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1. **Introduction**

1.1. We write on behalf of, Charterhouse Strategic Land (CSL), in support of representations made to the Examination of the Tandridge District council (TDC) emerging Local Plan, July 2018.

1.2. CSL have acquired an interest in the Land West of Limpsfield Road. Our client’s site (identified on the Site Location Plan at Appendix 1) was assessed as part of the Council’s Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) under site reference number WAR 005. The site is identified for release from the Green Belt in the emerging Local Plan and forms part of a wider area that is subject to a draft policy allocation for development (Policy HSG15: Land West of Limpsfield Road, Warlingham).

1.3. We have previously made representations on the emerging Local Plan during the Regulation 19 consultation.

1.4. During the July 2018 consultation (Regulation 19 version) our client’s site and the site to the north (now in the control of CALA Homes), was assessed as one single site. At this stage, the wider site’s proposed infrastructure requirements included the relocation of the Warlingham Village Primary school.

1.5. As part of our representations, dated 10 September 2019 (attached in Appendix 2), we welcomed the site’s removal from the Green Belt for residential development and considered that further research would be required to assess the need for the school.

1.6. TDC then submitted the Publication Version (January 2019) of the Local Plan to the Inspector and split the site into two parts, Parcel A to the north of the site (now in the control of CALA Homes) and Parcel B, our client’s site. However, our client was not given the opportunity to respond to a significant alteration to the wording of the policy. The Inspector’s initial letter, dated 29 March 2019, has since reviewed the January 2019 Local Plan version and confirmed that main modifications to the Plan are subject to consultation and, therefore, the Inspector is assessing the Regulation 19 Local Plan version, i.e. Local Plan drafted in July 2018.

1.7. Based on our understanding of the Inspector’s letter dated 29 March 2019 (Examination document ID2), the examination will relate explicitly to the July 2018 version of the Local Plan which was subject to consultation as part of Regulation 19. Through these MIQs, the Inspector is inviting representatives to comment of the changes made to the Local Plan post-Regulation 19 (the January 2019 submission version). However, it is not considered that these changes are necessary for soundness and, therefore, these hearing statements refer wholly to the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan (July 2018) unless expressly stated.

1.8. We also provided representations to the draft Housing Strategy 2019-2023. Our representations, dated 24 October 2018, concluded that Policy HS1, HS4 and HS5 should be flexible enough to ensure that the required housing can be delivered within the plan period. Our representations to this consultation have been attached in Appendix 3 of this report.

1.9. As part of the Examination of the Plan, we seek to respond to Matters 2, 4 and 6 on the Inspector’s agenda.

1.10. This Written Statement responds to the questions set out in Matter 6: South Godstone Garden Community and housing allocations. In short, we welcome the provision of housing in this sustainable location. Specifically, we support the identification of CSL’s landholding interest as part of Policy HSG15: Land West of Limpsfield Road, Warlingham but dispute the
requirement of the policy to make provision for the relocation and expansion of the Warlingham Primary School.
2. **Matter 6: South Godstone Garden Community and housing allocations**

**Housing allocations**

**Issue**: Are the proposed housing allocations justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

2.1. Our response to this matter refers to Policy HSG15: Land West of Limpsfield Road, Warlingham as allocated within the draft Local Plan (July 2018).

“6.76 What are the exceptional circumstances for the release of the site from the Green Belt?”

2.2. Paragraph 83 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) states:

“Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.”

2.3. Neither the NPPF nor the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provides detail on what constitutes an “exceptional circumstance”, entrusting the decision-maker with this matter. However, the judgement handed down in 2015 by the High Court for Calverton Parish Council v Greater Nottingham Council & Others (EWHC 1078) identifies five matters to consider in this case when assessing whether exceptional circumstances are present to justify release from the Green Belt. These are as follows:

- The acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed need;
- The inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development;
- The consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt;
- The nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt; and
- The extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent.

2.4. This case law forms the basis for TDC’s Green Belt Assessment paper (GBA), part 3 which sets out the exceptional circumstances justifies TDC reasoning to release land from the Green Belt (Examination document GB1).

2.5. There is a severe level of unmet housing need within TDC whether using the 2014 or the 2016 household projection to calculate the objectively assessed housing need. TDC cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing supply and performed poorly in the Housing Delivery Test results published in February 2019. The Council also has an affordability ratio of 15.62, making it one of the worst councils in Surrey (and the country) for affordable living. It is clear TDC meets the first criteria of exceptional circumstances due to the acuteness of its objectively assessed need.

2.6. The extent of the Green Belt within the district is one of the highest in the country at 94% coverage, making the constraints on the supply of land and its availability even more acute.
TDC identifies that much of the district is of low-density character and the amount of land available outside the Green Belt for meeting the requirements of the district is extremely limited.

2.7. As such, it is necessary for TDC to consider land for release from the Green Belt.

2.8. Site WAR 005 (HELA and Part 3 GBA reference), forms approximately 6.86ha of the 10.9ha draft site allocation identified in Policy HSG15. The site is roughly rectangular in shape and currently comprises a recreation ground with associated pitches, playing fields, club house and car parking. To the north west of the buildings associated with the recreation ground is an area of woodland. The northern portion of the site beyond the sports pitches is an area of under used scrub land.

2.9. Adjacent to the site’s southern boundary is residential development fronting Shelton Avenue. The site is bounded by Limpsfield Road to the east, off which there is an existing vehicular site access. Beyond Limpsfield Road lies further residential development and a care home. Adjacent to the site’s western boundary is paddock land. To the north of the site lies the remainder of the land (HELA Site Ref: WAR 036) identified for development as part of Policy HSG15.

2.10. The site was subject to assessment as part of TDC’s GBA process. The Part 1 GBA identified an area (Part 1 GBA ref. 007) around Warlingham, including site WAR 005 (as referenced in the HELAA), as worthy of further investigation in respect of its potential for release from the Green Belt (Examination document GB6).

2.11. The Part 2 GBA then considered the merits of this area further and recommended specific parcels should be subject to more detailed consideration as part of the Local Plan preparation process. As such, site WAR 005 was rightly subject to a detailed and specific site assessment in Part 3 of the GBA.

2.12. The specific site assessment of the Part 3 GBA (Part 3 GBA ref. WAR 005) examines the site against its contribution to the wider Green Belt and concludes that “the site does justify the exceptional circumstances necessary to recommend an amendment and of the Green Belt boundary”. The assessment rightly notes the site’s compliance with the Local Plan spatial strategy which is to focus development at Urban Settlements, the site’s sustainability credentials, and its potential to deliver a sensitive landscape led design at the planning stage to mitigate any perceived harm on the wider Green Belt.

2.13. Having reviewed the GBA process undertaken by the Council we consider its conclusions in relation to site WAR 005 to be robust and that exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the site’s release from the Green Belt.

“6.77 Is the proposed Green Belt boundary justified and consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 85 of the Framework?”

2.14. It is considered that the proposed amendment to the Green Belt boundary is justified and consistent with national policy.

2.15. The site is located adjacent to the settlement boundary of Warlingham. Policy TLP06 identifies Warlingham as an “Urban Settlement”. Urban settlements are identified as “Tier 1” settlements and are the most sustainable in the district. Such settlements are to be the focus of development during the Plan period.

2.16. Warlingham possesses a wide range of shops, services and public transport links making it a sustainable location for growth. This is consistent with the first bullet point of paragraph 85 of the NPPF which requires LPAs to ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development.

2.17. The site is not necessary to be kept permanently open, nor does it qualify “safeguarded
land”. The site is bounded by existing development on three sides. The site’s perimeter is lined by mature vegetation and trees except at the point of access off Limpsfield Road. This vegetation screens the site from the Green Belt land to the west. The development of this site, therefore, serves as an opportunity to strengthen and enhance the boundaries to the Green Belt.

2.18. The Green Belt boundary is, therefore, both justified and consistent with paragraph 85 of the NPPF.

“6.78 Is the proposed allocation consistent with paragraph 74 of the Framework in respect of the loss of recreation space? Would it be effective in bringing forward replacement playing pitch provision?”

2.19. Paragraph 74 of the NPPF states the following:

“Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

• an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or

• the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or

• the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.”

2.20. Policy HSG15 of the July 2018 Local Plan requires the sports facilities to be re-provided on the site at an “equal or better quantity and quality”. The policy states the location of the playing pitches will be determined in liaison with any users, Sport England and any relevant National Governing Bodies. Policy TLP39 of the draft Local Plan, July 2018, also requires playing pitches to be replaced in a suitable location or demonstrate they are surplus to requirement. Furthermore, Policy TLP39 states that provision for “new or enhanced pitch…facilities, will be supported”.

2.21. The existing provision on the site is poor quality and suffering from inadequate drainage which renders the pitches unusable and reduces the amount of playing time available. Our client is proposing to provide better facilities either on-site or elsewhere through either re-provision and/or a financial contribution which is consistent with paragraph 74 of the Framework.

2.22. As previously stated in our Regulation 19 representations (attached in Appendix 2), to add flexibility to the policy and to ensure it is both sound and justified, it is recommended that the policy is amended to allow for the re-provision of the playing pitches either on-site or in the surrounding area where there is capacity, or through a financial contribution towards replacement space to enhance existing facilities. In addition, it is recommended that the playing pitch re-provision element of draft Policy HSG15 is rationalised into a single element to make for a more clear and concise planning policy.

2.23. It can be more sustainable and viable for existing facilities in the vicinity to be improved and there are several playing pitches within the immediate surrounding area which would benefit from a financial contribution to enhance their facilities some are set out below:

• Warlingham Rugby Football Club
• Hamsey Green Playing Field
• Croydon Post office Social and Athletic Club
• Warlingham Squash and Racketball Club
• Farleigh Rovers Football Club

2.24. Further research can be undertaken during the application stage to address this point further but as it stands, the current policy as worded is unsound.

“6.79 Are the requirements for financial contributions as set out under Infrastructure consistent with national policy for planning obligations and conditions as set out in the Framework, and are they justified?”

2.25. Our comments made at Regulation 19 stage have not been addressed by the Council and the policy remains unsound in its current form. Our main objection relates to the requirement of a school in this location as TDC have not demonstrated the need for the relocation and expansion of the Warlingham Village Primary School, nor would the proposed number of houses on this site increase demand for primary school places to a point where the provision of additional school places would be required. Neither TDC nor SCC have provided any evidence which looks specifically at the preferred location for the school. There is no basis for TDC to claim that our client’s site is the best site for the possible relocation and expansion of the school.

Education

Context

2.26. Whilst the provision of educational facilities is not a financial contribution under Policy HSG15, it falls under the heading of Infrastructure, so it is logical to address our concerns at this stage. An additional assessment has been undertaken by a Messrs EPDS Consultants into the educational needs of the area and is contained in Appendix 4.

2.27. Policy HSG15 was assessed as one whole site and included within the “Infrastructure” section the relocation and expansion of Warlingham Village Primary School (currently a one form entry (1FE)) to provide a three form entry (3FE) primary school. The submission version shows this text has been amended to state that the requirement is for a two form entry (2FE) primary school. We are not aware of any change to the evidence base which justified this amendment. Notwithstanding this, we still dispute the need for a school in this location and why the delivery of 190 homes on the site would generate the requirement for a new school.

2.28. It is also relevant that Policy HSG18 (the former Shelton Sports Ground to the south west of CSL’s site) of the Regulation 19 version of the Plan also allocates for a 3FE primary school. It is simply not credible that there is a requirement for two 3FE primary schools within 300m to replace the 1FE Warlingham Village Primary School.

2.29. Although we have not seen any justification, TDC tacitly acknowledge this because the submission version of the Plan seeks to remove the 3FE school allocation from HSG18. There is no explanation as to why the alleged requirement for a primary school to replace and expand Warlingham Village Primary School should be removed from HSG18 rather than HSG15. Notwithstanding this, as we explain below, the evidence shows that there is no need for a school on either site.

2.30. Furthermore, between the close of the Regulation 19 consultation period and the submission of the Plan to the Secretary of State, the Council decided to split allocation HSG15 into two parts. Part ‘A’ which forms the northern half of the site is currently under the control of CALA Homes and part ‘B’ to the south comprises the site under the control of our client, CSL. In the submission version of the Plan, the proposed 2FE primary school is now to be delivered in parcel ‘B’. Again, there is no justification why the development of this site would constitute a need for a new school.

2.31. The intention to subdivide these parcels and to locate the new primary school on parcel ‘B’ did not form part of Surrey County Council’s (SCC) representations to TDC as part of the
pre-submission Regulation 19 stage process of the Local Plan. The change to separate allocation HSG15 into two parcels and for the primary school to be provided in parcel ‘B’ was not raised with the landowner or our client, CSL. Further, the changes to Policy HSG15 in relation to the subdivision of the site and the location of the proposed primary school was not listed as a modification to the policy upon submission to the Planning Inspectorate of the Local Plan.

2.32. In November 2018 after the close of Regulation 19 representations, CALA Homes who are promoting parcel ‘A’ of Policy HSG15, signed a delivery agreement which allowed for the provision of solely residential development on its portion of the site. A separate delivery agreement was presented to CSL requiring the provision of a 2FE primary school on the parcel of land under its control. Our client will not sign this agreement because the splitting of the site was not reflective of the Regulation 19 version of the Plan and would require parcel ‘B’ to deliver a school regardless of the local need, at the expense of new housing which is needed.

2.33. The total estimated infrastructure cost for the school relocation and expansion is stated as £9,000,000 within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (Examination document INF1) and according to the January 2019 submission version of the Plan, only parcel ‘B’ of the proposed allocation HSG15 is expected to contribute to this infrastructure provision, despite there being a further four housing allocations in the Warlingham area totalling 400 new dwellings and parcel ‘A’ of HSG15 providing an additional 100 dwellings.

2.34. Following legal advice, CSL wrote to the TDC on 18 January 2019 expressing concern that the provisions of Policy HSG15 had been materially changed in relation to the provision of an entire new school to be serviced and at nil cost to Surrey County Council (SCC) and it should be provided on parcel ‘B’ of the site (Appendix 5). It was requested that the Council provide evidence to justify the following:

(i) Warlingham should have a new and larger primary school, having regard to existing capacity within the catchment;

(ii) The school should be provided on the newly identified “Part B” of HSG15; and

(iii) The burden of providing land for the school should fall entirely on part of HSG15, when 400 new units in total are proposed for Warlingham across 5 sites.

2.35. TDC responded stating that CSL’s letter of 18 January 2018 was being treated as a request for information under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, highlighting the Council does not hold information on education evidence and the information request would best be dealt with via SCC as the County Educational Authority.

2.36. Whilst it is acknowledged that SCC is responsible for providing evidence of educational need in TDC, the Council’s inability to provide evidence which details educational need and how this has informed the Local Plan process is concerning. For this element of Policy HSG15 to be considered justified, TDC must be able to demonstrate evidence which clearly supports the requirement for a provision of a new primary school.

2.37. In addition to this, WSP | Indigo submitted a request under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 and the Freedom of Information Act 2000 to TDC in December 2018 which sought to obtain all relevant information held by the Council to seek to understand the rationale of the school allocation. The information has been reviewed in detail and the relevant documents have been summarised below and are appended to this statement. This information confirms that there is no justification or evidence to justify the allocation of a new primary school in Policy HSG15 in either parcel A or B.

School allocation origins

2.38. From the information provided by the Council, following on from the site’s identification for
removal from the Green Belt, the earliest record of discussion surrounding the provision of a
new primary school at Warlingham is recorded in the notes of the Tandridge Joint
Infrastructure Team (TJIT) meeting held 2 February 2016 as attached in Appendix 6. The
notes reference an approach by a developer offering a site in Warlingham to build a new
primary school (with no justification to support this approach), and a number of private
residential units which would finance the school’s construction. The developer in question is
Asprey Homes who were unsuccessful in bidding for the site. It appears that this suggestion
by an unsuccessful bidder on land they had no control over has continued to be pursued by
TDC and SCC without evidence to back up the need for this new school.

SCC’s Schools Plan

2.39. The SCC School Organisation Plan 2018-2027 (January 2018) states that primary schools in
TDC have capacity with “pressure on Oxted and Limpsfield in the short to medium term”
(attached in Appendix 7). The future requirements indicate a need for an increase of 30
pupils at St Mary’s Church of England Junior School in Oxted and an additional 1FE primary
school in northern Tandridge, which includes Oxted and Limpsfield. There is no evidence to
suggest there is a need for additional primary school places in Warlingham and specifically
at allocation HSG15. Indeed, given the acknowledged ‘pressure’ in Oxted and Limpsfield, it
would be logical to conclude that the new 1FE primary school should be delivered in one of
these locations.

Does Warlingham Village School need to relocate?

2.40. There have been several objections from local stakeholders regarding the proposed
relocation and expansion of Warlingham Village Primary School as part of Policy HSG15.

