

PROPOSALS FOR PRESCRIBED ALTERATIONS OTHER THAN FOUNDATION PROPOSALS

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 and a contact address for the local education authority who are publishing the proposals.

St Mary's and St Peter's Church of England Primary School (voluntary-aided),
Somerset Road, Teddington, TW11 8RX.

London Borough of Richmond upon Thames, Regal House, London Road,
Twickenham, TW1 3QB.

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.

1 September 2011. The reception class intake for the 2011/2012 school year will be 90. The admission number will increase to 90 for Year 1 in 2012/2013, for Year 2 to 90 in 2013/2014, and so on until 2017/2018 when the admission number for each year-group, up to and including Year 6, will be 90.

Objections and comments

3. A statement explaining the procedure for making representations, including—
- (a) the date 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.

Objections and/or comments should be sent by no later than Friday 10 April 2009 to: Matthew Paul, Deputy Head of Commissioning, Delivery and Service Improvement, Regal House, London Road, Twickenham, TW1 3QB; m.paul@richmond.gov.uk. As that date is Good Friday, responses will be accepted if they are received by the end of Saturday 11 April 2009.

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.

It is proposed that from the 2011/2012 reception class intake, the school should be increased in size from two-form to three-form entry, i.e. its published admission number should be increased from 60 to 90.

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 or paragraphs 1-4, 7, 8, 18, 19 and 21 of Schedule 4 to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007, 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 current capacity of the school is 420; and the proposed capacity, by 2017/2018 when each year-group will have an admission number of 90, will be 630.

- (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 of the school is 60 in each year-group.

- (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;

The reception class intake for the 2011/2012 school year will be 90. The admission number will increase to 90 for Year 1 in 2012/2013, for Year 2 to 90 in 2013/2014, and so on until 2017/2018 when the admission number for each year-group will be 90.

- (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.

The school is full in all year-groups, except Years 4 and 5 which have 53 and 56 pupils respectively.

(2) Where the alteration is an alteration falling within any of paragraphs 1, 2, 9, 12 and 13 to 4, and 7 and 8 of Schedule 2 or paragraphs 1, 2, 8, 18 and 19 of Schedule 4 to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 a statement of the number of pupils at the school at the time of the publication of the proposals.

As at January 2009, there are 453 pupils on roll.

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.

The proposal will be implemented by the Local Authority on behalf of, and in liaison with, the Governing Body and the London Diocesan Board of Education.

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.

N/A.

(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 7 or 14 of Schedule 2 or 4 to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 —

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

N/A.

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

N/A.

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

N/A.

- (d) 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 7 or 14 of Schedule 2 or 4 to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 —

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

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;

N/A.

- (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;

N/A.

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

N/A.

Objectives

10. The objectives of the proposals.

The expansion of the school to two-form entry will meet the need for additional school places in the Teddington / Hampton Wick and South Twickenham / West Twickenham / Fulwell & Hampton Hill planning areas (coterminous with electoral wards). The Authority's reception class forecasts indicate that there will be a consistent shortfall of up to 70 places per year in these areas from 2010/2011 onwards, rising to up to 90 from 2012/2013.

Without the additional places that this proposal will provide, the Authority would be reliant upon a strategy of providing *temporary* additional places, which is considered to be a less than ideal solution compared with permanent expansion, given that the shortfall of places is predicted to continue for the next decade unless additional places are made available. It would also represent poor value for money compared with permanent expansion.

The school has sufficient space for expansion and, is a popular and successful school. Expansion will give the school a larger budget, which will enable the school to have a broader curriculum, with a greater variety of teaching expertise and specialisms.

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.

- (a) The Governing Body was consulted at meetings on 28 November 2007 and 17 December 2008. A meeting was held at the school on 24 November 2008 for parents of current pupils and for local residents, and parents have been kept informed via school newsletters since then. A parents' consultation day, for consideration of the architects' design, was held at the school on 20 November 2008. An overarching consultation document, outlining all of the Authority's proposed school expansions was sent, in January 2009, to all schools in the borough, Richmond upon Thames Admissions Forum, all elected members, neighbouring local authorities, the four Diocesan Boards of Education whose areas cover the borough, Land Securities Trillium; RUTSS; Ethnic Minority Advocacy Group; and parent governor representatives. It was also been posted on the Council's website. A copy of the consultation document is appended to this document.
- (b) Views expressed at the meeting on 17 December 2008 are contained within the minutes of that meeting, which are appended to this document.
- (c) Responses to the consultation are contained within a summary appended to this document.
- (d) All statutory requirements have been complied with in respect of this proposal.
- (e) See (a). The responses to the overarching document are included in the consultation summary which is appended to this document. The proposed expansion was also listed as a favoured option within the Local Authority's [Primary Strategy for Change](#), to which no objections regarding St Mary's and St Peter's were expressed.

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.

