

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND LEARNING****DATE: 21 NOVEMBER 2012****REPORT OF: NICK WILSON, STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES****SUBJECT: EXPANSION OF TRUMPS GREEN INFANT SCHOOL - DECISION****KEY ISSUE/DECISION:**

To decide whether to approve the expansion of Trumps Green Infant School to become a two form entry (2FE) infant school on 1 September 2013 with a Published Admission Number (PAN) of 60.

DETAILS:

1. Numbers of children starting school in The Virginia Water and Englefield Green area have been increasing. There are not enough permanent reception places in September 2012 for those that need them. Therefore, an additional bulge class is being provided at Trumps Green Infant School. The forecast increase in demand for reception places means we have identified Trumps Green Infant School as a school that should expand over the next few years.
2. On 19 July 2012 the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning authorised the publication of statutory notices regarding the Proposals.

Proposal

3. The notice period has expired and the Cabinet Member needs to consider the proposal and act as Decision Maker and, giving regard to the Decision Maker's Guidance, to examine the Prescribed Information (Annex A) and determine the proposals - decide whether to approve the proposals that:
 - Trumps Green Infant School expands to become a two form entry (2FE) infant school on 1 September 2013
 - the PAN would increase from 30 to 60 in September 2013
 - the school would increase its number of places by 30 pupils each year from 2013 until it has fully expanded
4. Additional classrooms would be built to accommodate the additional pupils and increase the capacity of the school from 90 to 180 places.

Issues**Pupil Numbers in the area**

5. Trumps Green Infant School is in the Virginia Water & Englefield Green primary planning area. The Virginia Water and Englefield Green area is a large planning area in Runnymede with the Egham and Thorpe area in the north east,

the Chertsey area to the east and Addlestone and the Ottershaw area to the south east. There is pupil movement across the planning area as well as across the boundaries of the planning areas. Therefore, it is appropriate to consider places in the wider area.

Births

6. All births in the Virginia Water & Englefield Green and adjacent areas have increased since the Millennium, though dropped from 2003 to 2005, but have increased since then. The births are now significantly higher than around the Millennium, and they are projected to increase slightly beyond that. Births are now about 14% higher than 4 years ago, which means there will be about 14% more children needing a primary school place in 4 years than need a place now.

Housing developments

7. Despite a slowdown in building owing to the recession, some housing developments are taking place, with over 170 housing units being completed in Runnymede Borough in 2011. Families move into new housing developments, further increasing demand for places in the area. Pressure from housing developments is not only felt close to the development, but the increased numbers of pupils apply pressure on all schools in the wider area.

Historic Numbers on Roll and Forecast demand for primary places

8. Applications for places in the area have steadily increased apart from a dip in the 2008/09 school year. Numbers entering reception also dipped in 2008 but have steadily increased since then.
9. Numbers are forecast to increase significantly in the next few years and then steadily for the foreseeable future. The forecast assumes increasing births and additional new housing which already has planning permission and housing as identified in the borough's housing trajectory.
10. An expansion of primary provision by over two forms of entry (2FE) of infant places and over 4FE of junior places is needed in the wider area. Trumps Green Infant School has been identified as an appropriate school to expand in order to meet part of this additional demand.

Are there choices?

Option 1: No Change

11. There would be insufficient primary places in the area. Surrey County Council (SCC) would fail to meet its statutory duty of providing sufficient primary school places for those that need them.
12. Therefore, no change is not an acceptable option.

Option 2: Proceed with the proposal with modification

13. The only modification available would be to amend the implementation date. The additional primary school places are needed now and a delay in the implementation date would delay the provision of additional places.

14. Therefore, the implementation date should not be modified.

Option 3: Proceed with the proposal

15. This would enable SCC to meet its statutory duty of providing sufficient primary school places for those that need them.
16. Therefore, it would be appropriate to approve the proposals.

Financial and value for money implications

17. This scheme is in the School Basic Need Capital Programme approved by Full Council in February 2012. The level of funding available for the capital programme was approved on the basis that through more cost effective build solutions and joint procurement efficiencies with Hampshire, financial savings could be made. All schemes within the capital programme have therefore been allocated a provisional budget which includes a savings target to be achieved. The cost of all schemes will be evaluated, monitored and reported against their target budget.
18. A demountable classroom has had adaptations to provide the accommodation for September 2012. The governing body of the school managed the project and have identified a suitable cost-effective scheme that will come within the budget allocated to this project in the Education Capital Programme.
19. The expansion should be cost-effective as only two further additional classrooms will be required. Therefore the total cost of this scheme should be kept within the total budget allocated to it.

Consultation

20. The consultation included all those persons who are required to be consulted according to statutory requirements. The following were consulted: the governing body of the School; the families of pupils, teachers and other staff at the school; the trade unions who represent staff in Surrey schools; all primary schools in the Borough; the Church of England and Roman Catholic Dioceses in which the school is located; the local MP; the local SCC members; local borough councillors; the Primary Care Trust; SCC Early Years and Childcare Service; the local Early Years setting.
21. Public consultation has taken place on the proposal to expand the School, and a Consultation Booklet was issued. Two public meetings were held at the School. A relatively small number of people attended the consultation meetings.

Consultation Response analysis

22. There were 9 responses received by the deadline for submitting responses. Of these 4 were parents/carers of a child at the school. This is a low number, so the analysis will not be highly reliable.
23. There are about 90 pupils at the schools, so this is a response rate of about 8% of the parents/carers of children at the schools depending on whether each child has one or two parents/carers and the number of children in the families. This is a low response rate.