2.41. Warlingham Village Primary School is a successful academy. We have seen no evidence
that the academy wants to or needs to relocate or expand. This site is not allocated for
redevelopment elsewhere in the Plan so there does not appear to be any pressing need to
locate. If Warlingham Village Primary School did not relocate, Policy HSG15 could result in
a new 3FE primary school being provided on our client’s site (Policy HSG15) with the
Warlingham Village Primary School remaining open resulting in a significant oversupply
of primary schools within the Warlingham area.

2.42. It is not clear whether Warlingham Village Primary School was consulted specifically about
the potential relocation. However, it is clear that the parents of pupils at the school have not
been consulted. The action group “Save Warlingham Village Primary School”, who have
their own Facebook page (https://www.facebook.com/groups/1867479070034945/), strongly
objects to the relocation of the school from its current site and have lobbied local councillors
on the matter. The group agree with our assessment that TDC’s evidence documents
provide no supporting justification for the need for a replacement school (see correspondence attached in Appendix 8).

2.43. The “Save Warlingham Village Primary School” action group have stated that the
Warlingham Village Primary School and local residents only became aware of the proposals
to relocate the school as part of Regulation 19 stage of the Local Plan process. They were
not consulted at an early stage to assess whether the school considered there to be a need
for expansion or their agreement for its relocation.

2.44. This lack of engagement with the village school strongly indicates that there is no evidence
to support its relocation. If there was genuine evidence of a need to relocate Warlingham
Village Primary School, it is inconceivable that TDC and/or SCC would not consult the
School.

There is an alternative

2.45. As part of the Regulation 19 stage of the Local Plan, Tandridge Learning Trust (TLT) and the
Chair of the Hamsey Green Governors submitted representations to TDC objecting to the
inclusion of a new primary school in draft Policy HSG18: Former Shelton Sports Ground, Warlingham. As noted, this allocation is located immediately south west of the site and is proposed to deliver 110 dwellings. The objection letter sets out TLT’s position very clearly and demonstrates there is no evidential need for a new school. The allocation has been removed in the submission version of the Plan (see paragraph XX, elsewhere)

2.46. TLT’s letter, dated 8 September 2018, (shown in Appendix 9) states that Hamsey Green Primary used to be a 3FE school and still has the capacity to accommodate additional need. As Hamsey Green and Warlingham Secondary school share the same site, TLT contend there is significant capacity to increase pupil numbers at both schools without requiring new land to be acquired, or without huge additional capital expenditure. This would also address the sixth form capacity required within the area. TLT argue convincingly that the creation of a new school within a mile of two existing schools is not necessary or justified. This position is supported by our client and the same principles apply directly to allocation HSG15.

2.47. In our view, it is a key principle of sustainable development that the best and most effective use should be made of existing facilities, and it is absolutely sensible to make best use of existing facilities and infrastructure at Hamsey Green rather than using resources unnecessarily to build a new school close by.

2.48. There is no quantitative evidence to demonstrate the need for this additional primary school capacity in Warlingham. Further, as evidenced above, Hamsey Green has existing capacity for a 3FE primary school and could accommodate an additional 1FE if the need can be adequately justified by the Council.

2.49. Given the concerns regarding the need for a new primary school in Warlingham, CSL commissioned the EPDS Consultants to prepare a report addressing educational provision and need in Warlingham. A copy of this report is provided at Appendix 4.

2.50. Paragraph the table at page 10 of the EPDS report confirms that there is currently capacity for 116 places at Hamsey Green Primary School, and 254 spaces within 3km of the Policy HSG15 site.

2.51. EPDS Consultants’ report reinforces the evidence provided by Hamsey Green Primary School that there is ample capacity to absorb any demand for primary schools generated by all of the new housing opposed in Warlingham at the existing school.

2.52. EPDS also conclude that there is no justification for the allocation of a new primary school at CSL’s site or elsewhere.

Other infrastructure matters

2.53. Policy HSG15 (July 2018) Regulation 19, listed additional infrastructure requirements for this site. This includes the following:

- Traffic calming at Hillbury Road
- Pedestrian Crossing between Warlingham Green and Trenham Drive
- Kerb improvements and informal crossing point at Tithepit Shaw Lane
- Expansion to doctors’ surgery in Warlingham
- On site amenity green space in accordance with the most up to date open space assessment.
- Cycle route from Warlingham Green to Upper Warlingham Station
2.54. These requirements do not relate specifically to this site and therefore, should be removed. Hillbury Road is separated from our site by large open space and residential dwellings (including their back gardens). Tithepit Shaw Lane is to the north of Hillbury Road and is also separated from our site by open space as well as residential dwellings. There are no links proposed as part of this site allocation to these roads and no evidence has been provided by the Council to justify these allocations. The policy should, therefore, remove these infrastructure requirements.

2.55. Furthermore, the Council have not provided evidence for the additional infrastructure requirements as listed above. However, the policy should be worded to ensure that the contributions are proportionate to the development proposed and based on the viability of the scheme.

Conclusion

2.56. The proposed allocation for a new 2FE primary school within HSG15 is not justified nor effective, as:

- TDC cannot adequately demonstrate there is even a need for the provision of an additional 1FE in the Warlingham area.
- There is no evidence that either TDC or SCC have the power to force the closure of Warlingham Village Primary School relocate.
- The closure of the existing Warlingham Village Primary School would go against the wishes of local residents and stakeholder groups including Save Warlingham Village Primary and Hamsey Green Primary School.
- There is no evidence of a need to relocate Warlingham Village Primary School and there is a surplus of secondary school places in Warlingham.
- There is capacity for additional primary school places to be provided within the existing site of Hamsey Green Primary, and this would make best use of this existing school.
- Neither TDC or SCC has control of HSG15 to deliver the new school without finance/contributions from developments.

2.57. Given all of the above, it is not justified, effective or ultimately sound for allocation HSG15 to require the provision of a 2FE primary school on the site as a pre-requisite of development. This is particularly the case if the school is specifically required on parcel ‘B’ without sufficient consultation and communication with the promoter and contributions from other developers in Warlingham.

“6.80 Are there any matters which would mean that the site is not deliverable or developable as per footnotes 11 and 12 to the Framework?”

2.58. As noted above (in our response to 6.78) neither TDC nor SCC can demonstrate that the 2FE primary school proposed as part of HSG15 is deliverable. There is no consent or willingness from the landowners to provide the school nor is there support for the relocation of the existing primary school from the academy. This aspect of the policy allocation is not, therefore, deliverable.

2.59. Draft policies TLP12 and HSG15 of both the Regulation 19 and Regulation 22 version of the Local Plan (July 2018 and January 2019, respectively) identify the site allocation covering site WAR 005 should deliver 40% affordable housing due to the site currently forming part of the Green Belt and being undeveloped. Draft policy TLP12 also states sites at ‘Urban Settlements’, such as Warlingham, would usually attract a 20% affordable housing requirement. This significant shift in the level of affordable housing requirement on the basis...
2.60. In the case of site WAR 005 the 20% increase in affordable housing requirement is not justified and may not be viable when considered alongside the infrastructure requirements listed in draft policy HSG15. The site’s location on the edge an ‘Urban Settlement’ means it has a disproportionate amount of developer requirements which other Green Belt allocations at Tier 1 and Tier 2 (Semi Rural Service Settlement) avoid. In addition, site WAR 005, has existing structures onsite making it partially brownfield.

2.61. To put the Council’s requirements for the HG15 site into perspective, the site is required to deliver a 2FE school, 36 affordable housing dwellings, the provision of a new playing field on or off site as well as other additional infrastructure requirements (as well as the built costs) and expect this to be viable from the delivery of 54 market housing dwellings. This is clearly putting the site’s viability at risk. For these reasons, an assessment of each site’s viability should be assessed on a case by case basis, rather than imposing an overall blanket requirement across all former Green Belt sites.

2.62. The issue of affordable housing provision and type and tenure mix needs to be considered in the context of wider development viability. As such, we welcome the provisions within TLP12 which allow for the submission of a Viability Appraisal should a development be rendered unviable by providing 40% affordable housing. A similar caveat regarding the ability to submit a Viability Appraisal to support any planning application for development should be also be added to draft Policy HSG15. Not only would this be sound and ensure delivery, it would make sure that the Plan is consistent.

‘6.81 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?’

2.63. It is not necessary for the site to be split into two parcels as per the modifications proposed post Regulation 19 and this will further impact the deliverability of the school as part of a larger holistic development (the need for which we contest above).
Land west of Limpsfield Road, Warlingham, Surrey

Site Plan
Dear Sir/Madam

REPRESENTATIONS TO THE TANDRIDGE DC LOCAL PLAN PUBLIC CONSULTATION (REGULATION 19)

LAND WEST OF LIMPSFIELD ROAD, WARLINGHAM (REF WAR 005)

On behalf of our client Charterhouse Strategic Land Ltd (CSLL), we wish to make representations in respect of the emerging Local Plan. CLL have acquired an interest, in the Land West of Limpsfield Road. Our client’s site (identified on the attached Site Location Plan) was assessed as part of the Council’s Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) under site reference number WAR 005. The site is identified for release from the Green Belt in the draft Local Plan and forms part of a wider area that is subject to a draft policy allocation for development (Policy HSG15: Land West of Limpsfield Road, Warlingham).

It is our client’s intention to provide further comment on the Local Plan and Policy HSG15 at the Examination stage.

These representations support the selection process underpinning the Council’s identification of site WAR 005 as suitable for development. As such, in principle, our client has broad support for draft Policy HSG15. Site WAR 005 is suitable, available and deliverable.

These representations also provide comment on other draft policies in the Local Plan which will influence and shape any future development at site WAR 005.

Attached to these representations is a completed version of the Council’s ‘Our Local Plan: 2033 Consultation – Legal Compliance and Soundness Questionnaire’. This questionnaire confirms our client’s request to participate at the Examination Hearings in order to support development at site WAR 005 and shape policies within the Local Plan, including Policy HSG15.

Site and Settlement Sustainability

The Site
Site WAR 005, forms approximately 6.86ha of the 10.9ha draft site allocation identified in draft Policy HSG15. The site is roughly rectangular in shape and currently comprises of a recreation ground with associated pitches, playing fields, club house and car parking. To the north west of the buildings associated with the recreation ground is an area of woodland. The northern portion of the site beyond the sports pitches is an area of under used scrub land.

Adjacent to the site’s southern boundary is residential development fronting Shelton Avenue. The site is bounded by Limpsfield Road to the east, off which there is an existing vehicular site access. Beyond Limpsfield Road lies further residential development and a care home. Adjacent to the site’s western boundary is paddock land. To the north of the site lies the remainder of the land (HELAA Site Ref: WAR 036) identified for development as part of draft Policy HSG 5.

The site’s perimeter is lined by mature vegetation and trees except at the point of access off Limpsfield Road. This vegetation screens the site from the Green Belt land to the west.

The site lies entirely within Flood Zone 1 and as such is at a low risk of flooding. The nearest listed buildings are the Grade II* listed Church of All Saints and the Grade II First World War memorial, located approximately 300m to the east and south of the site respectively.

The Settlement

The site adjoins the current settlement boundary of Warlingham. Draft Policy TLP06 identifies Warlingham as an ‘Urban Settlement’. Urban Settlements are identified as ‘Tier 1’ settlements and as such are the most sustainable settlements in the district. Warlingham possesses a wide range of shops, services and public transport links making it a sustainable location for growth. Table 1 appended to this letter demonstrates the site’s sustainability in terms of access to services.

In respect of public transport links, there is an existing bus stop on Limpsfield Road immediately adjacent to the site. This stop provides a frequent daily service (Service No.403) to West Croydon where there are interchange opportunities with London Overground and National Rail services. Bus route 409 serves the same bus stop. This service provides an hourly direct link to Upper Warlingham Station and Whyteleafe Station.

In summary, Table 1 demonstrates that site WAR 005 is a sustainable site for residential development in terms of accessing shops, services and public transport links to meet the day to day needs of local residents. Warlingham also benefits from excellent public transport links which future residents of the site would have convenient access to. We endorse the Council’s decision to identify Warlingham as an ‘Urban Settlement’ in the draft Local Plan. As such it is entirely appropriate for the Local Plan to make allocations for residential development at Warlingham. Assigning growth to Warlingham will safeguard the vitality and viability of existing services in line with paragraphs 77 and 78 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
Site Selection and Green Belt Review

In identifying suitable and available land for development the Council have completed a HELAA, Green Belt Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal.

Site WAR 005 was assessed as ‘developable’ by the HELAA in respect of its suitability, availability and deliverability. The HELAA states that the site had a potential yield of 120 dwellings. In light of our own review of site constraints, we support the Council’s HELAA assessment in terms of the site being ‘developable’ and capable of coming forward during the early part of the plan period. However, we consider that the site can deliver more than housing that is suggested in the HELAA.

Green Belt Assessment

Due to the site’s existing Green Belt designation, it was subject to assessment as part of the Council’s three part Green Belt Assessment (GBA) process. The Part 1 GBA identified an area (Ref: 007) around Warlingham, including site WAR 005, as worthy of further investigation in respect of its potential for release from the Green Belt. The Part 2 GBA then considered the merits of this area further and recommended that specific parcels should be subject to more detailed consideration as part of the Local Plan preparation process. As such, site WAR 005 was rightly subject to a detailed and specific site assessment in Part 3 of the GBA. The specific site assessment (Ref: WAR 005-282) examines the site against its contribution to the wider Green Belt and concludes that “the site does justify the exceptional circumstances necessary to recommend an amendment and of the Green Belt boundary”. The assessment rightly notes the site’s compliance with the Local Plan spatial strategy which is to focus development at Urban Settlements, the site’s sustainability credentials, and its potential to deliver a sensitive landscape led design at the planning stage to mitigate any perceived harm on the wider Green Belt.

Having reviewed the Green Belt Assessment process undertaken by the Council we consider its conclusions in relation to site WAR 005 to be robust.

Sustainability Appraisal

The NPPF requires Local Plans to be underpinned by a Sustainability Appraisal (SA). In this case, the draft Local Plan has been published alongside a SA which assesses Warlingham in terms of it suitability to accommodate growth and the sustainability of site WAR 005. These assessments confirm the following:

• Warlingham is the third most sustainable settlement in the district when assessed against the all sixteen sustainability objectives; and

• Site WAR 005 has either a positive or neutral impact on thirteen of the sixteen sustainability objectives thus making it one of the most sustainable development sites in Warlingham. As our client continues to progress the site through the Local Plan and planning process there is potential for the site’s negative ratings in respect of land contamination and biodiversity to be mitigated by the
implementation of appropriate on site measures.

The SA also assesses the wider site allocation (HSG15) against sustainability objectives.

In light of the above we are satisfied that an appropriate SA process has taken place in order to justify Warlingham as suitable location to accommodate growth and site WAR 005 as sustainable development site.

Summary

In respect of our client's site, it evident that the Council's approach to site selection and subsequent assessment in terms of sustainability and Green Belt review has been robust. As such, the site's inclusion within the development area associated with draft Policy HSG15 is entirely justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy.

The Site Allocation Policy (HSG15: Land West of Limpsfield Road, Warlingham)

Site WAR 0005 accounts for the largest element of proposed site allocation HSG15. As identified by the Council's evidence base the site is suitable and available for development. Indeed, our client is keen to bring forward proposals for the site in association with the Local Plan preparation process and at the appropriate time in consultation with key stakeholders.

Whilst our client is, in principle, supportive of draft Policy HSG15 and the evidence base identifying the suitability of the site for development, we do have comments regarding the wording of the draft policy. Accordingly, at present we consider draft Policy HSG15 to be unsound in the context of the NPPF's test of soundness. Set out below are observations regarding the wording of the draft policy and proposed wording modifications to strengthen Policy HSG15 and render it sound.

– **Estimated Site Yield**: 190 dwellings – Our Comments: The Local Plan proposes a housing target of 6,056 dwellings over the plan period. This target falls short of the district's objectively assessed housing need (OAN) which is 9,400 dwellings over the plan period. To assist the Local Plan in delivering its housing need and to significantly boost the supply of housing in line with the requirements of NPPF, the policy estimate of 190 dwellings should be proceeded by 'a minimum of'. This wording amendment would make for a more positive and proactive policy in the context of the district's rising housing demands. In addition, the suggested wording would ensure that there is sufficient flexibility at the planning stage to utilise the allocation to its full development potential.

– **Infrastructure** – Our comments: Bullet point one requires the site allocation to deliver an on-site 3FE primary school. To make bullet point one a more robust and flexible policy tool capable of responding to changing circumstances such as, the relocation of the 3FE primary school was no longer required or a more preferable solution for the Council came forward, it
is recommended that bullet point one is subject to amendments. It is recommended that the following text is added to the end of bullet point one, "or a financial contribution towards increasing the capacity of primary education in the local area”.