All costs will be met by the Local Authority. The total capital costs are currently estimated at £6m broken down as follows:

	£
Building Works	4,125,000
Fitted Furniture	120,000
VAT on building works	721,875
VAT on furniture	21,000
Professional Fee	740,000
VAT on Prof Fees	127,125

Loose FF&E (inc VAT)	50,000
ICT Hardware & Equipment (inc VAT)	75,000
School Decant	20,000
<u>Total Capital Costs</u>	6,000,000

13. A copy of confirmation from the Secretary of State, local education authority and the Learning and Skills Council for England (as the case may be) that funds will be made available (including costs to cover any necessary site purchase).

The costs will be met from a variety of sources, including Basic Need Safety Valve, Basic Need borrowing, Primary Capital Programme funding and Section 106 receipts. Copies of notifications of Government funding allocations are attached.

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;

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. (1) 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—

- (a) improve the educational or training achievements;
- (b) increase participation in education or training; and
- (c) expand the range of educational or training opportunities for 16-19 year olds in the area.

N/A.

(2) Where the proposals are to alter the upper age limit of the school so that the school will provide sixth form education, 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;

N/A.

- (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;

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.

There are no places currently reserved for children with SEN, but it is proposed that up to five places will be reserved.

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;

N/A.

- (d) a statement as to how the authority believe 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;

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;

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 privately-run nursery on the school site will be unaffected by the proposal. No changes to any other extended services are anticipated.

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;

The expansion of the school to two-form entry will meet the need for additional school places in the Teddington / Hampton Wick and South Twickenham / West Twickenham / Fulwell & Hampton Hill planning areas (coterminous with electoral wards). The Authority's reception class forecasts indicate that there will be a consistent shortfall of up to 70 places per year in these areas from 2010/2011 onwards, rising to up to 90 from 2012/2013.

Without the additional places that this proposal will provide, the Authority would be reliant upon temporary additional places, which are considered to be a less than ideal solution compared with permanent expansion, given that the shortfall of places is predicted to continue for the next decade unless additional places are made available. Further detail is available in the Local Authority's [Primary Strategy for Change](#).

- (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;

St Mary's and St Peter's is a Church of England school. In providing school places, the Local Authority seeks to strike a balance between demand for community and faith schools. This proposal is one of a number of planned expansions across the borough, and they are equally divided between community and faith schools. All infant and primary schools in the borough are oversubscribed with reception class applications for September 2009 entry and most of the seven Church of England schools with reception class intakes are among the most over-subscribed; some – St Mary's, and St Mary's and St Peter's itself – by more than three applications for every place.

- (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;

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) paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 to Schedule 2 and paragraphs 12 and 13 of Part 2 to Schedule 2; ;

(b) (for proposals published by the LA) paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 to Schedule 4.

of the Prescribed Alteration regulations.

(3) Whilst not required by regulations to provide this information for any LA proposals to expand a voluntary or foundation school, it is desirable to provide this below.

The Local Authority considers that St Mary's and St Peter's is a popular and successful school.

The school has been regularly oversubscribed, and has become increasingly popular, in recent years. The recent numbers of applications for the 60 places at the school are as follows:

2005/2006	2006/2007	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010
94	132	122	143	186

The overall effectiveness of the school was rated as 'outstanding' in its last [Ofsted inspection](#), in March 2008.

The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

St Mary's & St Peter's C of E Primary School

Minutes of the meeting with parents Re: Proposed Expansion held at the school on

Monday 24th November 2008 at 7:30pm

PANEL PRESENT AT MEETING			
Justine Bateman	Beverly Butler	Building Development Manager, LBRuT	
John Logan	Shirley Clifford	Development Projects Manager, LBRuT	
	Cllr Malcolm Eady		
	Cllr Stephen Knight		
	Graham Marriner	London Diocese	
	Matthew Paul	Deputy Head of Commissioning, Delivery & Service Improvement, LBRuT	
	Steve White	London Diocese	
	Nick Whitfield	Director of Education, LBRuT	

<p>Cllr Stephen Knight introduced members of the panel and informed that the purpose of the meeting was to give parents an opportunity to understand issues around the proposed expansion and for Governors to engage with parents and hear the views of everyone.</p> <p>SK explained that himself and Cllr Malcolm Eady would not be taking part in any decision making by virtue of their specific portfolios as Cabinet Members of the local authority.</p> <p>Nick Whitfield gave an overview of why the school has been asked to expand. This included the huge rising numbers of reception places required all across London especially South London. The borough of Richmond is expected to expand to provide 7 extra classes across the borough. NW explained that all areas have been researched and that in his judgment SMSP has the capacity to expand.</p> <p>Discussions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would it not be better to build a new school? <i>If the borough had the land it would be a very good idea but unfortunately there is not an identifiable area to build on. This would also only provide 1 Reception</i>

class initially and 7 forms of entry are required.

