

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING****DATE: 17 JULY 2014****LEAD OFFICER: NICK WILSON, STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES****SUBJECT: TO DETERMINE A PROPOSAL TO EXPAND AND REBUILD CRANMERE PRIMARY SCHOOL****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

School rolls have been rising steadily across Elmbridge since 2006. To ensure sufficient provision of primary school places in the Dittons and Weston Green Planning area Surrey County Council is proposing the expansion and rebuild of Cranmere Primary School with effect from 1 September 2016.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that:

1. The school is enlarged by two forms of entry (from its original capacity of one form of entry to three forms) plus the addition of a new twenty-six place nursery.
2. The school will be rebuilt on the Grove Farm site which is land owned by Surrey County Council adjacent to the current Cranmere school.
3. This expansion would be effective from 1 September 2016 as the new school is unlikely to be ready for new admissions by September 2015.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Cranmere Primary is a popular and successful school delivering high quality education. It was rated by OFSTED, at its last inspection (Nov 2011), as good with some outstanding features. The school has taken additional (bulge) Reception classes every year since September 2009. The provision of additional places at a new Cranmere with greater capacity meets the Government's policy position to expand successful schools in order to meet parental preferences.

DETAILS:**Business Case**

1. There is an immediate pressing need for more primary school places in the Dittons and Weston Green planning area of Elmbridge Borough. Cranmere Primary School has already been expanded on a temporary basis; it has accommodated two Reception classes each year since 2009 with the addition of temporary accommodation in the form of demountable classrooms. It is no longer possible to expand further on the present site without compromising play space. Also the accommodation is insufficient to support the size of the school, i.e. the school was built to accommodate seven classes and it now has eleven

classes; the hall is too small, as is the staff room, and there are insufficient small group rooms and toilet facilities for the number of pupils.

2. The school is willing to expand and is keen to do so with the promise of new, purpose-built accommodation which is designed to enhance the quality of the educational opportunities on offer and provide nursery education on site. The staff and governors have been working closely with Surrey County Council and the Hampshire County Council Cluster Programme Office to design a new building fit for twenty-first century primary education. The design and associated scheme received planning approval from Surrey County Council's Planning Committee in May 2014.
3. The Local Authority has a statutory duty to provide sufficient school places and it is not currently possible to expand other local schools in the immediate planning area. This is because they are either on restricted sites that are too small to take more buildings or they are in the Green Belt where it would be equally difficult to obtain planning permission. Based on the most recent pupil projections, the County Council is forecasting a need for two additional forms of entry in the Dittons and Weston Green. This proposal forms one part of an area strategy for Elmbridge which will require at least seven additional forms across the borough by 2020. The area strategy includes a number of other expansions of schools; some of these are agreed with the schools in question, and others are still at the proposal stage, but all are accounted for within the Capital Strategy and the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan.

CONSULTATION:

4. Public consultation was carried out between 5 and 30 November 2012. A consultation document was produced and circulated to all parents and other stakeholders and interested parties. In addition, a meeting was held at the school on 21 November. This was attended by approximately 26 parents and residents. The consultation document was also published on the Surrey County Council website and the local Borough and County councillors were sent copies of this document.
5. The Council has received 15 written consultation responses. An analysis of these is given in the table below:

Respondent	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know
Parent of a child attending the school	0	1	0
Potential Future parent/child in an Early Years setting	8	1	1
Parent of child at another school	0	0	0
Employee of the school	3	0	0
School governor	0	0	0
Other stakeholder	0	1	0

6. Eleven responses are in agreement with the proposal. One respondent stated that they do not know whether or not they are in favour; three respondents are against the proposal.
7. The main concern raised by respondents was the need to retain the 'family ethos' of the school; the perception being that this was much easier if a school is

small in size. To some extent this concern was addressed by the Headteacher at the public meeting where she explained in some detail how she would manage a larger organisation and also manage the transition to the new site.

8. Residents on Arran Way and some parents raised the issue of access to the proposed new building stating that the expansion may cause further traffic problems, especially if there is no vehicular access to the site enabling parents to drive in, drop off or pick up and drive out of the school. Mitigation of traffic management issues were addressed in the planning stages with pupil safety considerations being of paramount importance. The council's policies on safeguarding, site security and environmental issues have been factored into the final design for the new school. Those in support of the proposal recognised the need for more places and welcomed the opportunity to provide some of these at Cranmere in order to benefit the local community. A number of people were enthusiastic about the proposed new provision.
9. The Cabinet Member subsequently approved the publication of a statutory Notice after planning permission had been obtained. This Notice complied with all statutory requirements and included a four week consultation period. It closed on 11 June 2014. The Council received no further representations during this time.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

10. The key risk to this proposal is the completion of the new building on time. In order to build some additional temporary capacity into the planning area another school has agreed to take a bulge class in 2014, and potentially in 2016 after which it is crucial that permanent places are available at Cranmere.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

11. The cost of the proposed project will be funded through the Schools Basic Need Capital Programme and was approved as part of the 2014/19 Medium Term Financial Planning (MTFP) process. The detailed financial implications and costings will be developed as part of the business case which will go to Investment Panel.

Section 151 Commentary

12. The Section 151 Officer confirms that this project is included in the 2014/19 MTFP. The business case for the project will be considered as part of the Investment Panel process. There is an expectation that the scheme costs will remain within the approved funding levels.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

13. The *School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007* contain the regulations that apply to prescribed alterations. The DCSF has published updated Guidance in January 2014 relating to prescribed alterations: *Expanding a Maintained Mainstream School or Adding a Sixth Form*. This suite of documents contains both statutory guidance (i.e. guidance to which proposers and decision makers have a statutory duty to have regard) and non-statutory guidance on the process for making changes to school provision. This proposal has been submitted in line with the new Guidance.

Equalities and Diversity

14. There are no direct equalities implications arising out of the proposal. The increase in provision will be open to all applicants with the highest priority given to Looked After Children and pupils on the SEN register and/or those who would benefit from a statement of educational need, thus supporting provision for our most vulnerable children.

Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults implications

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

Climate change/carbon emissions implications

16. The County Council attaches great importance to being environmentally aware and wishes to show leadership in cutting carbon emissions and tackling climate change. The proposed new building will be energy efficient. A safe walking route to the school has been identified for use by residents and facilities will be provided at the new campus for children cycling or using scooters to come to school.
17. The additional school provision is centred close to the demographic demand and as a result will enable most parents and children to attend a local school and thus reduce the need for lengthy school journeys.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- Subject to Cabinet Member approval the building scheme will be tendered within the County Council's framework for procurement.

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

Consulted:
Parents of pupils and prospective pupils of Cranmere Primary School
Local Councillors
Local residents via the consultation document published on the SCC website and via the statutory Notice published in the local newspaper and on the school gate

Annexes: None

Sources/background papers:
School Organisation Consultation Proposal
15 Consultation responses
Statutory Notice
Planning Application
Minutes of the Surrey County Council Planning Committee's decision