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan states that the primary school expansion and reprovision will be funded by a mixture of the County Council and s106 contributions. We are conscious that the Council’s adopted Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulation 123 List states that CIL funding will be used to fund school places (primary and secondary). As such, we need to ensure that any financial contributions towards primary education provision are compliant with the CIL regulations. Our client is committed to working with the Council, the local education authority and other stakeholders to identify and assist in the delivery of the most appropriate and robust solution to meet primary school needs.

Bullet point 2 requires any development to re-provide playing pitches, by way of a financial contribution, to offset the loss of existing on-site facilities. Point VII of draft Policy HSG15 states that replacement space will need to be provided ahead of development. To add flexibility to the policy it is recommended that Point VII is amended to state “replacement space or a financial contribution towards replacement space will need to be provided ahead of development”. In addition, it is recommended that the playing pitch re-provision element of draft Policy HSG15 is rationalised into a single element to make for a more clear and concise planning policy.

Bullet points 3, 4, 5 and 8 relate to highways improvements that the development might be required to deliver. The detail of such schemes and their need to be delivered in order to make any development acceptable in highways terms will be addressed at the application stage. Indeed, the deliverability of each specified scheme also needs to be assessed in detail. Any financial contribution towards specific schemes would need to be compliant with CIL Regulations and be commensurate to the scale of development proposed by a planning application.

Bullet point 6 highlights the need for any development to contribute towards the expansion of a doctors surgery in Warlingham. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan states that an expansion will be funded by a s106 contribution from policy allocation HSG15. We note that medical infrastructure is included on the Council’s Regulation 123 List. As such, we need to ensure any s106 contribution towards medical infrastructure is compliant with CIL regulations. In addition, we seek clarity from the Council as to whether this financial contribution would, in fact, be delivered by CIL payments.

The housing trajectory contained within the Council’s Housing Topic Paper has site WAR 005 scheduled to deliver residential development in 2030/31 and 2031/32. We are very confident that the site can come forward sooner than proposed in the trajectory. Following the adoption of the Local Plan our client will seek to gain planning approval as soon as practically possible. Any enhancements to the delivery timetable would assist the Council in meeting the rising housing needs of
the district.

The developer requirements as set out in draft Policy HSG15 would need to be factored into the viability of any development proposals as and when they come forward.

At this time, our client has no comment to make on the Conservation, Landscape, Ecology and New Defensible Boundaries elements of draft Policy HSG15.

**Other Planning Policies**

**TLP12: Affordable Housing Requirement**

Draft policies TLP12 and HSG15 identify that the site allocation covering site WAR 005 should deliver 40% affordable housing due to the site currently forming part of the Green Belt and being undeveloped. Draft policy TLP12 also states that sites at ‘Urban Settlements’, such as Warlingham, would usually attract a 20% affordable housing requirement. This significant shift in the level of affordable housing requirement on the basis a site was located in the Green Belt is not justified and will impact on the viability of affected sites.

In the case of site WAR 005 the 20% increase in affordable housing requirement is not be justified and may not be viable when considered alongside the infrastructure requirements listed in draft policy HSG15. The site’s location on the edge an ‘Urban Settlement’ means that it has a disproportionate amount of developer requirements which other Green Belt allocations at Tier 1 and Tier 2 (Semi Rural Service Settlement) avoid. In addition, site WAR 005, has existing structures on-site making it partially brownfield. Therefore, the blanket 40% requirement on the basis the site is undeveloped is not justified and may not be viable at the planning application stage.

The issue of affordable housing provision and type and tenure mix needs to be considered in the context of wider development viability. As such we welcome the provisions within TLP12 which allow for the submission of a Viability Appraisal should the development be rendered unviable by providing 40% affordable housing. A similar caveat regarding the ability to submit a Viability Appraisal to support any planning application for development should be also be added to draft Policy HSG15.

**TLP14: Specialist Need Housing & Extra Care**

Our client supports the provisions of this draft policy which seeks the delivery of units of Specialist or Extra Care accommodation where it can be demonstrated that sites are sustainable by virtue of their location. This policy should highlight the potential for site allocations, which are by their very nature sustainable sites, to deliver care facilities alongside other policy requirements. Such an amendment to the policy would focus delivery at the most sustainable locations in the district and maximise the development potential of land.
TLP18: Place-Making and Design

Draft Policy TLP18 is a criteria-based policy which promotes high quality design and the need for development to respect the character of its surroundings. The final paragraph of this policy promotes the use of Design Codes to inform and guide development proposals. Design Codes can be an important tool to shape the delivery of large scale residential developments and urban extensions, usually on sites where 500+ dwellings are proposed. It would be beneficial to include a threshold of 500+ dwellings in Policy TLP18. Such a caveat will allow sites below this threshold to move through the planning process towards implementation at a greater pace.

Conclusion

These representations are, in principle, supportive of draft Policy HSG15 and endorse the site selection process underpinning the Council’s identification of site WAR 005. Site WAR 005 is suitable, available and deliverable and as such is fully capable of accommodating sustainable housing growth in the early part of the plan period. The site will form an important and robust element of the Council’s housing trajectory.

These representations also make a number or comments and proposed modifications regarding the draft wording of policy HSG15. As such, whilst we have broad, in principle, support for draft Policy HSG15, it is contended that the policy is unsound in its current form. However, we are confident that draft Policy HSG15 can be strengthened by the suggested wording modifications to render it sound.

We will be provided further detailed evidence to support the allocation of site WAR 005 as part site allocation HSG15 at the Local Plan Examination stage. As set out on the accompanying completed Local Plan Questionnaire our client wishes to participate in the Local Plan Examination hearings.

Yours sincerely/faithfully

Sean McGrath

Enc: Site Location Plan
     Local Plan Questionnaire
Table 1 – Accessible Service Provision for Land West of Limpsfield Road, Warlingham (Site WAR 005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Closest Facility</th>
<th>Distance from the site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>Warlingham Village Primary School 85 Farleigh Road, Warlingham, CR6 9ER</td>
<td>Approximately 0.9km distance which equates to a 12 minute walk. Within walking distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>Warlingham School Tithepit Shaw Lane, Warlingham, CR6 9YB</td>
<td>Approximately 0.9km distance which equates to a 12 minute walk. Within walking distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Co-op 52-58 The Green, Warlingham, CR6 9NA ‘The Green’ area and adjacent streets also contain a garage, pubs, restaurants, hairdressers, beauty salons and hot food takeaway. Sainsbury’s 631 Limpsfield Road, Warlingham, CR6 9DY</td>
<td>Approximately 0.3km distance which equates to a 4 minute walk. Within walking distance. Approximately 1.2km distance which equates to a 15 minute walk. Within walking distance. Also accessible via a 9 minute bus journey (Service No. 403).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>Warlingham Village Hall 441 Limpsfield Road, Warlingham, CR6 9LE</td>
<td>Approximately 0.4km distance which equates to a 5 minute walk. Within walking distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors Surgery</td>
<td>The Warlingham Green Medical Practice 1 Church Road, Warlingham, CR6 9NW</td>
<td>Approximately 0.1km distance which equates to a 2 minute walk. Within walking distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Opportunities</td>
<td>Small scale employment opportunities are available at the shops and services located within Warlingham.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Google Maps
Our Local Plan: 2033 Consultation  Legal Compliance and Soundness Questionnaire

Our Local Plan: 2033 (Regulation 19)

This consultation relates to the proposed submission version of Our Local Plan and is being conducted in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (2012). This consultation asks for your comments on the **legal compliance and soundness** of the Plan and whether you wish to request involvement in the Examination in Public hearing sessions, which will be determined at the discretion of the appointed Planning Inspector. To assist you in making your comments the Council has prepared a **Guidance Note** on how to respond to this consultation, and sets out the next steps and should be utilised to guide your response as far as is practicably possible.

You do not need to answer every question, only those that relate to the point you wish to make.

**How we will use your information**

In submitting comments to this consultation we are required, under the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, to notify you when the independent examination will take place. We will use the contact details you have provided to do this.

**Please note:** at the end of the consultation period all comments will be made public and will be submitted to the Secretary of State along with the Local Plan and other relevant supporting documents. Your comments and name will be published but other personal information will remain confidential.

Your comments will be reviewed by the independent Planning Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to carry out the examination in public. You may be invited to discuss your comments at the examination in public at the discretion of the Inspector.

In line with General Data Protection Regulations (2018), your details are stored on a secure system and are used only for the purposes of consultation for the Local Plan and associated documents.

Your details will be stored until such a time that the Local Plan has been adopted. If you do not wish to receive further updates from the Council in relation to the Local Plan, please email [localplan@tandridge.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@tandridge.gov.uk) or log on to your Objective account.

Please tick below to indicate you have read this notice.
I have read the notice about how my information will be used..........................✓
Legal Compliance and Soundness – Questionnaire

Legal Compliance

Please see the Guidance Note for an explanation of Legal Compliance.

Do you consider the Local Plan is legally compliant/non-compliant?  
(Please select one answer)

Legally Compliant...........................................✔ Non Compliant......................................................

Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is/is not legally compliant, including references to relevant legislation, policies and / or regulations.
Modifications – Legal Compliance

Are you proposing a modification(s) to make the Local Plan legally compliant and/or to strengthen its compliance?
(Please select one answer)

Yes………………………………………….. □ No………………………………………….. √

Proposed Modifications – Legal Compliance

You will need to say why this modification(s) will make the Local Plan legally compliant/strengthen its legal compliance. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text and include all information and evidence necessary to support / justify your suggested change. Please be as precise as possible.

After this stage, further submissions for modifications will be ONLY at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he / she identifies for examination.

Please set out your suggested modification(s) below

Independent Examination - Legal Compliance
If your representation is proposing a modification(s), do you consider it necessary to participate in the examination in public?
(please select one answer)

Yes........................................................................................................... No.........................................................................................................

Reasons for Attending the Examination in Public - Legal Compliance

Please note attendance at the examination in public is at the discretion of the appointed Inspector.

If you wish to participate in the examination in public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

N/A
### Tests for Soundness

Please see the Guidance Note for an explanation of Soundness.

*Please select one answer for each question*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the Local Plan positively prepared?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the Local Plan justified?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the Local Plan effective?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the Local Plan consistent with national policy?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thinking about the tests of soundness, do you consider the Local Plan to be sound?**

*Please select one answer*

- Sound………………………………………☐ Unsound………………………………………..☑
Please state why you consider the Local Plan to be sound/unsound, including references to relevant legislation, policies and / or regulations.

See attached representations

**Modifications - Soundness**

**Are you proposing modification(s) to make the Local Plan sound, or to strengthen its soundness?**

*(Please select one answer)*

Yes............................................................................ ☑  No............................................................................

**Proposed Modifications – Soundness**

You will need to say why this modification(s) will make the Local Plan sound/strengthen its soundness. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text and include all information and evidence necessary to support / justify your suggested change. Please be as precise as possible.
After this stage, further submissions relating to soundness will be ONLY at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he / she identifies for examination.

Please set out your suggested modification(s) below

See attached representations
Independent Examination – Soundness

If your representation is proposing a modification(s), do you consider it necessary to participate in the examination in public? *(Please select one answer)*

Yes..............................................................☒ No...............................................................☐

Reasons for Attending the Examination in Public – Soundness

*Please note* attendance at the examination in public is at the discretion of the appointed Inspector.

If you wish to participate in the examination in public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

See attached representations
Duty to Cooperate

Please see the Guidance Note for an explanation of the Duty to Cooperate.

Do you consider the Local Plan to have met/not met the requirement of the Duty to Cooperate in accordance with section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 and section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004? Please note that any non-compliance with the Duty to Cooperate is incapable of modification at examination.

(Please select one answer)

Met..........................................................☐ Not met.........................................................☐

Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan has met/not met the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate?
Independent Examination – Duty to Cooperate

Do you consider it necessary to participate in the examination in public? *(Please select one answer)*

Yes.................................................. No.............................................

Reasons for attending the examination in public – Duty to Cooperate

*Please note* attendance at examination in public is at the discretion of the appointed Inspector.

If you wish to participate in the examination in public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:
Uploading/Providing Supporting Information

Please note that you can attach files, such as a scanned map, image or other document, along with your comments. Your documents will be made public as part of the response process. Please note that we have a maximum file size of 10Mb, files larger than this may be rejected by our server.
Local Plan: Monitoring

Awareness
Were you aware that the Council is drafting a Local Plan?
(Please select one answer)

Yes…………………………………………..☐ No……………………………………………………….

Previously responded
Have you previously responded to any of the consultations on the Local Plan?
(Please select one answer)

Yes…………………………………………..☒ No……………………………………………………….

Please give reasons for not responding to any of the Local Plan consultations in the past?
(Please select all that apply)

I didn’t know about the Local Plan………………………………………………………☐
I don’t feel I can make a difference………………………………………………………☐
I don’t think it’s relevant to me……………………………………………………………☐
Other people are making comments on my behalf…………………………………☒
Other…………………………………………………………………………………………☐

The Local Plan
With regards to the Local Plan, have you:
(Please select all that apply)

Understood the documents………………………………………………………………☒
Understood what happens next……………………………………………………………☒
Found all the information you needed…………………………………………………☒
Raised the points you wanted to make………………………………………………….☒

Consultation Awareness
How did you find out about the consultation?
(Please select all that apply)

In the media…………………………………………………………………………………☐
On the internet………………………………………………………………………………☐
Library………………………………………………………………………………………☐
Word of mouth………………………………………………………………………………☒
Parish Council…………………………………………………………………………………☐

Thank you for taking part.
Land west of Limpsfield Road, Warlingham, Surrey

Site Plan
Dear Sir/Madam

REPRESENTATIONS TO THE TANDRIDGE DC HOUSING STRATEGY 2019-2023

On behalf of our client Charterhouse Strategic Land Ltd (CSLL), we wish to make representations in respect of the Tandridge Housing Strategy 2019-2023. CLL have acquired an interest, in the Land West of Limpsfield Road. Our client’s site was assessed as part of the Council’s Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) under site reference number WAR 005. The site is identified for release from the Green Belt in the draft Local Plan and forms part of a wider area that is subject to a draft policy allocation for development (Policy HSG15: Land West of Limpsfield Road, Warlingham).

We previously submitted representations on the Council’s emerging Local Plan and it is our client’s intention to provide further comments on the emerging Local Plan at the Examination stage.

The Housing Strategy 2019 - 2023 sets out three priorities that the Council are seeking to achieve within the Borough. These relate to building the homes the Council needs, improving the quality and the use of existing housing stock and meeting the housing needs of vulnerable households. We have reviewed the document and our comments relate to Priority 1: Building the homes we need.

Policy HS1: Market Housing Mix, Policy HS4: Affordable Housing – Tenure Split and Policy HS5: Private Rented Developments refer to housing requirements on development sites, including mix of dwelling, the type of affordable housing to be provided and privately rented developments. All three polices have specific requirements for developments.

However, the evidence base for these policies have assessed the District as a whole and do not acknowledged that site specific circumstances and needs will differ and a ‘one size fits all’ approach is not necessarily appropriate. Specific requirements and restrictions that can either help or hinder the development of a site. Policy wording should acknowledge this and allow for flexibility on a case by case basis.

By email only
housingstrategy@tandridge.gov.uk

24 October 2018
let.002.SM.LR.29360001
Paragraph 31 of the recent National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) acknowledges that all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence, but, goes on to note that policies should take into account market signals. Paragraph 33 highlights that reviews of the local plan should take into account changing in circumstances affecting the area. Therefore, policies should be flexible enough to adapt to changes in the market in the short to medium term. If policies are too inflexible, it could constrain the delivery of housing.

In summary, the wording for policies HS1, HS4 and HS5 should be flexible enough to ensure that the required housing can be delivered within the plan period.

We trust our comments will be taken into consideration and the policy wording will be amended accordingly. If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully

Victoria Chase

cc: Mr O Taylor
Land to the West of Limpsfield Road, Warlingham
Written Representations on Education Provision

6th September 2019
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John Powell
EPDS Consultants
Conifers House
Blounts Court Road
Peppard Common
Henley-on-Thames
RG9 5HB

0118 978 0091

www.epds-consultants.co.uk

This document and its content is copyright of EPDS Consultants Ltd - © EPDS Consultants Ltd 2019. All rights reserved. Any redistribution or reproduction of part or all of the contents in any form is prohibited. You may not, except with our express written permission, distribute or commercially exploit the content
1. This statement has been prepared as a formal submission to the Examination of the Regulation 19 version of the Tandridge District Council Local Plan and has been prepared on behalf of Charterhouse Strategic Land.

2. This is a response to Matter 6: South Godstone Garden Community and housing allocations, specifically HSG 15: Land west of Limpsfield Road, Warlingham.