- Why is SMSP expanding when Stanley has more land?
Stanley will also be increasing by 1 more form of entry.
- SMSP was a 1 form entry school and has increased to 2 form entry, now the school has been asked to move to 3 form entry, will there be a request to go to 4 form entry in future years?
No, the school site does not have the capacity for 4 forms of entry or have any bulge classes.
- Nick Whitfield left the meeting at 8:00pm
- The procedures of applying for funding were explained.
- Parents were informed that the Governing Body would ultimately make the decision and at this stage a decision had not been made. The constitution of the Governing Body was explained. A meeting will be held on 17th December 2008 to vote on a decision.
- *School place planning was discussed in some depth covering the statutory proposal process and the timescales involved.*
- *The reduced outside space was discussed at length. Alternatives for making the best use of the spaces including split playtimes, use breakout areas etc., outlined.*
- *A timescale of construction starting in early 2010 was outline issues were discussed regarding Health & Safety during the building process. Assurances were given that the construction company is contractually and legally bound to follow stringent legislation procedures, and this is even more stringent where children are involved. If these were not adhered to building work would cease.*
- *The admissions criteria gives priority to siblings, church and then distance places, predictions are that distance places will be very close to the school. It would not be reasonable to use the current Reception Year as a guide to distances.*
- *A schedule of work will be presented to governors.*
- *The LA expressed their full commitment to the project.*
- *Parents commented that they felt that they had not been consulted and that a decision had already been made. They were assured that this was not the case.*
- *If the school did not expand then it would lose out on government funding for buildings for the next 10-12 years.*
- *The school website will provide feedback on the exhibition and keep parents informed.*
- *Further questions from parents were requested to be put in writing.*

	<i>The meeting closed at 9:45pm</i>
--	-------------------------------------

Sanctuary Buildings
Great Smith Street
Westminster
London, SW1P 3BT

To:-

Mrs Anji Phillips, Director of Children's Services
Richmond upon Thames Local Authority

Cc:-

Matthew Paul, Head of Pupil & Student Services

11 November 2008

Dear Colleague

PRIMARY CAPITAL PROGRAMME: NOTIFICATION OF ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

To access the funding earmarked for the delivery of the Primary Capital Programme, local authorities were asked to develop and agree with the Department a strategic plan, the Primary Strategy for Change, setting out how the programme will support national policies and local priorities.

All strategies have now been assessed against the guidance issued on 6 December 2007. I am writing to advise you of the outcome.

I am pleased to confirm that your authority's strategy has been **approved**. This means that the strategy was judged to have met all of the required elements and we are consequently able to confirm with immediate effect indicative allocations for 2009-10 and 2010-11. This will enable your authority to move ahead with planning and procuring its initial projects.

The overall comment from the assessors on the Primary Strategy for Change submitted by your authority was as follows:

This is a very full and clear strategy for transformation with only minor gaps in coverage. In all such cases, other elements of the strategy indicate that the LA has plans in place.

The annex to this letter provides a brief overview of the overall assessment process and outcomes.

Many congratulations on achieving a successful outcome. However, I should emphasise that this marks the start of your journey; it is not an end in itself. The local authority will need to keep the strategy under review to ensure that it delivers both in terms of the planned outputs and outcomes for children and families. To that end, you will need to continue working in partnership with schools, diocese and other stakeholders.

I would also remind you of our expectations in respect of sustainability and energy efficiency. New school buildings and refurbishment projects are required to achieve at least a 'very good' BREEAM Schools rating. In addition, we expect all new school

buildings to reduce carbon emissions by at least 60% relative to those constructed and designed to 2002 building regulations.

The Department will look to the authority to provide annual updates of progress against your plans, including in respect of achievement of BREEAM and the 60% carbon reduction target. We will provide further information on the monitoring arrangements in the New Year.

In the meantime, if you need any further information, please do not hesitate to get in touch with Peter Connell (email peter.connell@dcf.gov.uk)

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Sally Brooks". The signature is written in a cursive style with a period at the end.

Sally Brooks
Deputy Director, Schools Capital

Susan Kramer MP
House of Commons
London
SW1A 0AA

May 2008

Schools Capital Basic Need Safety Valve Funding (BNSV) 2008-11

I am pleased to announce that Richmond-upon-Thames London Borough Council has been allocated £8,897,708 BNSV grant for the three years commencing 1 April 2008. This is in addition to £34.8 million, including £3.0 million Basic Need, that has already been allocated to the local authority and its schools for the period.

BNSV is a programme intended to provide those few authorities with exceptional pupil growth with an allocation that increases their Basic Need programme funding. Both programmes are intended to help local authorities improve and expand their school facilities to cope with increased demand. They can be combined with other sources of funding available to the local authority from the Department, also with other resources available locally.

This funding forms part of a wider framework of capital support, which also includes targeted funding such as the Standards and Diversity initiatives, and strategic funding including our new Primary Capital Programme. Taken together, these programmes are steadily growing to a record supported capital figure of £8.2 billion by 2010-11.