24. The figures for percentages may not add up to 100% owing to rounding errors or where either more than one response was made, or where respondents provided no response.
25. There was a high level of support for the proposals.
26. Of the total respondents, 78% supported the expansion proposal, 22% neither supported nor opposed the proposal, and 0% of respondents opposed the proposal.
27. Of those respondents with a child at the school, 80% supported the expansion proposal, 20% neither supported nor opposed the proposal, and 25% of respondents opposed the proposal.

Statutory Notice

28. There were no representations made in response to the publication of the Statutory Notice.
29. Details of the consultation are provided in the document " Trumps Green Infant School Expansion Consultation Analysis ", but the responses are summarised below with SCC's observations upon them.

Point 1

30. There were concerns about traffic and parking – 56% of respondents raised this as an issue.

Response 1

31. It is recognised that on occasion there can be inconsiderate parking even though there is adequate parking within a short walking distance from the school and this is of particular concern to some local residents. The local community are not opposed to the expansion despite issue over parking.
32. The school currently serves a large area, with some pupils living at distance from the school. However it is the nature of school provision in more rural areas that whilst some families live close to school, others live further away and, therefore, children are likely to be driven to school.

Point 2

33. The school is a good school and should expand – 22% of respondents raised this as an issue

Response 2

34. The expansion of successful and popular schools is an underlying rationale for this proposal.

Point 3

35. Priority in admissions to the school should be given – 22% of respondents raised this as an issue

Response 3

36. It is important for community cohesion that schools serve the local community and, therefore, families can attend linked schools. This will be given consideration.

Point 4

37. The school would be too large – 22% of respondents raised this as an issue and there would be insufficient infrastructure

Response 4

38. Sufficient physical infrastructure will be provided. The School is confident that there would not be an adverse impact on either the ethos or standards.

Equalities implications

39. This educational provision would be for children in the communities served by the school. If there is sufficient provision available, then it would be beneficial for all children, including vulnerable children. Therefore, enhancing provision would promote equalities.
40. The proposal is for an expansion of provision, so more staff would be employed. Employment opportunities would increase with a larger school. The range of opportunities would be enhanced by the expansion of the school and there would also be greater professional development opportunities.

Risk management implications

41. A project to provide additional classrooms for September 2013 will be required. There is a low risk that these classrooms will not be available in time.

Implications for the Council's Community Strategy priorities

42. The provision of sufficient school places contributes to the children and young people strand of the Community Strategy.
43. Expansion of community infrastructure in appropriate locations is in accordance with housing, infrastructure and environment policy.

Climate change/carbon emissions implications

44. The County Council attaches great importance to being environmentally aware and wishes to show leadership in cutting carbon emissions and tackling climate change.

Legal implications/legislative requirements

45. Section 1 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 inserts section 13A into the Education Act 1996, which places a duty on local education authorities (ie Local Authorities with responsibility for the functions of education in their area) to promote high standards and the fulfilment of potential. A local education authority shall exercise its functions with a view to promoting high standards, ensuring fair access to educational opportunity, and promoting the fulfilment by every child concerned of his educational potential. The duty of promotion means a local education authority should be proactive in the discharge of its functions.
46. Section 13 of the Education Act 1996 places a general duty on local education authorities to secure that efficient primary education is available to meet the needs of the population of their area. Section 14 of the Education Act 1996 places a duty on local education authorities to secure that sufficient schools for providing primary education are available in their area. Section 5 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 places a duty to promote high standards. Therefore, there is a duty to provide efficient education and sufficient schools to do so.
47. The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 contains the regulations that apply to prescribed alterations. The former DCSF, now DfE published two pieces of Guidance relating to prescribed alterations: Expanding a Maintained Mainstream School or Adding a Sixth Form and Making Changes to a Maintained Mainstream School (Other than Expansion). These contain both statutory guidance (i.e. guidance to which proposers and decision makers have a statutory duty to have regard) and non-statutory guidance on the process for making changes to school provision.

Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications

48. This proposal would provide increase provision in the area, which would be of benefit to all in the community served by the school. This means it would, therefore, also be of benefit to any looked after children who will attend the school.

Section 151 Officer commentary

49. The Section 151 Officer confirms that this scheme is part of the approved capital programme and that provisional funding has been allocated. The full costs of this scheme will be evaluated during the procurement process and reported to Cabinet.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member approves the proposals that:

- Trumps Green Infant School will expand on 1 September 2013
- the PAN would increase from 30 to 60 in September 2013
- the school would increase its number of places by 30 pupils each year from 2013 until it has fully expanded
- Additional classrooms would be built to accommodate the additional pupils and increase the capacity of the school from 90 to 180 places

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Additional infant places in the area are necessary. The expansion of Trumps Green Infant School would increase parental choice and provide effective long-term provision to meet the needs of local children, promoting high standards, ensuring fair access to educational opportunity, and promoting the fulfilment by every child of their educational potential.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

Subject to Cabinet Member approval, Surrey County Council will implement the proposals. There will be a separate approvals process to authorise the spending of funds on the scheme.

Contact Officer:

Mark Burton, School Place Planning Manager, tel 020 8541 9142

Consulted:

David Hodge, Leader

Mel Few, Member for Foxhills and Virginia Water

Nick Wilson, Strategic Director – Children Schools & Families

Julie Fisher, Strategic Director – Change & Efficiency.

Informed:

Finance

Legal Services

Sources/background papers:

The Education Act 1996; the School Standards and Framework Act 1998; the Education Act 2002; the Education Act 2005; the Education and Inspections Act 2006. Consultation Booklet regarding the expansion of Trumps Green Infant School
Trumps Green Infant School Expansion Consultation Analysis.

This page is intentionally left blank