3. Charterhouse has an interest in HSG15: Land at Limpsfield Road, Warlingham the allocation of which also included land for relocation and expansion of Warlingham Village Primary School.

4. Further to the Main Modifications, this allocation has remained unchanged.

5. As part of the Local Plan process, there has been no evidence produced by either the Local Planning Authority or the Local Education Authority (Surrey County Council) to show any requirement for additional primary education provision in Warlingham.

6. As part of our representation of our client, we have attempted to engage with the County Council, and held a meeting on 31st January 2019 with a representative of the County’s Planning department, although unfortunately no Education representatives could attend.

7. Since that date we have attempted on numerous occasions to arrange a follow up meeting with Education colleagues to discuss what, if any, evidence exists to justify the proposed allocation for further primary school provision in Warlingham. The attached email trail at Annex 2 shows the efforts made to obtain such a meeting.

8. To date, the County have not been able to offer any dates for such a meeting nor produce any rationale for the requirement for further primary education provision on HSG15 in Warlingham.

9. Additionally, we have met with representatives of both Primary Schools which already serve Warlingham to understand their perspective on the local position.

10. There is no active support within these schools for the educational element proposed for HSG15 and indeed Warlingham Village Primary School has not offered any public support for the idea of its relocation and expansion.

11. Tandridge Learning Trust, as the representatives of Hamsey Green Primary School, has already objected to HSG18 when that allocation included reference to the relocation and re-provision of Warlingham Village Primary School.

12. This view was confirmed to us in our meeting as also referring to the allocation at HSG15. The Trust’s view is that Hamsey Green Primary School is best placed to accommodate any new pupils arising from housing in Warlingham and would welcome this.

13. We have produced a report showing the impact of the allocation at HSG15 and that there is no requirement for any primary education site to be part of the allocation. This report and its appendices are attached at Annex A below.
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1. Introduction

1.1.1. EPDS Consultants has been asked by the client, Charterhouse Strategic Land Limited, to consider the site at Land to the West of Limpsfield Road, Warlingham for its likely impact on schools in the local area and to set out any potential issues and/or mitigation options.

1.2. Report Purpose & Scope

1.2.1. The principal purpose of this report, and the analyses contained therein, is to act as a point of reference for discussions with the relevant local education authority and local planning authority regarding the future provision of education in the area and, subsequently, the requirement to provide Community Infrastructure Levy regulations compliant contributions.

1.2.2. It is hoped that the findings of this Report will assist in the determination of the future provision of school places within the local area and the potential education-specific mitigation options pertaining to the client site at Land to the West of Limpsfield Road, Warlingham.

1.3. Intended Audience

1.3.1. The intended audience of this Report is the client team, but this report may be shared with the Local Planning Authority, Tandridge District Council (TDC) and the Local Education Authority, Surrey County Council (SCC).

1.3.2. This report may also be shared as part of the Local Plan process for the area and may be of particular assistance to the Inspector responsible for the Local Plan Examination process.

1.4. Research Sources

1.4.1. The contents of this Report are based on publicly available information, including data from central government and local authorities, where relevant.

1.4.2. Additional information was received from SCC through a Freedom of Information (FOI) request, in December 2018.

1.4.3. The original research for this report was carried out in December 2018, and was revisited in September 2019 to update the report to version 2.0.
1.5. Department for Education Guidance on Planning Obligations

1.5.1. In April 2019, the Department for Education (DfE) published “Securing developer contributions for education”, non-statutory guidance for local authorities regarding seeking planning obligations towards education provision from residential development. This guidance is attached at Appendix EPDS01.

1.5.2. Whilst this is non-statutory, it is important to consider elements of this guidance, as they would carry some weight in a planning context, although this clearly does not supersede or outweigh the CIL regulations as outlined above.

1.5.3. The purpose of the guidance is underpinned by four principles, as set out below:

- Housing development should mitigate its impact on community infrastructure, including schools;
- Pupil yield factors should be based on up-to-date evidence from recent housing developments;
- Developer contributions towards new school places should provide both funding for construction and land where applicable, subject to viability assessment when strategic plans are prepared and using up-to-date cost information;
- The early delivery of new schools within strategic developments should be supported where it would not undermine the viability of the school, or of existing schools in the area.

1.5.4. The fourth of these principles is of relevance to this proposed development.
2. The Proposed Development Site

2.1. Site Location

2.1.1. The proposed client site for up to 190 dwellings at Land to the West of Limpsfield Road, Warlingham, lies within the planning remit of Tandridge District Council (TDC) and is allocation reference HSG15 in the TDC draft Local Plan.

2.1.2. This site is one of four in Warlingham that have been allocated for housing in the TDC Draft Local Plan. The other relevant allocations are HSG16, HSG17 and HSG18.

2.1.3. For the purposes of this report all distances have been measured using the postcode point closest to the eastern edge of the site on Limpsfield Road.

2.1.4. A Location Plan extract of the site is as follows:

![Location Plan extract of the site](image)

**Graphic:** Location Plan of the HSG15 allocation, with the site comprising the redline boundary.

(Source: Site Location Plan at Appendix EPDS02)
3. The Local Education Authority

3.1. Surrey County Council’s Duty to Secure Sufficient School Places

3.1.1. The site lies within the primary and secondary pseudo-catchment areas (based on furthest distances of places offered) of schools for which the local education authority is Surrey County Council (SCC).

3.1.2. The Education Act 1996 (as amended) provides in section 14(1):

“A local education authority shall secure that sufficient schools for providing – (a) primary education and (b) secondary education ... are available for their area”.

3.1.3. The Education Act does not state it is the duty of a local education authority to ensure that there are sufficient school places at the catchment or pseudo-catchment area school for all children residing within that particular school’s catchment or pseudo-catchment area.

3.1.4. The Education Act simply states that the education authority must provide school education appropriate to the requirements of pupils for their area. In the case of SCC that is the area defined as the county of Surrey.

3.1.5. This duty applies in relation to all the children in the local education authority area, whether they have lived there all their lives or have just moved into a new development.

3.1.6. The residential component of the proposed development will include family housing. Family housing often includes school age children who will seek to enrol in local schools. Those schools may or may not be sufficient to accommodate these children without the need for additional capacity to be provided.
4. The Position at Local Schools

4.1. School Forms of Entry

4.1.1. School capacity is often measured in terms of forms of entry (“FE”). A single class can typically accommodate up to 30 children. As primary schools have 7 year groups, a 3FE primary school would have capacity for 630 children \[\text{calculation: } 30 \times 7 \times 3 = 630\]. Similarly, as secondary schools have 5 year groups, a 6FE secondary school would have capacity for 900 pupils aged 11-16 \[\text{calculation: } 30 \times 5 \times 6 = 900\].

4.2. Patterns of Pupil Migration

4.2.1. As there is likely to be movement of children between these respective schools’ catchment areas, pseudo-catchment areas (based on furthest distances of places offered), designated areas, or priority areas, our analyses includes schools within a reasonable straight line distance of the proposed development.

4.2.2. This movement of children due to parental preference and other factors is often referred to as “inflow” and “outflow”.

4.2.3. In the normal annual admissions round, if a school is full, children from within a school’s priority area take precedence over children living outside a school’s priority area. This is an important factor is helping determine the future forecast at a school if additional housing is likely to be built in the school’s catchment during the period of school forecasting.

4.3. Local Primary School Position

4.3.1. In order to assess the degree of mitigation required from the proposed development regarding primary school place provision EPDS Consultants has considered the impact on primary schools within two miles to the proposed development site.

4.3.2. There are ten such schools, with six of these within the area for which SCC has responsibility as the local education authority and a further four for which Croydon Council is the local education authority.

4.3.3. The proposed development is located with Hamsey Green Primary School as its nearest school, as can be seen from the plan attached at Appendix EPDS03.

4.3.4. The majority of the primary schools listed operate on distance based admissions rather than having a catchment area.
4.3.4. According to the most recently available school data, the current position of pupil places at local primary schools (including infant and junior schools) within 2 miles of the proposed development in Warlingham is as shown in the Table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Local Education Authority</th>
<th>Distance from Site</th>
<th>Net Capacity</th>
<th>Current NOR</th>
<th>Surplus Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamsey Green Primary</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham Village Primary</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whyteleafe Primary</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenley Primary</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atwood Primary</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>475 *</td>
<td>5 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marden Lodge Primary</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gresham Primary</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis Catholic Primary</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audley Primary</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenvale Primary</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,183</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>254</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table:** Primary School pupil places local to the proposed development in Warlingham, in distance order

* - this number may include nursery pupils who should be excluded from any surplus calculation

[Source: Children on Roll and capacity data from DfE website – there may be a discrepancy between centrally held data and that held at a local level].

4.3.5. Notwithstanding the potential impact of future developments on local primary school places in Warlingham, and regarding which we comment on later in this Report, it is evident that there is currently a surplus of local primary school places. Currently the surplus is **254 places**, or **8.07%** [calculation: 254/3183].
4.4. **Local Secondary School Position**

4.4.1. There are two secondary schools within three miles of the proposed development within SCC and a further four schools for which the responsible local education authority is Croydon Council:

4.4.2. The proposed development is located within the catchment area of Warlingham School.

4.4.3. According to the most recently available school data, the position of pupil places is as shown in Table 4 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Local Education Authority</th>
<th>Distance from Site</th>
<th>Net Capacity</th>
<th>Current NOR</th>
<th>Surplus Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham School</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riddlesdown Collegiate</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>1,903</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Stafford School (11-16)</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oasis Academy Coulsdon (11-16)</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quest Academy</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian High School</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6,816</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,562</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table:** Forecast Secondary School pupil places at the local schools.

[Source: Children on Roll, capacity and Forecast data from SCC & CCC FOI requests].

4.4.4. Notwithstanding the potential impact of future developments on local secondary school places in the Warlingham area, and regarding which we comment on later in this Report, it is evident that there is a significant surplus of local secondary school places.
5. The Adopted Position of the Councils

5.1. SCC School Organisation Plan

5.1.1. Attached at Appendix EPDS04 is an extract relating to the TDC area of the most recent School Organisation Plan published by SCC. This dates to January 2018.

5.1.2. This Plan includes forecasts on an area basis for Reception and Year 7 places (ie the year of entry into Primary and Secondary education). SCC’s position, as set out in the Plan, is that there will be a requirement for a further 1FE of places in the northern area of Tandridge at primary level, and no need for new places at secondary level.

5.1.3. SCC does not set out any thoughts on how, or where, it intends to deliver this additional 1FE. It does however indicate that to deal with a previous “bulge year”, Marden Lodge Primary School has offered 2FE of places in Reception rather than its usual admission level of 1FE.

5.2. TDC Local Plan policy

5.2.1. As noted previously, there are four sites allocated for housing in the Warlingham area of Tandridge. These allocations are set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Housing Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSG15</td>
<td>Land West of Limpsfield Road, Warlingham</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSG16</td>
<td>Land at Green Hill Lane and Alexandra Avenue, Warlingham</td>
<td>50 (+ extra care unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSG17</td>
<td>Land at Farleigh Road, Warlingham</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSG18</td>
<td>Former Shelton Sports Ground, Warlingham</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.2. Two of these allocations have a specific on-site education requirement set out in the allocation. These are the adjoining sites of HSG15 (allocation details extracted from the draft Local Plan are attached at Appendix EPDS05) and HSG18. The wording of the respective allocations is identical and is set out below:

VIII. In accordance with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), financial contribution to/onsite provision of the following infrastructure are relevant to the development of this site and will be a requirement of any proposal:

- Relocation and expansion of Warlingham Village Primary School to provide an on-site 3FE primary school

5.2.3. Notwithstanding the correction from 3FE to 2FE subsequently made, it is still unclear how TDC expects this matter to be dealt with, and there is neither rationale nor evidence provided in support of this specific requirement.
6. Primary & Secondary Education Impact & Mitigation

6.1. SCC Assessment and other Local Plan sites

6.1.1. There are no documents available in the public domain to clarify exactly what child yield from new housing SCC uses in assessing development. However, it appears to be in the region of 0.25 primary pupils per new dwelling.

6.1.2. Applying this yield level to the allocations within the Warlingham area (which total 400 new dwellings) would give rise to approximately 100 new primary school aged pupils.

6.1.3. The current draft allocation seeks to increase the size of Warlingham Village Primary School from 1fe (210 places) to 2FE (420 places), an increase of 420 places.

6.1.4. This is set against a back drop of a falling birth rate, leading to less pressure on Reception year places, and a current position where surplus places already exist in the primary school closest to the proposed allocation.

6.2. Potential Primary School Mitigation Options

6.2.1. It is clear from paragraph 4.3.5 above that there are surplus places in the local primary schools, and the SCC School Organisation Plan describes the overall need in the future for the North Tandridge area as being an additional 1FE of places.

6.2.2. Whilst there are no plans set out in the School Organisation Plan as to how this additional 1FE of places is to be delivered, there is also no analysis to show why North Tandridge requires an additional 1FE at all, nor where would be best placed to deliver any such expansion if it is in fact required.

6.2.3. Even if an additional 1FE is required in the north of Tandridge, this does not necessarily have to be provided at Warlingham. Marden Lodge Primary School has previously admitted 60 pupils in a year group to accommodate a bulge class, and may therefore be able to permanently expand to this level.

6.2.4. Even if Warlingham were deemed to be the most appropriate setting for a 1FE expansion if required, the Tandridge Learning Trust has confirmed that Hamsey Green Primary School could provide such an expansion on its existing site. There is no evidence that this has been considered by SCC or TDC prior to the allocation of a school site at HSG15.


6.3.1. Given the position adopted by SCC in its School Organisation Plan on secondary school need for Tandridge, and the availability of school places within a reasonable distance of the proposed allocation, it is clear that no mitigation for secondary school places will be necessary.
7. Conclusions & Recommendation

7.1.1. EPDS has considered the site at Land to the West of Limpsfield Road, Warlingham for its likely impact on schools in the local area and has set out any potential issues and/or mitigation options.

7.1.2. SCC has not demonstrated that there will indeed be a requirement for an additional 1FE of primary school places in the north of Tandridge, nor that the relocation and expansion of Warlingham Village Primary School is the most appropriate way to deliver this.

7.1.3. SCC and TDC have also failed to justify why the allocations for HSG15 and HSG18 indicated that a 2FE primary school is required on site. The allocation for HSG18 has since had the reference to new school provision removed, with the objection from Tandridge Learning Trust an underlying reason.

7.1.4. The Tandridge Learning Trust object to any such provision in Warlingham and it is mere oversight that means the same objection was not put forward for HSG15. This has been confirmed in subsequent meetings with the Trust.

7.1.5. Further information was sought and as yet has not been provided as to the site sizes (and therefore possibilities for expansion) at existing local primary schools by SCC. The Tandridge Learning Trust has confirmed that Hamsey Green Primary School could expand on its existing site to deliver an additional 1FE of places if necessary.

7.1.6. In addition, and on the basis of the findings in this Report, it is recommended that there is continued pressure for engagement with SCC and TDC to enable a robust challenge to the wording of the draft allocation prior to its approval.
8. Appendices

The following appendices accompany this document:

- APPENDIX EPDS01 – DfE “Guidance on Securing Developer Contributions”;
- APPENDIX EPDS02 – Site Location;
- APPENDIX EPDS03 – Location of Hamsey Green Primary School in relation to HSG15;
- APPENDIX EPDS04 – SCC School Organisation Plan (extract relating to Tandridge), January 2018;
- APPENDIX EPDS05 – TDC draft Local Plan extract; HSG15 allocation.
APPENDIX EPDS01

DfE “Guidance on Securing Developer Contributions”
Securing developer contributions for education

April 2019
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Summary

This publication provides non-statutory guidance from the Department for Education (DfE). It has been produced to help local authorities secure developer contributions for education so that housing developers contribute to the cost of providing the new school places required due to housing growth. The guidance promotes good practice on pupil yield evidence, engagement with local planning authorities and the delivery of expanded or new schools with funding from housing development.

Expiry or review date

This guidance will be reviewed as necessary (for example, in response to changes in legislation or government policy).

Who is this publication for?

This guidance is for local authorities with a responsibility for providing sufficient school places under the Education Act 1996. It may also be a source of information for local planning authorities and other stakeholders involved in the delivery of schools.
Introduction

Government is committed to ensuring that there are enough good new school places to meet local needs, while also driving forward an ambitious housing agenda to increase housing delivery, home ownership and the creation of new garden communities. The timely provision of infrastructure with new housing is essential in meeting these objectives to secure high quality school places where and when they are needed.

DfE expects local authorities to seek developer contributions towards school places that are created to meet the need arising from housing development. You should consider the recommendations in this guidance alongside National Planning Practice Guidance on the evidence, policies and developer contributions required to support school provision.