Further details on our school capital programmes can be found on our website, <http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/management/resourcesfinanceandbuilding/capitalinvestment/>

Over the next few weeks, my officials will agree with the local authority how the allocation can be phased over the three year period. I am sending a copy of this letter to the local authority.

Jim Knight MP

CONSULTATION ON PRIMARY SCHOOL EXPANSIONS STRATEGY 2009-2013

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

15 responses were received by the closing date of 2 February 2009 and they can be broken down as follows: -

Diocesan boards of education	3
Elected members	3
Local authorities	0
Schools	5
Sets of parents	4
Other	0

In the simplest terms, these responses can be further broken down as follows: -

Definitely agree: 7 Tend to agree: 4 Tend to Disagree: 1 Definitely disagree: 2 Not clear 1

The LA's comments on responses, where appropriate, are in **bold** type.

Respondent	Response
<p>Michael Cullinane, Deputy Director of Education, Archdiocese of Southwark Commission for Schools and Colleges</p>	<p><i>Not clear.</i> I have spoken with our primary heads in Richmond and some concerns have been raised. The main concern is given that there is a proposal for a significant increase in forms of entry there is not a consideration for a proportion of these places for Catholic children. In real terms it reduces the percentage of places for Catholic children in Catholic schools at a time when there is considerable oversubscription. The Heads believe that a fair consideration would be for an extra form of entry for Catholic schools. As part of the drafting of the authority's Primary Strategy for Change in 2008, officers wrote to both Archdioceses and to all six Catholic schools in the borough regarding Catholic school provision, but neither Archdiocese nor any of the schools raised significant concerns, and both Archdioceses formally approved the Primary Strategy for Change. The current school expansion proposals flow from the Primary Strategy for Change. There is no evidence to suggest that demand from Catholic parents for Catholic school places has significantly increased since then – and even if it had, it could well be that that would be solely due to the recession-related effect of parents 'hedging their bets' with state schools when they would ordinarily send their children to private schools. The authority will, though, closely monitor demand for Catholic primary schools in the borough.</p> <p>We are concerned about the inference that larger schools can bring about better benefits to parents. It could be interpreted that they are better than one form entry schools. There is no evidence to suggest that larger primary schools are higher achievers because of their size. The Catholic primary schools in Richmond are very successful. There is no research that we can find to suggest that smaller schools do not have a broad curriculum, staff expertise or cannot be judged outstanding. Good schools are down to the quality of leadership, management and teaching regardless of size. I think, perhaps, it should have been made clearer that this is an aspirational target by the LA rather than one which will be delivered by virtue of size. The comments regarding larger schools were meant purely to say that with a larger staff, some schools could therefore have a broader range of expertise and specialisms, which could then feed into the curriculum. No slight was intended towards any smaller, schools and we accept that the meaning could have been better expressed.</p>
<p>Tom Peryer, Director of Education, London Diocesan Board for Schools</p>	<p><i>Definitely agree.</i> Although the report makes clear that the Diocese of London though its Board for Schools is supportive of the expansion proposals in relation to St Stephen's and St Mary's & St Peter's I am writing for the record to confirm that this is the case, In particular we welcome the opportunity to create two new primary schools to replace the separate infant and junior schools of Orleans and St Stephen's. This is a better option educationally and for parents. Whilst not taking the consultation and statutory procedures for granted, we look forward to the enjoyable prospect of working with the school communities to develop proposals to expand and improve the existing buildings and provision.</p>
<p>John Russell, Assistant Director, Southwark Diocesan Board of Education</p>	<p><i>Definitely agree.</i> The Board of Education thank the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames for the opportunity to comment on this issue. The Board of Education agree with the strategy suggested. The Board are pleased to see the rationale explained for the potential expansion of the Holy Trinity CE School in Carrington Road.</p>
<p>Cllr Piers Allen</p>	<p><i>Definitely agree.</i> I understand some of the Schools in the area of my ward (including the Trafalgar Schools and Archdeacon)</p>

