupils make enough progress". The evident quality of education provision at Downs Way 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

8. 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)
9. 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:

10. As a community school, the increase in admission number was the subject of a Council-led consultation process which was held for a 4-week period, between 21 September and 19 October 2015. This process engaged a range of interested stakeholders, including the school community, local residents, local admissions authorities and the Surrey School Admissions Forum. On 7 October 2015, a consultation evening was held at the school, to which all interested parties were invited. A summary of the feedback from the entire consultation process is appended to this report as Annex 2.
11. The feedback to the consultation was largely positive and in support of the proposed expansion; in total over 85% of respondents expressed support for the proposal. The feedback raised a number of issues, most of which were neutral in character. One core concern was raised in relation to the proposal, in terms of the perception that access to the site was restricted and thereby problematic, especially at peak drop-off/pick-up times. Naturally, this is an issue that will be picked-up in more detail during the planning process with suitable highways measures being introduced to the scheme, if it is deemed to be necessary, in order to mitigate the proposed level of expansion. 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:

12. As the education consultation has been completed in compliance with the relevant legislation governing such decisions, there is no outstanding risk in this respect.
13. 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 time for the opening of the new provision by September 2016. 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

14. The building project associated with this proposal is included in SCC's Basic Need Capital Programme in the 2015-20 Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP). It is to be funded from the allocation for demountable provision. All schemes are expected to remain within the funding allocated in the MTFP.

Section 151 Officer Commentary

15. This scheme will be funded from within the demountable allocation of the 2015-20 MTFP.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

Public Sector Equality Duty

16. 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

17. 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. Such consultation will need to involve those directly affected by such changes together with relevant representative groups. It will be important that the material presented to consultees provides sufficient information to allow for intelligent consideration and response in relation to the proposals. This information will need to be presented in a way that consultees will understand. 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 school.

Post-consultation

18. In considering this Report, the Cabinet Member must give due regard to the results of the consultation as set out above 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

19. 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 MTP, the council's fiduciary duty, any relevant risks, the results of the consultation and the public sector equality duty.

Fiduciary Duty

20. 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

21. The best value duty is contained in s3 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

22. 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.
23. This report sets out how the Authority will meet its duties in response to increasing demand for school places in Oxted & Limpsfield.

24. As the school's capacity and published admission number will be increased, a consultation and publication of notices was required. Seven responses were made to the consultation, of which six were in support and one opposed to the proposal. These responses were duly considered. The School Organisation Guidance and Admissions Code 2014 were duly followed.

Equalities and Diversity

25. 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.
26. The new school building will comply with Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) regulations.
27. As a community school, admissions to Dovers Green are governed by SCC'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

28. 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

29. 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:

30. Subject to Cabinet Member approval of the recommendation of this report, the next steps are:
- To implement the proposed expansion from September 2016.
 - To deliver the associated building works through the demountables programme for 2016/17, with a view to having the expanded school facilities ready to accommodate the new 2 FE pupil cohort in September 2016.

Contact Officer:

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

Consulted:

Downs Way School Governing Body

Parents of pupils attending the school

Local residents

Local Headteachers

Peter-John Wilkinson, Assistant Director for Schools and Learning

Nicholas Skellett, Local County Council Member for Oxted

Tandridge District Council

Unions (NUT, GMB)

School Admissions Forum

Annexes:

Annex 1 – Downs Way School Statutory Notice (Full)

Annex 2 – Summary of Consultation Feedback

Sources/background papers:

- Downs Way School Consultation Document
-

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex 1 – Downs Way 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 **Downs Way 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.

Downs Way School, Downs Way, Oxted, Surrey, RH8 0NZ
(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 Downs Way School from one-and-a-half forms of entry (1.5FE) at Reception to two forms of entry (2FE) at Reception. As such, the total capacity of the school would be permanently increased from 135 to 180 pupils. As the school has taken an additional bulge year class in the 2015/16 academic year, the school will effectively reach its new capacity of 180 places in September 2017.

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 21 September 2015 and concludes at midday on Monday 19 October 2015. 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 Downs Way School from one-and-a-half forms of entry (1.5FE) at Reception to two forms of entry (2FE) 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 135-place Infant School, 45 places per year from Reception to Year 2, to a 180-place Infant School, 60 places per year from Reception to Year 2.

- (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 45. Under this proposal, the PAN would be increased to 60, 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;

60 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 127 pupils on roll at Downs Way School.

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 Oxted and Limpsfield 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 Downs Way School on 7 October 2015.

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;

Tandridge is experiencing a steady increase in the 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 9.2% higher than births in 2002. Additional primary school places have already 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 45 additional infant places within Tandridge 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 solid reputation, which it is building on an ongoing basis. For September 2015, the school received 33 1st preferences, and 104 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 – Proposal to enlarge Downs Way School

Summary of Consultation

The consultation process ran from 21 September 2015 to 19 October 2015. On 7 October 2015, a consultation meeting was held with interested parties. At this meeting, the following issues were raised and discussed:

- Demand – a question was raised with respect to whether there was sufficient long-term demand to justify the expansion of this school. An explanation of the projections for the Primary Planning Area (Oxted & Limpsfield) was provided in response. These numbers show a peak in demand over the next couple of years, followed by a stabilisation of the numbers at or around the current level thereafter. Given that there was sufficient demand this year to warrant the expansion of the school (even though there was a projected surplus in the area), it would appear that a permanent expansion will meet with demand. Furthermore, it was noted that, in contrast to other Boroughs, for which this information is available, the current forecasts for this area do not include an allowance for future housing development. As such, the Council will expect demand to be higher than projected, thus strengthening the case for expansion.
- Selection of Downs Way – it was asked why Downs Way School was chosen to expand to meet local demand, in preference to other schools in the area. It was explained that the reasoning behind the selection of this school was twofold. Firstly, the alteration made sense from a school organisation perspective, in terms of enabling the school to operate with full forms of entry, as opposed to the current situation, which can be difficult from a financial and curriculum planning point of view. Secondly, being a 0.5FE expansion, the proposal is neatly aligned with the profile of demand in the area. A larger, 1FE expansion, would be both more expensive and likely to lead to a surplus of places in the area.
- School Building – a question was raised as to how the new classroom would be integrated with the current building. The school responded that the current intention was to link the new building with the existing by way of a covered walkway.

In addition, interested parties were invited to return responses to the consultation, via the Consultation Response Form, included at the end of the Consultation Document. In total, 7 such formal responses were received. 3 of these responses were from local residents; 3 were from members of the school staff; and 1 was from a parent/carer of a child attending another school. Of the responses received, 6 agreed with the proposal and 1 disagreed with the proposal. Many of the responses raised issues in line with those set out above. However, a number of new issues were raised, as set out below:

- School Management – one response lent its support to the proposal on the basis that it would enable single age classes and, consequently, effective year group teaching and budget planning.
- Site Access – A concern was raised in relation to a feeling that access to the site was restricted and thereby problematic, especially at peak drop-off/pick-up times. It was felt that this translated into a Health & Safety concern in relation to children’s welfare and that, in order to avoid this situation being worsened, the Council should look to invest in a site for a new school, rather than expanding “already stretched services”. However, at present, the pupil forecasts do not indicate sufficient levels of demand to warrant the creation of a new school in the area and, as such, expansion of Downs Way is considered to be the best available option in school organisation terms. All such Highways matters will be properly considered as part of the Planning Process and suitable highways measures will be introduced to the scheme, if it is deemed necessary to mitigate the proposed level of expansion.