This guidance is for local authorities with a responsibility to provide sufficient school places under the Education Act 1996. The guidance does not:

- Advise the construction/development industry on its duties or responsibilities in paying for infrastructure;
- Replace or override any aspects of other DfE publications such as guidance on SCAP and the Admissions Code, or policy/guidance produced by other government departments;
- Make recommendations for individual schools or academy trusts on managing their capacity or published admission numbers;
- Propose new DfE policy on setting up new schools (central or presumption route), parental preference or the academy system.

Purpose

As a local authority with education responsibilities, you already provide evidence of education need and demand for use by planning authorities in plan- and decision-making. This guidance draws on existing good practice and is intended to help you establish a robust and consistent evidence base, underpinned by the following principles:

- Housing development should mitigate its impact on community infrastructure, including schools;
- Pupil yield factors should be based on up-to-date evidence from recent housing developments;
- Developer contributions towards new school places should provide both funding for construction and land where applicable, subject to viability assessment when strategic plans are prepared and using up-to-date cost information;
- The early delivery of new schools within strategic developments should be supported where it would not undermine the viability of the school, or of existing schools in the area.

There is great value in detailed local methodologies and guidance that explain to all stakeholders the process and reasons for the collection of developer contributions for
education in that area. This guidance is not intended to replace local approaches, which often provide detail on:

- The approach to seeking contributions for education from affordable housing.
- Types/sizes of homes that will be excluded from calculations of developer contributions.
- Education projects developer contributions may fund.
- The minimum viable size of new schools.
- Assumptions about the schools children from a development will attend, when assessing available capacity in affected schools.
- Minimum surplus capacity to allow for fluctuations in demand and parental choice, not counted as available when calculating developer contributions.
- Contributions 'in kind' (land and/or construction).
- Requirements on size and suitability of school sites, including checklists, exemplar layouts and facility specifications.
- Standard planning obligation clauses.

As local approaches to securing developer contributions for education are reviewed, they should take account of updated National Planning Practice Guidance, this guidance, and the Department’s emerging national methodology for the calculation of pupil yields from housing development.

**Mechanisms for securing developer contributions**

1. Developer contributions for education are secured by means of conditions attached to planning permission, a planning obligation under Section 106 of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990, or the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). CIL revenues are intended to help fund the supporting infrastructure needed to address the cumulative impact of development across a local authority area. CIL can be used to fund the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of a wide range of infrastructure, including education. Alternatively, a Section 106 planning obligation secures a contribution directly payable to the local authority for education (or direct provision of a school ‘in kind’), though a planning obligation must comply with the following tests set out in the CIL Regulations\(^1\), requiring it to be:

   - Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms
   - Directly related to the development
   - Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

2. Government intends to revise the CIL Regulations, including the removal of the ‘pooling restriction’ on the use of planning obligations to fund the same type of infrastructure or infrastructure project. We advise you to work with local planning

authorities in devising their approaches to securing developer contributions, to consider the most appropriate mechanism (Section 106 planning obligations and/or CIL) to secure contributions from developers towards education alongside other infrastructure funding priorities.

3. It is important that the impacts of development are adequately mitigated, requiring an understanding of:

- The education needs arising from development, based on an up-to-date pupil yield factor;
- The capacity of existing schools that will serve development, taking account of pupil migration across planning areas and local authority boundaries;
- Available sources of funding to increase capacity where required; and
- The extent to which developer contributions are required and the degree of certainty that these will be secured at the appropriate time.

4. The local authority providing children’s services is not always the charging authority for the purposes of collecting and distributing CIL. In two-tier areas where education and planning responsibilities are not held within the same local authority, planning obligations may be the most effective mechanism for securing developer contributions for education, subject to the tests outlined in paragraph 1. The use of planning obligations where there is a demonstrable link between the development and its education requirements can provide certainty over the amount and timing of the funding you need to deliver sufficient school places. We recommend that planning obligations allow enough time for developer contributions to be spent (often this is 10 years, or no time limit is specified).

5. Central government basic need grant, the DfE free schools programme and other capital funding do not negate housing developers’ responsibility to mitigate the impact of their development on education. When the DfE free schools programme is delivering a new school for a development, we expect the developer to make an appropriate contribution to the cost of the project, allowing DfE to secure the school site on a peppercorn basis and make use of developer contributions towards construction. National Planning Practice Guidance explains how local planning authorities should account for development viability when planning for the provision of infrastructure. There should be an initial assumption that both land and funding for construction will be provided for new schools planned within housing developments.

6. While basic need funding can be used for new school places that are required due to housing development, we would expect this to be the minimum amount necessary to maintain development viability, having taken into account all infrastructure requirements.

2 National Planning Practice Guidance. Construction costs include ICT and furniture and equipment required for the delivery of the school.
Where you have a reasonable expectation of developer funding being received for certain school places,\(^3\) and you have declared this in your SCAP return (or plan to do so), then basic need funding should not be considered available for those school places other than as forward funding to be reimbursed by developer contributions later.

7. There are other options besides basic need grant for forward-funding school places, including the use of local authority borrowing powers where necessary. Where developer contributions have been secured through a planning obligation, you can recoup the borrowing costs from developer contributions later, provided these costs have been incurred as a result of housing growth. Local authorities can bid for funding under government grant programmes such as the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) as they become available, while developers delivering schools directly as an ‘in kind’ contribution may be eligible for loan funding from DfE or Homes England, allowing a new school to be delivered at an earlier stage in the development than would have been possible otherwise.\(^4\)

**Evidence of pupil yields from housing development**

8. Pupil yield factors should be based on up-to-date evidence from recent local housing developments, so you can forecast the education needs for each phase and type of education provision arising from new development. As well as being useful for pupil place planning across your area, pupil yield factors allow you to estimate the number of early years, school and post-16 places required as a direct result of development, underpinning the contributions agreed in planning obligations. We are working on a detailed methodology for calculating pupil yields from housing development, to be published in due course.

9. While many early years settings fall within the private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sector, local authorities have a duty to ensure early years childcare provision within the terms set out in the Childcare Acts 2006 and 2016. DfE has scaled up state-funded early years places since 2010, including the introduction of funding for eligible 2 year olds and the 30 hours funded childcare offer for 3-4 year olds. The take-up has been high, increasing demand for early years provision. All new primary schools are now expected to include a nursery. Developer contributions have a role to play in helping to fund additional nursery places required as a result of housing growth, however they may be provided, in particular where these are proposed as part of school expansions or new schools.

\(^3\) In accordance with a local plan’s viability assessment, policies and/or an infrastructure funding statement.

\(^4\) Guidance on the [Home Building Fund](#).
10. You are also responsible for ensuring sufficient schools for pupils receiving primary and secondary education up to the age of 19. Furthermore, you must secure sufficient education and training provision for young people with an Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan, up to the age of 25. Pupil yield data should identify the number of students living in recent housing developments, aged 16-19 (without an EHC plan) and up to the age of 25 (with an EHC plan). We advise you to seek developer contributions for expansions required to sixth form and special educational needs and disabilities (SEN) provision, commensurate with the need arising from the development.

11. To determine the need for SEN provision, pupil yield data should identify the number of pupils/learners within recent local housing developments who attend special schools, pupil referral units or alternative provision, SEN units and resourced provision within mainstream schools. It is reasonable and fair to seek developer contributions for SEN provision in direct proportion to the needs arising from planned housing development, applying the same principle to SEN provision as to mainstream. There is no standard capacity assessment applicable to special schools and other types of non-mainstream education, as their ability to accommodate pupils depends on the specific needs of each child. However, an increase in housing will lead to an increase in SEN, and we advise you to seek developer contributions for all special school/SEN places generated by a development, where there is a need for additional SEN provision. Greater travel distances to special schools and alternative provision should not affect your consideration of whether a planning obligation meets the legal tests outlined in paragraph 1.

12. We advise you to identify a range of SEN or other non-mainstream projects and ensure that planning obligations allow you the flexibility to direct funds appropriately within a 10 year period. Non-mainstream provision does not conform to standard class sizes, these being determined according to need. While it may be appropriate to pool contributions towards a new classroom in a special school or SEN unit at a mainstream school, it is equally valid to seek contributions for school building alterations that increase a school’s capacity to cater for children with SEN, such as additional space for sensory rooms, facilities to teach independent living skills or practical teaching space.

13. It is not necessary to disaggregate the SEN pupil yield factor according to different complex needs. All education contributions are based on an assessment of probability and averages, recognising that the precise mix of age groups and school choices cannot be known before a development is built. Site-specific factors will always need to be taken into account, but a robust local authority-wide pupil yield factor based on evidence of

_____________________

5 Participation of young people: education, employment and training.
recent developments will often be sufficient to demonstrate that this need is reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

**Costs of provision**

14. The amount of money that you seek to secure through developer contributions for education provision should reflect the current cost of providing school places, linked to the policy requirements in an up-to-date emerging or adopted plan that has been informed by viability assessment.

15. We advise that you base the assumed cost of mainstream school places on national average costs published annually in the DfE school place scorecards.\(^6\) This allows you to differentiate between the average per pupil costs of a new school, permanent expansion or temporary expansion, ensuring developer contributions are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. You should adjust the national average to reflect the costs in your region, using BCIS location factors.\(^7\) We recommend the use of index linking in planning obligations so that contributions are adjusted for inflation at the point they are due.

16. Developer contributions for early years provision will usually be used to fund places at existing or new school sites, incorporated within primary or all-through schools. Therefore, we recommend that the per pupil cost of early years provision is assumed to be the same as for a primary school. Similarly, further education places provided within secondary school sixth forms will cost broadly the same as a secondary school place.

17. Special schools require more space per pupil than mainstream schools, and this should be reflected in the assumed costs of provision. We recommend that developer contributions for special or alternative school places are set at four times the cost of mainstream places, consistent with the space standards in Building Bulletin 104.\(^8\) You can also refer to the National School Delivery Cost Benchmarking report for the costs of delivering SEN school places.\(^9\)

18. Where there is local evidence of higher costs for a particular project, such as a bespoke feasibility study or known site abnormalities, these can be used in preference to the adjusted national average.

---

\(^6\) School places scorecards.

\(^7\) Further guidance on doing this will be available with the school place scorecards for 2018 onwards.

\(^8\) Primary and secondary school design guidance.

\(^9\) National School Delivery Cost Benchmarking: Primary, Secondary and SEN Schools, February 2018
Identifying education projects

19. Local plans and other planning policy documents should set out the expectations for contributions from development towards infrastructure, including education of all phases (age 0-19) and special educational needs.\(^\text{10}\) We advise local authorities with education responsibilities to work jointly with relevant local planning authorities as plans are prepared and planning applications determined, to ensure that all education needs are properly addressed, including both temporary and permanent education needs where relevant, such as school transport costs and temporary school provision before a permanent new school opens within a development site. This does not mean double funding the same school places, but allows development to be acceptable in planning terms when it is not possible to open a permanent new school at the point of need. When a permanent new school is delivered (or the relevant financial contribution is received), no further contributions to temporary provision should be required.

20. Government intends to lift the pooling restriction on planning obligations, subject to amended legislation. Following this and where applicable, we recommend that you identify a preferred and ‘contingency’ school expansion project in a planning obligation, as long as both would comply with the Section 106 tests. This will help you respond to changing circumstances and new information, such as detailed feasibility work leading you to abandon a preferred expansion project.

21. We advise you to consider the realistic potential for schools in your area to expand or increase capacity through other alterations, in discussion with academy trusts, and identify site options for any new schools (within proposed housing developments or on standalone sites). Including suitable projects in the local planning authority’s infrastructure funding statement will ensure that developer contributions are clearly identified as the funding source where new schools, expansions or alterations are required due to housing growth. This background work will also minimise the risk of a specified school project in a planning obligation proving undeliverable.

Safeguarding land for schools

22. National Planning Practice Guidance advises on how local planning authorities should prepare plans and take account of education requirements. We advise you to work with local planning authorities and developers to ensure your long-term pupil place planning objectives are reflected in the development plan (and masterplans where these

\(^{10}\) National Planning Practice Guidance
do not form part of the development plan, such as supplementary planning documents). Precise policies can aid decision-making later, setting out the total amount of land required for education, and the approach to securing equitable developer contributions when one developer provides the land for a new school, though the need for the school is generated by more than one development or phase.

23. You may wish to safeguard additional land when new schools within development sites are being planned, to allow for anticipated future expansion or the reconfiguration of schools to create a single site. ‘Future-proofing’ can sometimes be achieved informally through a site layout that places open space adjacent to a school site. Where justified by forecast need for school places, additional land can be designated specifically for education use and made available for purchase by the local authority within an agreed timescale, after which the land may be developed for other uses.

24. While developers can only be expected to provide free land to meet the education need from their development, the allocation of additional land should also preclude alternative uses, enabling you to acquire the site at an appropriate cost. Land equalisation approaches can be used in multi-phase developments to ensure the development ‘hosting’ a new school (and any additional safeguarded land) is not disadvantaged. Nevertheless, the market price for the land will depend on its permissible uses. Land allocated for educational use in a local plan would usually have no prospect of achieving planning permission for any other uses. Independent land valuation may be required to establish an acquisition cost. National Planning Practice Guidance provides advice on land valuation for the purposes of viability assessment.

25. The use of compulsory purchase powers may be considered a last resort, but in these situations the allocation for educational use would be an important consideration in determining any compensation that would be payable to landowners.

26. Where new schools are planned within housing developments, we advise you to consider whether direct delivery by the developer would represent the best value for money, subject to an appropriate specification and pre-application support from the local planning authority. Advice on complying with state aid and public procurement legislation is provided in the Annex.

**Strategic developments and new settlements**

27. Garden communities are an increasingly popular way of planning for housing growth at the scale required to meet the country’s housing needs. The government is

---

11 The development plan is defined in Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and comprises the spatial development strategy, development plan documents and neighbourhood development plans.
supporting a number of garden communities under the Garden Communities Programme. We have published guidance on education provision in garden communities, to assist local planning authorities and Homes England in delivering schools as part of garden communities. We advise you to consider this in conjunction with this guidance on securing developer contributions for education.

28. Strategic planning of urban extensions and new settlements often includes place-making objectives about the early provision of infrastructure, to establish a sense of community and make the place attractive to residents. Early delivery of a school can be problematic if it precedes new housing and draws pupils from existing schools, threatening their viability and resulting in unsustainable travel-to-school patterns. We advise local authorities with education responsibilities to work jointly with local planning authorities and other partners to agree the timing of new school provision, striking an appropriate balance between place-making objectives, education needs and parental preference.

29. Schools can be delivered in single or multiple phases; the best approach will depend on local circumstances and characteristics of the development. Where appropriate, for instance in the early stages of development while the need for school places is growing, developer contributions can be secured for temporary expansions to existing schools if these are required, and transport costs for pupils travelling further than the statutory walking distance. This will allow a permanent new school to be provided in a single construction phase once the development has generated sufficient pupil numbers, rather than phased construction over a longer period. While the existing pupil cohort may not switch schools initially, children living in the development will usually have priority for admission to the new school and will take up these school places over time.

30. As far as possible (and often in relation to primary schools only), new settlements should be expected to meet their full education requirement. Where an onsite school is required, it should be large enough to meet the need generated by the development. While there may be exceptions justified by local circumstances, as a general rule, existing school capacity in the wider area does not need to be taken into account when calculating developer contributions for permanent onsite schools in new settlements, which should be within the statutory walking distance for the pupils living there. This promotes sustainable and healthy travel patterns for young people.

31. When a permanent new school is proposed to be built early in the development of an urban extension or new settlement, you will naturally consider the effect this might have on parental demand and the viability of existing schools. To minimise detrimental

—

12 Education Provision in Garden Communities
13 The statutory walking distances are set out in the Home to School Transport guidance
impacts on existing schools while supporting local planning authorities to plan new communities, you should work with school providers and the relevant Regional Schools Commissioner to promote Admission Arrangements and opening strategies that will maintain equilibrium in school populations across your area. This can include phased delivery, with the initial phase future-proofed for future expansion (such as an oversized assembly hall and dining area) and land safeguarded for the school’s expansion when need builds up over a long period, though it is important to secure commitment to the delivery of later phases.

32. You should also work with local planning authorities to ensure that local plans, masterplans and planning obligations require a suitable school site to be made available at the appropriate time. If early school delivery is required, the school site must be identified and agreed at an early stage, giving consideration to its accessibility and condition at the point of transfer.

33. If a new school opens in a single phase below its full capacity while it awaits pupils moving to the development, this does not represent an available surplus for other developments assessing their own impact and mitigation, unless the development delivering the new school will not be completed or generate enough pupils to fill the school. Complementary uses that share the school site can be considered for a temporary period while a new school fills. In practice, you may prefer to deliver the school in phases using modular construction methods, linking capacity more closely to emerging need, though the initial phase must still provide a viable sized school.