Respondent	Response
(West Twickenham), also LA Governor at Trafalgar Junior School	<p>have expressed concerns with regard to their own admissions if the Stanley Schools do become a 4 FE Primary School. Parents thinking ahead to their preferences for secondary school admission may favour Stanley over the other Infant/Primary schools in the area, adversely affecting the number of reception admissions and admission profile to the non-Stanley schools. The authority believes that there will be such a high level of demand for places that other schools will not be adversely affected. The other schools have a concern that the Link School system may further affect a drift in their admissions. This is a point that should be considered in the full feasibility study for the Stanley Schools to be carried out later this year. The ‘Linked School Policy’ for the borough’s mixed community secondary schools is subject to annual review as part of the statutory consultation on schools’ admission arrangements. Generally I believe the present expansion proposals are sound and well-founded and, subject to consultation, should go ahead so that sufficient primary school places are available to meet forecast demand. Plans should be put in place for a second phase of expansion as new evidence of birth rates and extra demand for state-sector education arises resulting from the economic downturn. The authority will continue to monitor demographic and admissions trends and will seek further funding from Government should, as appears probable, a second phase of expansions be required.</p>
Cllr David Marlow (South Twickenham), on behalf of the Conservative Group)	<p><i>Tend to agree.</i> We support the permanent expansion of primary schools in the borough. We recognise the need for additional places and regret that it has taken so long to get to this consultation stage; the shortage was known in early 2006. The apparent lack of funding for future years is a matter for concern. The authority will continue to ask the Government for additional funding to resource a second phase of expansions that will most likely be needed in due course. The overspend on Teddington school of £12million would have paid for two extra forms of entry. We endorse the view of the Ofsted report of 2001 that bulge classes are to be deplored. The Strategy is designed to obviate the need for bulge classes as much as possible, but some will be needed in peak years. We regret that this Council has again got into this state. We regard it as essential that the Council endeavours to obtain the wholehearted support of Governors before expansion is agreed by the Council. The authority seeks to work in partnership with schools and therefore shares this view. Hampton North schools do not support expansion of the Stanley schools. Only one of the Hampton area schools – Hampton Hill Junior – has responded to the consultation and they have not made any objection to the proposal to expand the Stanley schools.</p>
Cllr Eleanor Stanier (Mortlake & Barnes Common)	<p><i>Definitely agree.</i> My only caveat is that, in my area, Holy Trinity is the least popular of all the primary schools and that local parents would rather see the expansion of another. An Ofsted ‘satisfactory’ is not brilliant. Applications for Holy Trinity are increased significantly for 2009/2010 admissions, which reflects the school’s recent improvement. The last Ofsted inspection was over two years ago, in November 2006, and the authority believes that if it were inspected now, Ofsted would judge the school to be ‘good’. The school is in the right location to meet demand from both Richmond Town and East Sheen, and has a comparatively large site, which other local schools do not have.</p>

Respondent	Response
Peter Vanzozi, Chair of Governors, Hampton Hill Junior	<p><i>Tend to agree.</i> In tending to agree with the proposed strategy, Hampton Hill Junior School would also wish to make the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hampton and Hampton Hill do not feature very strongly in the proposed strategy, but there are particular needs relating to this area of the borough. The authority will continue to monitor the provision of places in the Hampton area and recognises that there may well be a need for additional places in the area in future years. ● The School recognises the need for expansion in the borough due to population numbers, and we request an increase in our Standard Number. This is being considered, outside the scope of this Strategy, but the authority has also to consider the demand for KS2 places at the other schools in Hampton.
Susan Ward, Chair of Governors, Sacred Heart Primary	<p><i>Definitely agree.</i> I am writing on behalf of the Governors of Sacred Heart Primary School. I confirm that governors considered the request contained within the Director's report regarding additional classes at their meeting last week. Unfortunately we do not feel able to consider hosting an additional temporary class during 2010-2011 as we do not have the facilities to offer a comparable level of provision to an additional class.</p> <p>With regard to permanent expansion, if it is the Diocesan and Local Authority view that there is a need for additional Catholic primary school places in the Teddington area, we would be happy to enter into dialogue with both bodies and facilitate a feasibility study. There has been no indication that this is currently the position.</p>
Christine Brett, Headteacher, St Elizabeth's Catholic Primary	<p><i>Tend to agree with the overall strategy, but definitely disagree on the following issue:</i> We are MOST CONCERNED that the LA is proposing to increase primary places by so many forms, but not ensuring that a fair proportion of these places are for Catholic pupils. Of the six forms suggested, three are community places and 3 are C of E. That will mean that C of E increases its proportion of Richmond places, but the proportion of overall places for Catholics is eroded, and at a time when we are very heavily oversubscribed. All of our evidence shows that the number of Catholic pupils is rising in line with, or perhaps faster, than the general population, so we cannot understand why Catholic provision has not been included. We also believe that the LA should maintain the proportion of Catholic places within the overall number of places created. We are aware that this did happen in the last big expansion of places when St James's grew by one form of entry, and we believe that additional provision should also be made in this round of expansion. To illustrate our concern about numbers we can use our own school, St Elizabeth's, as an example. For September 2009 we have 79 applications for 30 places, and 53 of those are from families who practice their Faith every week in the four parishes which make up our top criteria. Other Catholic schools in Richmond say that they are also oversubscribed, and at our Richmond Catholic Heads meeting last week three of us believed that we need an extra form of admission. In consulting on the Primary Strategy for Change document (published in June 2008), from which the Primary School Expansions Strategy derives, the Authority wrote to the Archdiocese of Southwark, the Archdiocese of Westminster and all six Catholic schools within the Borough, to request views specifically on Catholic school places provision, but did not receive any responses suggesting that there was sufficient demand for any of the Catholic schools to be expanded. There is specific reference to the issue on page 16 of the primary Strategy for</p>

Respondent	Response
	<p>Change. Both of the Archdioceses formally approved the Primary Strategy for Change prior to the Authority submitting it to the DCSF for their approval. The authority will continue to monitor demand for Catholic school places and may seek to provide further places in a second phase of the Strategy in the future, if necessary.</p> <p>On a subsidiary matter we would also ask that more care is taken in the assumptions made in such a public document as this. As a one form of entry school we are disappointed at the statements relating to larger schools within the document. These state that larger schools can offer a 'broader curriculum' than smaller ones and that they have better 'staff expertise'. These statements are wrong, misleading and, in the public eye, to the detriment of one form of entry schools. All schools have to offer a broad and balanced curriculum and many one form of entry schools are deemed outstanding for the curriculum that they offer. Similarly, many one form of entry schools have excellent staff expertise – in fact, because staff have to be multi skilled in order to cover all the curriculum areas in small school one could just as well assume that they are likely to be far more highly skilled than those in larger schools! The comments regarding larger schools were meant purely to say that with a larger staff, some schools could therefore have a broader range of expertise and specialisms, which could then feed into the curriculum. No slight was intended towards any smaller, schools and we accept that the meaning could have been better expressed.</p>
<p>Elaine England, headteacher, Sheen Mount Primary</p>	<p><i>Definitely agree.</i> We understand the issues that the LA face in providing primary school places for an increasing number of pupils over the next few years, and appreciate that the capital funding has to be directed towards allocating additional places. We also believe that the decision making for this has been done openly, fairly and with consultation. We agree with the LA that where possible schools should be expanded on a permanent rather than temporary basis.</p> <p>We appeal to the LA to be as open as possible with the parent community, and to ensure that the information on reception classes for 2010 is shared at an early stage. As parents view schools to make decisions about their choices (as they are at the moment) they must be fully aware of how many reception spaces each school has to offer. If Sheen Mount School is asked to have an additional temporary class, the sooner this decision is made and disseminated, the better. We will hope to make decisions in the autumn of 2009 regarding which schools will be asked to accommodate additional classes for September 2010 entry.</p>
<p>Judy Pearse, Headteacher, The Vineyard Primary School</p>	<p><i>Definitely disagree.</i> The governors of The Vineyard School do not agree with all of the proposals put forward. They particularly do not agree with the expansion of KS2 places at St Stephen's, Orleans Infants and Holy Trinity.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No Need for the Number of Additional KS2 Places. The solutions provided focus mainly on expanding primary school places when there is no need for expansion of KS2 places across the LA and particularly in the North and South Richmond Wards and St Margaret's. 2. There is already significant excess capacity offered in KS2 in many areas. This excess capacity makes it very difficult for the primary schools involved to manage their budgets. The Vineyard School is currently short of 58 pupils which represents

Respondent	Response
	<p>a very large percentage of the budget required to run a two form entry school with a bulge class. The impact on teaching and learning is significant. We are not able to employ enough support staff to provide all the support programs needed to maintain high standards. There is therefore a gap between our outstanding progress results and the good standards of attainment which we achieve.</p> <p>3. In 13 schools in the old Southside Cluster there is already a space capacity of 911 KS2 places. This represents a spare capacity of 26% across these schools. This level of surplus capacity is already unacceptable. The addition of 90 places at Holy Trinity, St Stephen's and Orleans Infants will increase this space capacity even further by 90 places. (see Survey of Spare Capacity in Southside Cluster Primary School Places in 2008/9 attached)</p> <p>4. Attrition patterns at The Vineyard School have been stable for at least six years and should be taken into account. Only 50% to 65% of families who join the school in Reception remain at The Vineyard School in Y6. (see The Vineyard School Pupil Mobility: Analysis of YR Admissions on Roll at KS1 and KS2) The Vineyard School is in the lowest group of schools nationally in regard to population stability. (RAISEonline 2008)</p> <p>5. There are various reasons for the attrition during KS2. These should be taken into account in planning for additional places. Some pupils are lost to the private sector and many move out of the area altogether as families grow. Others move to more local schools when places become available within walking distance of their homes. Others move abroad. These reasons are fairly stable over time and should be taken into account.</p> <p>The authority has a statutory requirement to provide school places for those in-borough children whose parents want places for them. Although the authority recognises that expanding schools to provide reception class places will also increase the number of places at KS2, it has no option but to meet its statutory obligation. It is the case that with the borough's secondary schools' standards, reputations and popularity increasing, and with an economic recession that will probably see fewer children being educated privately, the authority believes that there will be more children staying within KS2 in the borough's primary schools. This is already happening in some schools. We recognise that The Vineyard has a unique set of circumstances, being the only school that draws children from both sides of the Thames, and with a much higher mobility rate than other schools, but that cannot be a reason for not expanding schools to provide additional, urgently-required reception places.</p> <p>6. Some schools, including The Vineyard School, with high attrition and spare capacity are further disadvantaged by the Link School System. Increasingly loss of pupils in Y5 and 6 to other local schools is due to movement to other primary schools with a link to Orleans Park. This unfair link system disadvantages school without a link to a popular secondary school. The Vineyard School lost three boys from Y5 at the end of the 2007/8 year and has lost two boys so far this year. Parents from St Margaret's see Orleans Park as their local secondary school but they have no possibility of gaining a place there if they remain at The Vineyard School. They also have no possibility of gaining places at Christ's on distance ground and therefore move to other schools with the Orleans link. The consultation document does not specify whether St Stephens Primary will</p>