34. New housing tends to attract more young families than older housing, yielding higher numbers of pupils particularly in the pre-school and primary age groups, though this stabilises over time until the development resembles the mature housing stock. We advise you to respond to initial peaks in demand, such as planning for modular or temporary classrooms, securing a large enough site to meet the maximum need generated by the development. Where new settlements are planned, you may wish to carry out demographic modelling to understand education requirements in more detail, taking account of similar developments and different scenarios such as an accelerated build rate.

35. Where a requirement for both primary and secondary schools has been identified, we recommend you consider if there would be cost efficiency, space saving and educational benefits in providing an all-through school.

36. There may also be sustainability, efficiency and educational benefits in relocating an existing school, for example where a development is large enough to require a new

---

14 This phenomenon is widely reported in local authority evidence, such as for Central Bedfordshire and North Essex Garden Communities.
secondary school but it would be too close to an existing secondary school, both of which would be relatively small. Such reorganisation of the school estate, relocating and expanding an existing school on a development site, may be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, if the alternative distribution, size or condition of schools would be unsustainable. Proposed changes are subject to following the relevant process, depending on the category of the school.\textsuperscript{15} We advise that you work collaboratively with local planning authorities to ensure your objectives for the school estate are reflected in planning policies and decisions.

37. There is often a degree of uncertainty around the delivery of urban extensions and new settlements, in view of the long timescales involved, multiple developers and changeable market conditions. The build rate of development may be slower than anticipated, while land provided for a school may need to be returned to a developer if it is not used within an agreed period. Therefore, it is important to consider carefully the clauses within planning obligations if they impose any time restriction on the use of transferred education land, and the potential for the overall phasing of developer contributions to cause delays. Where land has to be returned to a developer, this should be on the same terms as it was given; land provided by free transfer should be returned as such.

38. We also advise you to consider any potential uplift in the value of a development following the grant of planning permission and before all housing units are sold or let. It may be possible to secure the full education contribution, where this had previously been reduced on viability grounds, using planning obligation review mechanisms. National Planning Practice Guidance advises further on how viability should be assessed during the lifetime of a project. We recommend that you work with local planning authorities to set out in plans the circumstances where review mechanisms in planning obligations may be appropriate, allowing you to maintain policy compliance on education contributions when circumstances have changed.

39. To support the delivery of strategic development at pace, you may need to forward-fund school provision within an urban extension or new settlement, using basic need funding or local authority borrowing if necessary and recouping these costs later through developer contributions secured by a planning obligation. While we recognise there are some inherent risks to this, our position on the use of basic need funding and other forward-funding options is set out in paragraphs 5-7 above.

\footnote{\textit{School organisation guidance and transparency data.}}
Annex

Developer delivery of new schools

1. Direct delivery of new schools by housing developers may represent good value for money. This model of delivery should not contravene state aid or public procurement rules. While we advise you to seek your own project-specific legal advice when necessary, this annex sets out the department’s view on the legal position at the time of publication. Local authorities should keep abreast of emerging case law that may have a bearing on this advice, and any legislative changes following the UK’s exit from the European Union.16

2. While the department supports developer delivery of schools in principle, the local authority’s control over the design specification and timescale for opening will be reduced, so we recognise it will not always be the preferred option. Nevertheless, high quality design and performance should still be achieved through the planning and building control process, and compliance with national standards such as the DfE building bulletins, output specification and other design standards and guidance.17

3. When developer delivery is proposed, it is a good idea to include a clause within a planning obligation requiring design disputes to be referred to an independent expert or design panel, so the local authority is not the ultimate decision-maker on the design specification. This does not preclude a partnership approach between the local authority, academy trust (where relevant) and developer to negotiate a brief and design specification; such collaboration is good practice and helps to avoid disputes.

4. Furthermore, we recommend that planning obligations allow local authorities to step in and deliver the school if developer delivery falls through but the school is still required. Longstop clauses should ensure that the land for the school is transferred early enough for the local authority to intervene and provide the school at the right time. In these situations, the planning obligation should also require financial contributions to be made in lieu of the ‘in kind’ provision of the school by the developer, making use of review mechanisms where necessary to respond to changing circumstances.

16 At the time of publication, current rules are expected to be preserved in domestic law. See The State Aid (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 (draft) and EU Exit guidance on public-sector procurement.
17 School design and construction guidance.
State Aid

5. In some cases, all relevant parties will support developer delivery of a new school, but the local authority accepts that the developer cannot fully fund the new school and its delivery would need a degree of public subsidy. It is important this this does not constitute unlawful state aid to the developer.\textsuperscript{18}

6. The question is whether a contribution by a local authority to the cost of the school (otherwise being funded by the developer under a planning obligation) is a grant of incompatible state aid to that developer. The answer depends on the circumstances that give rise to the local authority's contribution. There are two principal questions. Has the public contribution arisen:

(a) Because planning law/policy only requires the developer to make a partial contribution; or

(b) Because the local authority has otherwise volunteered to make this contribution?

Planning law/policy only requires the developer to make a partial contribution

7. This is unlikely to give rise to incompatible state aid (unlawful). If planning law/policy only requires the developer to make a partial contribution then no incompatible state aid should arise merely because the local authority (or another public sector body) funds the balance of those costs. This is subject to the relevant public sector body satisfying itself (through benchmarking and/or a cost consultant's report) that the developer's costs of building the school are not more than market costs. This would apply even if the initial application of planning policy dictated that the developer makes a full contribution but after applying planning viability principles (taking account of the total infrastructure burden on the development) the developer's contribution was reduced.

8. National Planning Practice Guidance says that for the purpose of plan making, an assumption of 15-20% of gross development value may be considered a suitable return to developers, in order to establish the viability of plan policies. A local authority’s contribution to school delivery which supports a higher profit margin for a particular developer may be considered a voluntary contribution (see below) and a selective benefit to one developer, which may amount to unlawful state aid.

9. The rationale for this assessment is that the key state aid test to be applied to the developer is whether it has selectively benefitted from the local authority's contribution. For example, if under planning law/policy it (or any other developer) would have only been required to fund 60% of the school's costs then it has not selectivity benefitted as another developer (in identical circumstances) would also only be required to make the

\textsuperscript{18} Guidance relating to state aid and CIL, and The State Aid (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 (draft).
same 60% contribution. The extent of the local authority’s contribution (if required) will usually be determined through viability assessment.

The local authority has otherwise volunteered to make this contribution

10. A voluntary contribution by the local authority would raise an issue that its funding may grant a selective benefit to the developer and could amount to incompatible state aid (unlawful).

11. The local authority may require a larger school than the development must provide, such as an increase to two forms of entry (2FE) when the development generates a need for a 1.5FE school. This may constitute a voluntary contribution but would not provide a selective benefit to the developer, provided any other developer in identical circumstances would receive the same contribution for additional school places, so in such circumstances the risk that this would amount to incompatible state aid is considered low.

Public works contracts (OJEU procurement)

12. It is possible to place a Section 106 planning obligation on a developer to provide a school without triggering a ‘public works contract’ which would require the local authority to undertake procurement under the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) or the equivalent following the UK’s exit from the EU. However, it is important that a number of principles contained in relevant case law¹⁹ are complied with:

   a) there is no positive works obligation on the developer to build the school in any event (meaning could the planning authority force the developer to build the school even if that developer never implemented its planning permission); and/or
   b) The public body has no ‘decisive influence’ on the design of the school. (The public authority is entitled to contribute to discussions about, be consulted on and set parameters about the building (e.g. compliance with national standards) but not have the ultimate decision about the works specification).

13. Most planning obligations requiring the delivery of new schools include trigger points that link the provision of infrastructure to the occupation of homes. Section 106 planning obligations that are only triggered when planning permission is substantially implemented may be considered conditional rather than constituting a positive works obligation. The developer would not be legally obligated to perform the works and could walk away from them at any time, until the development commenced.

¹⁹ The Queen (on the application of Midlands Co-operative Society Limited) and Birmingham City Council [2012] EWHC 620 (admin); Helmutt Muller GmbH v Bundesanstalt fur Immobilienaufgaben (C-451/08); R (Faraday Development Ltd.) v. West Berkshire Council & Anor [2016] EWHC 2166 (Admin)
14. The extent to which a contracting authority can become involved in the design of works before it is deemed to be "specifying" such works has been explored in case law and guidance.  

15. A contract would only be deemed a public works contract if the contracting authority took measures to define the type of work to be undertaken by the developer partner or at the very least had a "decisive influence" on its design. "Requirements specified by the contracting authority" has been taken to exclude the exercise of a public authority’s urban planning powers in examining building plans presented to it, or the decision to apply its planning powers in relation to a particular project.  

16. The former Office of Government Commerce (OGC) provided further interpretation of the land exemption. In particular they were of the view that:  

(a) national or local land-use planning policies, requirements or restrictions for a site would not in themselves comprise a requirement specified by the contracting authority;  
(b) a broad invitation that a site should be developed in accordance with applicable or national local land-use planning policies but with the developer free to put forward its own intentions, proposals and specifications within these parameters is unlikely to trigger a requirement specified by the contracting authority.  

17. Although the OGC no longer exists as a distinct government department, their guidance note has been referenced by the domestic Courts and it is still considered useful guidance in the UK. However, reliance on OGC views may need to be reviewed if their position is overruled by the European Courts or the Commission, or by domestic Courts following the UK’s exit from the EU. 

---

20 Helmut Muller GmbH v Bundesanstalt fur Immobilienaufgaben (C-451/08) and Office of Government Commerce (OGC) Information Note 12/10 (30 June 2010).
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Schools in Tandridge
There are 25 primary age schools in Tandridge, eight of which have nursery provision. There are three secondary schools in the district, two with post-16 provision and there is no college provision.

Two primary schools and two secondary schools host specialist centres that support students with a range of special educational needs within a mainstream environment. There are three special schools in the district - two for pupils with communication and interaction needs, and the other for students with severe learning and development needs.

Tandridge is made up of five individual primary planning areas as identified in the map to the left. Each primary age school is allocated to one of these planning areas.

Tandridge is a single secondary planning area. This means that demand for secondary places is estimated across the whole district.

Births in Tandridge
The graph below shows the number of births in Tandridge each academic year:

Data provided by the Office for National Statistics shows that births in Tandridge reached a low point in 2002. Since then, the borough has seen a small but steady increase in births, with spikes in 2007, 2012 and 2015.

PRIMARY
The need for primary school places depends on the local child population. Any increase in pupil population in Tandridge, as described above, leads to an increase in demand for school places. Whilst the rise in births is relatively modest compared to other boroughs and districts in Surrey, it is not spread evenly across the district and therefore some areas in Tandridge may experience more or less pressure for school places than others. This is not solely attributable to an increasing birth rate as additional demand is also being generated from inward migration and additional housing.
The graph below shows the number of pupils starting school in Tandridge in each of the academic years 2011 - 2016 and then estimates the number of pupils that will require a reception place in a primary school in Tandridge between 2017 and 2026.

![Graph showing number of students requiring reception places in Tandridge, forecast from 2017 onwards](image)

We are conscious that the district council is undertaking a review that could impact on future housing across the area that would inevitably lead to an increase in future demand on school places. We will continue to work with the district council to identify how future demand would be met through increases in provision.

**What have we done?**

In the last three years, the following projects have been commissioned to meet demand, with some of the temporary (bulge) classes leading to permanent expansions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downs Way School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Francis Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downs Way School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marden Lodge Primary School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What are we doing?**

Whilst there are expected to be spare places in Tandridge as a whole, this disguises the pressure on places locally. In line with the additional capacity provided at Infant level, there is expected to be a pressure on junior places in Oxted & Limpsfield in the short- to medium-term.

In addition, there is anticipated to be a short- and long-term need for additional primary school places in north Tandridge. This situation remains under constant review and provisional discussions are taking place with schools to determine the appropriate strategy moving forward, bearing in mind the need to ensure that there isn’t an over-provision of places in the medium-term.
The future requirements for primary provision in Tandridge are outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s C of E Junior School</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional 1FE in northern Tandridge</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How accurate were our primary numbers?**

It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 938 children on roll at Tandridge primary schools in Reception year. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 944 children on roll, giving an under-estimation of 1%.

**SECONDARY**

The need for secondary school places is based on the local population of secondary age children. The forecasts incorporate the numbers of children in local primary schools and factor in the historic patterns of children joining secondary schools from outside the local area. On average, historically around 90% of the district's Year 6 cohorts have transferred to secondary schools in the district. The remaining 10% of children choose to pursue independent secondary schooling, or apply to schools outside of the borough. However, overall, the district is a net importer of students from outside of the county. This means that there are more children from outside of Surrey attending Tandridge secondary schools than there are Tandridge children attending out of county secondary schools. This is largely because the location of schools near to the county boundary means that catchment areas include parts of the neighbouring London Borough of Croydon.

The graph below estimates the number of pupils who will require a secondary school place in Tandridge from 2017 to 2026.

**What have we done and what are we doing?**

Secondary provision is located towards the northern half of the district. In the shorter term, whilst schools in the borough are oversubscribed, it should be noted that this includes significant subscription from adjoining authorities for whose applicants Surrey is not obliged to provide a place if applicants do not meet the admissions criteria. Therefore, overall it is expected that current provision will be sufficient to meet demand. Admissions in the recent past have exceeded the total Published Admissions Numbers (PAN) and numbers are expected to once again rise from a low in 2014, with the shortage of places becoming pronounced by 2018.
With additional provision needing to be considered from 2018, discussions are taking place with local schools to determine the most appropriate way to provide these required places. In outline, the following provision is required:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>de Stafford School</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How accurate were our secondary numbers?**
In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 720 children on roll at Tandridge secondary schools in Year 7. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 693 children on roll, giving an over-estimation of 4%.
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Our Local Plan: 2033
(Regulation 19)
July 2018
HSG15: Land West of Limpsfield Road, Warlingham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Size:</th>
<th>10.9ha</th>
<th>Use / Estimated Site Yield:</th>
<th>(C3) 190</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Site Description:

The site covers a variety of land uses including an underutilised recreation ground and built facilities, poor quality paddock land and car parking. The site is surrounded by residential development on all sides excluding the western edge. Woodland contributes to screening on the western side.

Other evidence-based references: WAR 005 and WAR 036

Site-specific Policy Requirements:

In addition to complying with other relevant policies of Our Local Plan including those relating to affordable housing and design, applications will be supported where the following site-specific matters/requirements are addressed:
Green Belt Amendment

The exceptional circumstances to justify the release of this site from the Green Belt have been identified and the allocation of this site has resulted in an alteration to the Green Belt boundary. Due to the undeveloped nature of the land, proposals will be required to provide 40% affordable housing.

Conservation

I. Development will conserve and enhance the setting of the Grade II* listed All Saints Church to the east of the site

Landscape

II. Sensitive landscaping reflective of the site’s contribution to the character of Warlingham and its Green Belt location will need to be factored into any application for the benefit of the local community and local character, neighbouring properties and the open fields beyond. (This to include a green strip to the frontage of the site bordering Limpsfield Road which will, inter alia, provide local amenity space)

Ecology

III. Proposals will ensure that woodland edges to the site are retained and protected with appropriate unlit habitat buffer

New Defensible Boundaries

IV. Design and layout should actively seek to create and preserve, clear and defensible boundaries between the edge of the site and the Green Belt to which it is adjacent.

Open Space

V. Redevelopment of this site would result in a loss of playing pitch provision. Permission will only be granted where replacement provision is provided to an equal or better quantity and quality (or unless all shortfalls are alleviated) and in a location in accordance with the requirements and standards of the most up-to-date Open Space Assessment and Playing Pitch Strategy

VI. Loss of space and subsequent re-provision, including location, will need to be determined in liaison with any users, Sport England and any relevant National Governing Bodies

VII. Replacement space will need to be provided ahead of development

Infrastructure
VIII. In accordance with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), financial contribution to/onsite provision of the following infrastructure are relevant to the development of this site and will be a requirement of any proposal:

- Relocation and expansion of Warlingham Village Primary School to provide an on-site 3FE primary school
- Re-provision of high quality and suitably located playing pitches; where possible these should be provided in the Warlingham area and/or in accordance with the requirements of the most up to date Open Space Assessment and Playing Pitch Strategy
- Traffic calming at Hillbury Road
- Pedestrian Crossing between Warlingham Green and Trenham Drive
- Kerb improvements and informal crossing point at Tithepit Shaw Lane
- Expansion to doctors surgery in Warlingham
- On site amenity green space in accordance with the most up to date open space assessment.
- Cycle route from Warlingham Green to Upper Warlingham Station
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Good afternoon Chris,

I am writing to you as the education consultant representing one of the sites allocated in the Tandridge DC draft Local Plan in Warlingham. As you may be aware the Examination in Public of this plan is likely to take place in September and we would like to discuss the educational implications of the allocated sites with you, a colleague from your education department and a representative of the District Council in order to progress matters and hopefully begin to agree points for a Statement of Common Ground. It would be helpful if we could be provided with all evidence and feasibility works that led the Council to seek the inclusion of a new primary school against my client’s allocation in the current draft version of TDC’s Local Plan as soon as possible and certainly prior to meeting to discuss matters.