Respondent	Response
	<p>retain its link to Orleans Park or whether Orleans Primary School will be offered a link to Orleans Park. If either or both of these schools have that link is would further disadvantage other schools such as The Vineyard School and Marshgate School. Presuming it continues to transfer sufficient children to Orleans Park, St Stephen’s will retain its link and Orleans Primary would have a link to Orleans Park by virtue of being in the same electoral ward. The authority recognises that the Linked School Policy (LSP) is not perfect, but the alternative – using ‘distance’ as the main criterion – would have a huge, unpredictable effect on admissions patterns. Richmond upon Thames Admissions Forum has thoroughly reviewed the LSP twice in the last three years and on each occasion has concluded that retaining the LSP would be better than abolishing it.</p> <p>7. The expansion of Holy Trinity is not in the right location for additional demand in Sheen. This will put further pressure on the neighbouring schools which have spare capacity in KS2. Parents leave schools which are not in walking distance as soon as places become available at their local school. This is evidenced by loss of pupils in the two bulge classes at The Vineyard School. (EY 2006 53% of 90 pupils retained on roll) and EY 2015, the current bulge class) 3 children from the current YR bulge class have already left this year to take up places at their local schools. There is no evidence in the consultation document to support this and LA officers have acknowledged on other occasions that the need is closer to Sheen. It was disappointing and unhelpful that the data included in the consultation document was not presented ward by ward as this had been helpful in the past. Therefore the document did not provide any evidence that the proposals met the areas of need very specifically. Holy Trinity is in the right location to meet demand from both Richmond Town and East Sheen, and has a comparatively large site, which other local schools do not have.</p>
Rachel Lewis, parent of a child at Orleans Infant	<p><i>Definitely disagree.</i> I would like to register my strong objection to the proposals outlined in the consultation paper. I do not feel that the St Stephen’s site is appropriate for reception and years 1 and 2. Aside from the fact that the outdoor facilities are non-existent, I would also have major worries about environmental pollution. Placed so close to the A316, I would be extremely worried about the impact of traffic and noise pollution on such young children. The Sustainable Development Commission (the Government’s independent watchdog), makes it abundantly clear on their homepage:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Our research shows that the places where children grow up have a major influence on their health and happiness. For example, we know that exposure to road noise can be stressful for children, and that children who play in natural areas gain better balance and agility. Traffic-dominated neighbourhoods are simply bad for everyone’s fitness and health.</p> <p>It is the case that in such a built-up borough as Richmond upon Thames, most schools are by or very near busy roads. Were the proposal not to go ahead, Ms Lewis’s daughter would, presumably, be transferring to St Stephen’s at the end of Year 2.</p> <p>also have grave concerns about the way in which placements would be decided. As I understand it, 60 out of the 90 in my daughter’s year would be forced to leave Orleans. It has not been made clear how these children would be chosen or if parents will indeed have any choice in the matter. The modelling of the transition of Orleans Infant and St Stephen’s Junior to</p>

Respondent	Response
	<p>two-form-entry primary schools has not yet been ratified and will be subject to further discussion with both schools and parents, should St Stephen's agree to proceed with the proposal.</p>
<p>Howard and Liz Smith, parents of a child at Orleans Infant</p>	<p><i>Tend to disagree.</i> Following the very helpful consultation meeting at Orleans last week we have significant concerns. We appreciate that timing is a difficult issue and if consultation is delayed until all answers are available then officers could be criticised, however the current outline proposals do not address absolutely key issues which threaten the excellent (if numerically inadequate) current position:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The splitting of the non bulge year groups who will be at Orleans during the transition and the crucial lack of clear criteria for allocating children between Orleans and St Stephens if such a split takes place. Many parents would be less concerned if criteria were available at this stage explaining, in particular, how siblings would be treated, in our case older children receiving a 'reverse' sibling preference and remaining at Orleans to stay with their younger brother/sisters. 2. The fact that no precedents or examples have been identified/reviewed for this sort of transition which has some major issues in terms of imbalanced and 'missing' year groups, this seems surprising and concerning for such a major change. <p>Reviewing the pros and cons it would seem that 50% of the increase could be achieved with much less risk and disruption by simply planning formally for Orleans and St Stephens to take four form (120) entry every second year. Although this would only offer half the planned increase in capacity - and in a less 'tidy' form - it would require only relatively minor changes at Orleans and no more than the physical works required at St Stephens under the current proposal. It would remove once and for all the splitting of year groups, both 'bulge' and 'non bulge', which has been a key concern for parents and also avoid the major transitional concerns in 2 above. There would need to be some flexibility in managing larger and smaller year groups but less than under the current proposed transition. If, despite concerns, the current proposal is taken forward it still seems to us that the 30:60 split proposed for Orleans and St Stephens is wrong - we would very much appreciate site of the 'model' brought to the consultation meeting to see where our numbers do not tally. There is also the issue that almost certainly expansion of Orleans can take place more rapidly than at St Stephens and so to the extent that one or the other school has to grow more quickly Orleans has greater flexibility to do so in the short/medium term. The modelling of the transition of Orleans Infant and St Stephen's Junior to two-form-entry primary schools has not yet been ratified and will be subject to further discussion with both schools and parents, should St Stephen's agree to proceed with the proposal. However, if the proposal were not implemented the alternative would be that some St Margarets children would have to travel to schools much further afield, in Whitton or Richmond, in future years. Whichever way the transition to two-form-entry is modelled, some year-groups will be split. This would be achieved by applying the schools' oversubscription criteria at the end of Year 2.</p>
<p>Julian Gravatt and Jacqueline Williamson,</p>	<p><i>Tend to agree.</i> The Primary School Expansion Strategy makes a well-argued case that the council needs to respond to increased demand for places. Rising demand is a healthy sign for a number of reasons: it shows that people are having children, are moving to the borough with young children and are keen to use local primary schools. The Strategy sets out plans</p>

Respondent	Response
parents of a child at St Mary's and St Peter's C/E Primary	<p>for expanding existing schools by a total of 360 places but does not consider the possibility of creating a new primary school in the area of highest demand (the area between the A316 and the river). Perhaps available government funding is insufficient for this option to be realistic at the moment but it would be helpful to explain this and also to keep all options under review (given falling land prices. The Strategy makes no mention of the need for successful project planning and management to ensure completion of building plans with minimal disruption to children. The strategy suggests that St Marys and St Peters (SMSP) is further advanced with planning than some of the other schools. Our experience as parents is that SMSP governors have provided limited information about plans. Some questions remain unanswered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A design has been prepared for the school but we have not seen an outline budget. • The expansion of the building seems to lead to a loss of playground space. • The existing SMSP building contains asbestos in various places. We have suggested to the school that the building work is planned so that asbestos containing materials are only removed or disturbed when the children are not on site. • There seems to be less space for cycle and scooter parking than in the current site. <p>The authority has considered the possibility of new schools. On page 16 of the Authority's <u>Primary Strategy for Change</u>, with which the Consultation on Primary School Expansions is best read in conjunction, it states that, "In the initial phase of our Strategy, we have no plans to open any further schools on new sites, due to the lack of suitably designated land and the prohibitive cost of buying any were it to be available". We will, though, keep the situation under review, and we regularly liaise with colleagues in the Planning Department regarding sites. It may be the case that in the future we will be able to convince Government that we need funding for new schools, and we will certainly continue to make our case. With regard to successful project planning, again this is addressed in the Primary Strategy for Change, on pages 21-22. The outline budget for the St Mary's and St Peter's expansion is £6million. The architects and officers have been at pains to minimise any loss of playground space and are mindful of the fact that the school will need to cater for 630, rather than 420, children. The asbestos issue will be addressed with all due seriousness and caution, with full regard to health and safety requirements. The architects will address the issue of cycle and scooter parking.</p>
Joanne Wreford, parent of a child at Orleans Infant	<p><i>Definitely agree.</i> My daughter is currently in Yr1 at Orleans Infant School and my son will start there (obviously place TBC) in September this year. I attended the meeting [at the school] on 28/1 and listened with great interest. Although I do have some fears, namely the transition process and class separations, also the fact that my daughter's year-group will always be the oldest at Orleans, never having any older peers, in general I am in favour of the proposals. For me personally, it would mean that both my children would remain at Orleans since we live very close by and that would suit us well. I would also like to add that I looked at the building proposals for the Orleans site and it made a lot of sense to me. As far as I could tell, minimal play area will be sacrificed and the extra facilities would be an advantage. I do not agree that parking would be an issue as the new proposals</p>

Respondent	Response
	should mean that almost all of the pupils will live within walking distance, therefore decreasing traffic. I also agree that the community will largely benefit from having two excellent local primary schools that you actually have a chance of getting into, which will go some way to alleviating the headache that many parents face during the application process.