I would be very grateful if you could come back to me with a few suggested dates for a meeting at your earliest convenience given the timescales involved

Best regards,

John Powell
Operations Director
EPDS Consultants

m: 07803 402529 / t: 0118 978 0091
www.epds-consultants.co.uk / Twitter / LinkedIn
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Good afternoon Chris,

I refer to my email below and would be grateful for a response.

Best regards,

John Powell
Operations Director
EPDS Consultants
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Good afternoon Chris,

I am writing to you as the education consultant representing one of the sites allocated in the Tandridge DC draft Local Plan in Warlingham. As you may be aware the Examination in Public of this plan is likely to take place in September and we would like to discuss the educational implications of the allocated sites with you, a colleague from your education department and a representative of the District Council in order to progress matters and hopefully begin to agree points for a Statement of Common Ground. It would be helpful if we could be provided with all evidence and feasibility works that led the Council to seek the inclusion of a new primary school against my client’s allocation in the current draft version of TDC’s Local Plan as soon as possible and certainly prior to meeting to discuss matters.
I would be very grateful if you could come back to me with a few suggested dates for a meeting at your earliest convenience given the timescales involved.

Best regards,

John Powell
Operations Director
EPDS Consultants
Good morning Chris,

I am disappointed to not have heard further from you on this. I would be grateful if you could come back to me at your earliest convenience with some suggested dates to meet.

Best regards,

John Powell  
Operations Director  
EPDS Consultants
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Examples of Client Feedback:  “I've used EPDS on a number of sites where there have been unreasonable requests for education contributions. Will certainly use EPDS again and would highly recommend them” /  “Faced with a very challenging educational contribution as part of a planning project we turned to EPDS for assistance. They provided a very professional and robust service which resulted in a win at appeal, including overturning the unrealistic educational contributions” /  “EPDS prepared evidence on school place generation and capacity in support of one of our residential proposals. Oliver managed negotiations with the County Council on our behalf and his robust evidence was successful in demonstrating that sufficient school places would be available to accommodate the children arising from our proposed development.”
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Good afternoon Chris,

I refer to my email below and would be grateful for a response.
Good afternoon Chris,

I am writing to you as the education consultant representing one of the sites allocated in the Tandridge DC draft Local Plan in Warlingham. As you may be aware the Examination in Public of this plan is likely to take place in September and we would like to discuss the educational implications of the allocated sites with you, a colleague from your education department and a representative of the District Council in order to progress matters and hopefully begin to agree points for a Statement of Common Ground. It would be helpful if we could be provided with all evidence and feasibility works that led the Council to seek the inclusion of a new primary school against my client’s allocation in the current draft version of TDC’s Local Plan as soon as possible and certainly prior to meeting to discuss matters.

I would be very grateful if you could come back to me with a few suggested dates for a meeting at your earliest convenience given the timescales involved.

Best regards,

John Powell
Operations Director
EPDS Consultants
Hello John,

many apologies for the delay with the response on the issue.

I have coincidentally written to Education and Planning colleagues earlier today seeking an update and will get back to you.

Kind regards,

Chris.

07734 231088.

Good morning Chris,

I am disappointed to not have heard further from you on this. I would be grateful if you could come back to me at your earliest convenience with some suggested dates to meet.

Best regards,

John Powell
Operations Director
EPDS Consultants
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Good afternoon Chris,

I am writing to you as the education consultant representing one of the sites allocated in the Tandridge DC draft Local Plan in Warlingham. As you may be aware the Examination in Public of this plan is likely to take place in September and we would like to discuss the educational implications of the allocated sites with you, a colleague from your education department and a representative of the District Council in order to progress matters and hopefully begin to agree points for a Statement of Common Ground. It would be helpful if we could be provided with all evidence and feasibility works that led the Council to seek the inclusion of a new primary school against my client’s allocation in the current draft version of TDC’s Local Plan as soon as possible and certainly prior to meeting to discuss matters.

I would be very grateful if you could come back to me with a few suggested dates for a meeting at your earliest convenience given the timescales involved.

Best regards,

John Powell
Operations Director
EPDS Consultants
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Thanks Chris,

I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Best regards,

John Powell
Operations Director
EPDS Consultants
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“I've used EPDS on a number of sites where there have been unreasonable requests for education contributions. Will certainly use EPDS again and would highly recommend them” / “Faced with a very challenging educational contribution as part of a planning project we turned to EPDS for assistance. They provided a very professional and robust service which resulted in a win at appeal, including overturning the unrealistic educational contributions” / “EPDS prepared evidence on school place generation and capacity in support of one of our residential proposals. Oliver managed negotiations with the County Council on our behalf and his robust evidence was successful in demonstrating that sufficient school places would be available to accommodate the children arising from our proposed development.”
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Hello John,

many apologies for the delay with the response on the issue.
I have coincidentally written to Education and Planning colleagues earlier today seeking an update and will get back to you.

Kind regards,

Chris.

07734 231088.

From: John Powell <john.powell@epds-consultants.co.uk>
To: Chris Carey
Cc: Oliver Taylor; MKillip@tandridge.gov.uk
Subject: RE: Tandridge Local Plan & Warlingham - education provision

Good morning Chris,

I am disappointed to not have heard further from you on this. I would be grateful if you could come back to me at your earliest convenience with some suggested dates to meet.

Best regards,

John Powell
Operations Director
EPDS Consultants
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Examples of Client Feedback: “I've used EPDS on a number of sites where there have been unreasonable requests for education contributions. Will certainly use EPDS again and would highly recommend them” / “Faced with a very challenging educational contribution as part of a planning project we turned to EPDS for assistance. They provided a very professional and robust service which resulted in a win at appeal, including overturning the unrealistic educational contributions” / “EPDS prepared evidence on school place generation and capacity in support of one of our residential proposals. Oliver managed negotiations with the County Council on our behalf and his robust evidence was successful in demonstrating that sufficient school places would be available to accommodate the children arising from our proposed development.”
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Good afternoon Chris,

I refer to my email below and would be grateful for a response.

Best regards,

John Powell
Operations Director
EPDS Consultants
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Scotland & Northern Ireland Office : EPDS Consultants, Exchange Place 2, Semple Street, Edinburgh EH3 8BL

Good afternoon Chris,

I am writing to you as the education consultant representing one of the sites allocated in the Tandridge DC draft Local Plan in Warlingham. As you may be aware the Examination in Public of this plan is likely to take place in September and we would like to discuss the educational implications of the allocated sites with you, a colleague from your education
department and a representative of the District Council in order to progress matters and hopefully begin to agree points for a Statement of Common Ground. It would be helpful if we could be provided with all evidence and feasibility works that led the Council to seek the inclusion of a new primary school against my client’s allocation in the current draft version of TDC’s Local Plan as soon as possible and certainly prior to meeting to discuss matters.

I would be very grateful if you could come back to me with a few suggested dates for a meeting at your earliest convenience given the timescales involved

Best regards,

John Powell
Operations Director
EPDS Consultants

m: 07803 402529 / t: 0118 978 0091
www.epds-consultants.co.uk / Twitter / LinkedIn

England & Wales Office : EPDS Consultants, Conifers House, Blounts Court Road, Peppard Common, Henley-on-Thames RG9 5HB
Scotland & Northern Ireland Office : EPDS Consultants, Exchange Place 2, Semple Street, Edinburgh EH3 8BL

This email (including any attachments) is intended only for the recipient(s) named above. It may contain confidential or privileged information and should not be read, copied or otherwise used by any person unless express permission is given. If you are not the named recipient, please contact the sender and delete the email from the system. It is the recipient’s responsibility to ensure that appropriate measures are in place for software viruses.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

This email and any attachments with it are intended for the addressee only. It may be confidential and may be the subject of legal and/or professional privilege.
If you have received this email in error please notify the sender or postmaster@surreycc.gov.uk
The content may be personal or contain personal opinions and cannot be taken as an expression of the County Council’s position. Surrey County Council reserves the right to monitor all incoming and outgoing mail. Whilst every care has been taken to check this e-mail for viruses, it is your responsibility to carry out any checks upon receipt.

Visit the Surrey County Council website - http://www.surreycc.gov.uk

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
Good afternoon Chris,

I note a further fortnight has passed without a response? I would be grateful if you could confirm some suggested meeting dates by return.

Best regards,

John Powell
Operations Director
EPDS Consultants
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www.epds-consultants.co.uk / LinkedIn / Twitter

Examples of Client Feedback:
“I’ve used EPDS on a number of sites where there have been unreasonable requests for education contributions. Will certainly use EPDS again and would highly recommend them” / “Faced with a very challenging educational contribution as part of a planning project we turned to EPDS for assistance. They provided a very professional and robust service which resulted in a win at appeal, including overturning the unrealistic educational contributions” / “EPDS prepared evidence on school place generation and capacity in support of one of our residential proposals. Oliver managed negotiations with the County Council on our behalf and his robust evidence was successful in demonstrating that sufficient school places would be available to accommodate the children arising from our proposed development.”
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I have coincidentally written to Education and Planning colleagues earlier today seeking an update and will get back to you.

Kind regards,

Chris.

07734 231088.

---

From: John Powell <john.powell@epds-consultants.co.uk>
Sent: 31 May 2019 11:31
To: Chris Carey
Cc: Oliver Taylor; MKillip@tandridge.gov.uk
Subject: RE: Tandridge Local Plan & Warlingham - education provision

Good morning Chris,

I am disappointed to not have heard further from you on this. I would be grateful if you could come back to me at your earliest convenience with some suggested dates to meet.

Best regards,

John Powell
Operations Director
EPDS Consultants
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Examples of Client Feedback:

“I've used EPDS on a number of sites where there have been unreasonable requests for education contributions. Will certainly use EPDS again and would highly recommend them” / “Faced with a very challenging educational contribution as part of a planning project we turned to EPDS for assistance. They provided a very professional and robust service which resulted in a win at appeal, including overturning the unrealistic educational contributions” / “EPDS prepared evidence on school place generation and capacity in support of one of our residential proposals. Oliver managed negotiations with the County Council on our behalf and his robust evidence was successful in demonstrating that sufficient school places would be available to accommodate the children arising from our proposed development.”
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Good afternoon Chris,

I refer to my email below and would be grateful for a response.

Best regards,

John Powell
Operations Director
EPDS Consultants
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Scotland & Northern Ireland Office : EPDS Consultants, Exchange Place 2, Semple Street, Edinburgh EH3 8BL

Good afternoon Chris,

I am writing to you as the education consultant representing one of the sites allocated in the Tandridge DC draft Local Plan in Warlingham. As you may be aware the Examination in Public of this plan is likely to take place in September and we would like to discuss the educational implications of the allocated sites with you, a colleague from your education
department and a representative of the District Council in order to progress matters and hopefully begin to agree points for a Statement of Common Ground. It would be helpful if we could be provided with all evidence and feasibility works that led the Council to seek the inclusion of a new primary school against my client’s allocation in the current draft version of TDC’s Local Plan as soon as possible and certainly prior to meeting to discuss matters.

I would be very grateful if you could come back to me with a few suggested dates for a meeting at your earliest convenience given the timescales involved

Best regards,

John Powell  
Operations Director  
EPDS Consultants

m: 07803 402529 / t: 0118 978 0091  
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Chris

Just to be clear we want to meet with your education officers responsible for pupil forecasting. The time it is taking to actually arrange and hold this meeting is woefully worrying and does not cast SCC in good light. At our meeting SCC needs to clearly set out for us the evidential basis upon which the ‘need’ for the relocation and expansion of Warlingham Primary is justified. Further, education needs to confirm why Greenacres is the Council’s preferred site. The fact that a rogue developer purporting to be in control of the site sought to engineer a ‘Very Special Circumstances’ case to support a planning application is not a robust justification in itself.

I look forward to hearing from you with the names of the relevant education officers we need to speak with and a date the earliest you can all meet to discuss the matter in hand.

With kind regards
Oliver Taylor, MSc (Dev.Plan) MRICS MRTPI
Director
Tel: 020 7471 6060
Mob: 07471 471540

PLEASE NOTE: The information in this email is provided in confidence and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not read, use or disseminate that information. Any opinions or advice contained in this email are not necessarily those of Charterhouse Property Group LLP, nor any of its associated companies. Although this email and any attachments are believed to be free of any virus, or any other defect which might affect a computer or IT system into which they are received and opened, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that they are virus free and no responsibility is accepted by Charterhouse Property Group LLP (nor any of its associated companies) for any loss or damage arising in any way from receipt or use thereof.
Chris.

Chris Carey,
Senior Development Manager,
Property Services,
Surrey County Council.

07734 231088.
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18 January 2019

Mrs Sarah Thompson  
Head of Strategic Planning Policy  
Tandridge District Council  
The Council Offices  
8 Station Road East  
Oxted, Surrey  
RH8 0BT

Dear Mrs Thompson,

**HSG15 - LAND WEST OF LIMPSFIELD ROAD, WARLINGHAM**

We have reviewed the contents of the Local Plan (Appendix A) approved by the Council at the Meeting of its Planning Policy Committee on 19th December 2018.

We are extremely concerned that the provisions of allocation HSG15 have been materially changed in relation to the provision of a new primary school on the site and that the policy is now prescriptive as to the part of the site upon which such a new school would be sited. This modification has been made without the basis for the change having been set out in any evidence base document of which we have been made aware and without a proper opportunity for consultation with ourselves, our planning agents or other interested parties. The effects of the modification are even more serious when viewed alongside the revised Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which is expressly applied by policy HSG15 but which has itself now been substantially amended to provide for transfer of the entire new school site, **serviced and at nil cost** (my emphasis) to the County Council. These changes both individually and in combination plainly go well beyond matters of formatting or presentation and constitute a material change to the substance of the policy and so we have taken Leading Counsel’s advice on the position in which, regretfully, we have been placed.

We note that Appendix H to the Committee Papers contains a list of main modifications and amongst these is one relating to HSG15 which requires flooding matters to be addressed. We can see no reason why the amendments dividing the site into parcels A and B and directing the school provision to parcel B cannot be dealt with in the same way, if the Council genuinely believes them to be properly evidence-based (as to which we have substantial doubts – see below). This way, they can be subject to proper process and consultation in due course. Alternatively, the Council has the option of re-running the Regulation 19 stage to ensure that the plan which it now wishes to submit to the Secretary of State has been subject to due process. We realise, however, that this will have timing implications for the Plan, and so we favour the first option of reverting to the text which was actually the subject of the Regulation 19 process (from 30 July to 10 September 2018). We look forward to hearing from you urgently in relation to this proposal, so that we can consider carefully the courses of action which may be open to us.

Cont/d ...
At the same time, we would be grateful to receive from you full particulars of the evidential basis upon which it is considered that:

i) Warslingham should have a new and larger primary school, having regard to existing capacity within the catchment;

ii) The school should be provided on the newly identified “Part B” of HSG15;

iii) The burden of providing land for the school should fall entirely on part of HSG15, when 400 new units in total are proposed for Warlingham across 5 sites;

iv) The school site should be transferred at nil value by the owners of Part B, when CIL monies and County Council funds are available and other developer contributions from the Warlingham allocations could be secured to ensure that the provision of a new school is funded equitably.

We look forward to hearing from you in relation to these matters at the earliest possible opportunity.

Yours sincerely,

Oliver Taylor
Director

Cc. Vivienne Riddle, Tandridge District Council
    Mark Bristow, Tandridge District Council
    Sean McGrath, Indigo Planning
    Victoria Chase, Indigo Planning
    Michael Holt, Charterhouse Strategic Land
Tandridge Joint Infrastructure Team

Monday 8th February 2016
Conference Room 3, Tandridge District Council

2pm – 4pm

Notes

1. In attendance:
   Louise Round, Piers Mason, Clive Moore, Paul Barton, Belinda Purcell, Georgina Brightwell, Lesley Harding, Lee McQuade, Sue Janota, Zena Curry, Peter Hopkins, Alison Peet, Simon Matthews, Trevor Pugh, Simon Moore

2. Project updates
   a) Caterham Master Plan
      Piers updated the group regarding the progress of the Masterplan for Caterham. Nexus Planning put forward a very exciting tender proposal, which is to be taken to the Resources Committee on 9th February for approval. Piers believes the programme of 18 months could be compressed to 12/15 months. The Masterplan is to cover areas of Caterham Valley and the main shopping area of Caterham on the Hill. Louise stated there was support from Caterham councillors, and whilst it was an expensive project, TDC hope to be a main investor in the Caterham area. Simon (Matthews) suggested it may be worth talking to Mole Valley DC with regards to their recent work in Leatherhead, as they used the same tender company.

   b) Asset Management
      i. Caterham: library, CAB, museum
         Peter Hopkins updated the group about the potential merger of any of these sites, however, currently, there are some technical issues. Under TDC's new asset management strategy, Louise is keen to see maximised use of TDC owned property.

      ii. Hurst Green/Godstone depots
         Paul explained there was the potential to consolidate both sites, allowing the release of the Warren Lane depot. A review would shortly be going to the SCC investment panel, Louise requested to see a copy of this.

      A discussion took place regarding Permitted Development rights, business premise requirements, and software availability for SCC/TDC to help allocate sites at a strategic level for local business.

      iii. TDC offices
         Following the recent completion of the Smarter Working project at TDC, space has become available at the Oxted offices. Paul asked Zena if the Highways Agency would require more space, as they already rented some space at the Godstone depot. A conversation with Stuart Mitchenall would be required.

         Louise discussed the possibility of having the Citizens Advice Bureau and/or Tandridge Voluntary Services Council and/or Surrey and Borders based at the TDC offices.

      iv. Housing schemes
         In the future, there is the potential to sell-off sites for housing. Warren Lane depot was discussed; if any plans go ahead to consolidate the site at Godstone, the site could become a commercial space.

   v. Hubs – ASC, Mental Health Hubs
Peter explained that Adult Social Care Commission Hubs may be located in libraries in the future. However, they would actually be charged higher rents than current. The Citizens Advice Bureau could share a Hub space with SILK.

c) Devolution

i. 3SC Bid
Louise explained the premise of the 3SC bid. It involves a revolving infrastructure fund which would give local authorities more power and money to do to implement strategies. A pitch to central government Ministers was given shortly after Christmas.

ii. East Surrey Devolution (Double Devolution)
Trevor explained how the 4 East Surrey district and boroughs are ‘slightly ahead of the game’ in considering further devolution to the D’s and B’s. Further discussion would be required focusing on overlapping interests such as highways and transportation. He highlighted that there may be issues with diplomacy, but there was scope for real change.

d) LEP

i. East Surrey Proposition
Lee updated the group on the local growth deal progress. The deal will highlight on growth priorities in the locality. The deadline for the Proposition is the end of February.

Simon Matthews highlighted the need for East Surrey to rebalance their position in the LEP, and improve the distribution of finances near to Gatwick and the M25.

ii. LGF R3
No update was given.

iii. European funding
Simon Matthews updated the group on the situation regarding European funding. He suggested that the East Surrey bids to ESIF looked likely to reach the next stage. The current bids relate to cycling and rural tourism.

e) Local Plan

Piers explained that the current document out for public consultation is the Regulation 18 ‘Issues and Approaches’, and is accompanied by many technical assessments. The consultation began on 18 December 2015 and closes on 26 February 2016. TDC have already surpassed any previous representations tally, which currently stands over 500.

Piers highlighted that a detailed transport modelling document would be necessary for the Regulation 19 stage and consultation.

One of the technical assessments states that TDC have enough land for employment sites, but more may be required should Gatwick expand to a second runway or a planning inspector’s review highlights the need.

Zena questioned areas around Smallfield known to be flood plains, and the mitigation in the Plan. Piers explained that sites in Flood Zone 3 had been excluded, and further investigation of sites in Zones 2a and 2b may exclude them too.

f) Strategic Employment sites

i. Rose and Young site, Caterham
Currently, there are two applications in for this site. One is for retail space with flats situated above, and the other is for a hotel (Premier Inn).

ii. Gasholder site, Oxted
TDC have offered to lend SGN (Southern Gas Networks?) the 300-400k needed to bring down the gasholder. The process has halted, however Piers is meeting with SGN in the following weeks to discuss. The contract for European funding that TDC has states that the gasholder needs to be coming down by March 2017.

iii. Hobbs Industrial Estate, Felbridge
Following a recent visit, TDC officers have concluded that the owners are somewhat unlikely to sell or invest in the site, therefore officers need to push
opportunities to the owners about investment and funding for this underutilised site; currently only 17 of the 28 hectares site is used.

iv. Lambs Business Park
No update – work continues.

g) Transport

i. C2C LGF R1/R2 update
No update.

ii. C2C LGF R3 transport bid
A package has been devised regarding the A22 corridor intensification. There is a nuance currently around infrastructure and public perception.

iii. Rail
Lee explained that a recent study was undertaken about the capacity of the London to Brighton mainlines. Mainline 1 was found to have capacity – smaller lines were omitted from this study.

iv. East Surrey Community Transport Review
Belinda explained that currently a mapping exercise is underway, reviewing the provision in the East Surrey district and boroughs, and identifying areas where consolidation of the service could occur. The report to East Surrey Chief Executive’s Group is due in May.

v. Green corridors (infrastructure) / Cycle Plan
TDC is the last district or borough in Surrey to complete a study – the report is due at Corporate Management Team in two weeks’ time.

Surrey County Council is currently reviewing their Green Corridor Schemes; this looks, for example, at enhancing dual usage of footpaths i.e. leading to tourist sites.

vi. Biggin Hill Airport
TDC has just submitted their response to the Biggin Hill airport consultation regarding changes to flight paths and operating hours.

h) Town Centres

i. Secondary Shopping Centres Funding
TDC has submitted an application for the funding – a decision will be made in April 2016. If secured, this can be publicised from the beginning of the financial year 2016/17.

ii. Business Improvement Districts
The Oxted BID is underway with the first local event to take place in April 2016. Businesses in Caterham will go to ballot regarding a BID in the main shopping area in Caterham Valley in October 2016.

i) Superfast Broadband
Simon Matthews explained that the government had just released interim reports regarding the rollout of superfast broadband – near 97% of Surrey residents have superfast broadband. However, Belinda suggested that the 3% without are rural areas, and owing to the nature of the district, Tandridge may be disproportionately affected. The group discussed that businesses in the present day need superfast broadband.

j) Flooding
Paul gave details about the rising water levels in the North Downs, which were rising at 1m per day. A warning could be issued if the rainfall continues and the height reaches 17m.

3. Any Other Business

a) A22 roadworks
Louise asked Zena about the progress of the A22 roadworks between the A25 roundabout and the junction 8 M25 roundabout. Zena said that the road was on track for re-opening on 28th February, subject to workmen not discovering further issues and good weather conditions. The A22 website is constantly updated.
b) Piers raised that a developer has offered a site in Warlingham to build a new primary school, and a number of private residential units which would finance the school’s construction. He inquired about Surrey County Council’s position on this. The site is currently in the Green Belt. SCC did not provide a position, but offered to look into the application.

4. Date of Next Meeting
April 2016, at Tandridge District Council Offices
Minutes

1. In attendance:
Louise Round (TDC), Paul Barton (TDC), Clive Moore (TDC), Piers Mason (TDC),
Oliver Judges (TDC), Belinda Purcell (TDC), Georgina Brightwell (TDC), Elliot Bance
(Asprey Homes), Chris Carey (SCC), Sue Janota (SCC), Zena Curry (Surrey
Highways), Lesley Harding (SCC), Oliver Gill (SCC)

2. School place planning (Warlingham)
Asprey Homes has an interest to develop a site in Warlingham and provide a new
primary school on-site, either wholly or partly funded by the construction of 80 new
market homes. The site is in the Green Belt, and is being considered through the
Local Plan process.
Warlingham School currently does not meet the needs of the area, and the site
cannot be enlarged. Population forecasts show (in the wider area of Tandridge) that
indigenous population growth has increased 11.8% in the last 10 years. These
forecasts do not take the Local Plan into account.
- Chris will investigate Surrey CC’s asset and capital strategy to help build the
case (of why market homes are needed to fund the school).
- An agenda item on school place issues in Tandridge will be proposed for local
committee.
- Oliver Gill is drafting a response to the Local Plan: Sites Consultation with
regard to school place planning in Tandridge, both primary and secondary.
presented a few ideas to the group. Councillors were positive but raised parking as a key issue. The BID will be going out to all their businesses to consult on the strategy.

- A parking review in Oxted has just commenced, and a study has been commissioned to Systra to find out about the need for parking, enforcement of and availability of spaces. The review will look at the wider area of Oxted, and Louise was concerned that SCC were currently consulting on parking in Granville Road (which has the capacity for over 40 spaces). Oliver Judges is currently looking into Johnsdale and Ellice Road car parks in terms of assets.

- The library is still being investigated as a location for business start-up space – Belinda highlighted that local businesses were interested.

6. AOB

Grass cutting

Lesley asked if TDC had considered SCC’s offer of agreement regarding grass cutting. Louise said TDC would need to explore the offer and other options.

Joint Committee progress

This is not progressing. TDC will join the local committee.

Godstone Depot

TDC’s potential move to this site is still in discussion. Zena requested Highways England were consulted as there is a historic agreement regarding the use of the site for strategic access to the M25.

Next meeting:

Monday 30 January 2017

Conference Room 3, Tandridge District Council
1. Apologies and minutes from last meeting
   - Apologies were received from Louise Round (TDC), Paul Barton (TDC), Clive Moore (TDC), Lee McQuade (SCC), Sue Janota (SCC), Alison Peet (RBBC/TDC), Zena Curry (SCC), Peter Hopkins (SCC), Laura Forzani (SCC) and Doug Hill (SCC).
   - The minutes from the last meeting were agreed.
3. Sheltered Housing Scheme, Adult Social Care and extra provision

SCC Adult Social Care are reviewing funding for sheltered schemes; funding likely to be withdrawn or reduced. TDC have several sheltered schemes, but will look to condense the stock to ensure people are properly supported. A report is being taken to Committee in June to seek permission to submit a planning application for a scheme in Warlingham.

Potential for joined up thinking with assets team in Caterham Valley, where a sheltered scheme is next door to library, East Surrey Museum.

Surrey CC have identified a site for extra care provision in Lingfield.

4. CIL Update

Tandridge’s JIT (alongside the Local Committee, Neighbourhood Planning Groups and Parish Councils) has been identified in a report to Planning Policy Committee on 27th June as a form of governance in the selection/identification of projects suitable for CIL funding. The priorities for the current round of funding are flooding, health and education.

JIT members to come forward with upcoming or potential projects suitable for CIL funding at forthcoming meetings.

5. Warlingham School

The current primary school in Warlingham is 50% oversubscribed, and the school has no room for expansion due to site constraints. A site, Greenacres Sports Ground (submitted to TDC as HELAA site) has been highlighted by a developer where the building of market homes would fund the new school's development. Piers has met with Surrey CC Education officers, the developer and local councillors (whom are all broadly supportive). SCC is drafting their communications statement regarding this development. An outline application should be completed by the end of 2017, and the current hope is for completion by the start of the academic year in September 2019.

6. Flood scheme updates

Burstow Alleviation Scheme will merge with Smallfield Scheme – updates on this will be provided as the scheme progresses. Smallfield does not have an active Flood Forum, but many parts of the Action Plan could be dealt with by the Forum.

Smallfield Scheme has been delayed due to modelling issues (1 month delay). Detailed feedback should be ready by the end of July.

Scheme at Caterham on the Hill is completely separate to the Bourne Alleviation Scheme. Hoping for provisional results by July. The Flood Action Group will be updated in September and the feasibility work will have been completed by then.

TDC to put forward representative for Smallfield Forum

TP requests help regarding a potential planning application to continue Bourne scheme plan

7. Local Plan update
The preferred strategy for the Local Plan was agreed in March; it looks to allocate development to the most sustainable settlements and the creation of a new settlement following garden-village principles. There will be a round of consultation later this year focusing on the five broad locations for the garden village. Decisions on allocations will be made in October to allow for transport modelling. Having spoken to SCC, TDC has suggested that they could fund additional resource required in order to complete the transport modelling work.

8. RegenOxted update
A public consultation is currently underway (25 May – 23 June) for the urban redesign project for Station Road East and West, including conceptual designs commissioned by Oxted BID. So far approximately 150 responses have been received. In addition, St William is asking for resident’s feedback on their initial thoughts and designs for the redevelopment of the gasholder.

Following the parking review, the Council are looking to increase capacity in the town centre in its car parks. Its preferred option is to deck Ellice Road with either 2 or 3 decks, sell Johnsdale to St William to be incorporated into the gasholder redevelopment scheme, to temporarily deck the Council Offices car park and introduce a park and ride scheme for workers at the Council Offices and businesses in the town.

9. Local Highways update
Highways England is preparing to convert the M23 into a Smart Motorway (ability to use the hard shoulder at busy times) with work commencing in 2018. Highways are in talks with Roadchef at Clacket Lane Services about repairing the road barriers that prevent people using the country roads as access to M25. The JIT group were warned that there was a substantial reduction in capital and funding available from Highways. The Local Committee were being informed of this as well.

10. AOB
Laura Forzani (Strategic Director at SCC) will be leaving post in 5 weeks and will be replaced by Liz Lawrence.
SCC need TDC to progress talks about Godstone Depot – KOL is currently in talks with John Stebbings (Head of Property, SCC).
Tandridge Joint Infrastructure Team

Monday 16th October 2017

Present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tandridge District Council</th>
<th>Surrey County Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kathy O’Leary (Chair)</td>
<td>Lesley Harding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piers Mason</td>
<td>Pete Hopkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayne Godden-Miller</td>
<td>Sue Janota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Barton</td>
<td>Doug Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clive Moore</td>
<td>Kevin Lloyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnie Ngaluaf</td>
<td>Zena Curry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda Purcell</td>
<td>Paul Druce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Operating Officer</td>
<td>Head of Place Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Planning Officer</td>
<td>Lead Strategic Asset Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Housing Officer</td>
<td>Spatial Planning and Policy Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Community Services Officer</td>
<td>Strategic Network Resilience Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Legal Services and Monitoring Officer</td>
<td>Head of Economic Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Infrastructure Officer</td>
<td>South East Area Highways Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Policy Manager</td>
<td>Infrastructure Agreements and CIL Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Apologies and minutes from last meeting**
   - Apologies were received from Louise Round (TDC), Sarah Thompson (TDC), Oliver Gill (SCC), Liz Lawrence (SCC), Chris Carey (SCC),
   - The **minutes** from the last meeting were **agreed**.

2. **Warlingham School / Primary Schools in Tandridge**
   - Warlingham: SCC has yet to make a decision. TDC Members are broadly supportive and want to hear more detail.
4. CIL Update
- An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) will be submitted for inspection alongside the Local Plan: this document will identify projects to support future development.
- Minnie gives an update on the revised governance structure for CIL. The agenda for the next JIT meeting will have submitted CIL bids so the group can be made aware and discuss.
- The team discuss gap funding and governance structure until / before an IDP is adopted.
- An initial list of projects will be tabled at a JIT meeting once transport modelling is complete.
- On 16 September 2016, the Planning Policy Committee reviewed CIL bids, and some were unsuccessful. Minnie to circulate the list of unsuccessful bids and refresh the list based on recent submissions.
- Piers to discuss with Local Plan team when to bring projects / bids to the team, and to feedback at the next meeting.
- Minnie updated the group on the CIL financial position and how TDC have worked, and will continue to work, with parish councils.

5. Flood Scheme Update
- Smallfield: £15k feasibility funding used and report completed: due later this month. Detailed design and construction due next financial year.
- Caterham Valley: Modelling complete. Options to come out soon.
- Woldingham Road: Flood stores to be made more permanent. Talking to TDC planning department. Landowner issues preventing work to begin until March 2018.
- Communications re flooding are very important as it is a corporate priority. Should use Surrey Prepared and Tandridge Magazine.

6. Infrastructure / Transport Schemes – Development of Proposals
- SCC wants to try model projects in a similar way to West Sussex, and have access to a pot of feasibility funding to help projects develop ready to submit bids for funding. A report is going to Surrey Chief Executives for approval.
- A proposition for a sub-national transport body for the South East is being developed.

7. Regeneration Scheme Updates
- RegenOxted: Planning application for the gasholder has been submitted. Planning application for Ellice Road Car Park redevelopment due to be submitted in December 2017. TDC have nearly reached an agreement with St William regarding the sale of Johnsdale Car Park. Construction at Ellice Road to begin in May/June; the Council is looking into mitigation measures to make sure parking is still available in the town centre during this time. The appointment to a Major Regeneration Scheme post (SCC post with secondment to TDC on 50:50 basis) is being held up, SCC colleagues to expedite process with their legal team.
- Caterham Masterplan: A draft will be presented at Resources Committee on 1 November, with consultation to follow later in the month. SPD and adoption not due until 2018, but applications for the major sites are likely to come forward before this.
8. Local Plan / Garden Villages Consultation Update

- Garden Villages Consultation concluded on 9th October. More comments have been received to this consultation than the previous Sites Consultation. A headline report on the consultation is due in December. Infrastructure modelling to begin.

9. Highways Update

- Zena to send future programme list to the group once it is agreed.

10. AOB

- Pete confirms that Burstow Primary School own the freehold to their site so can dispose of land as they wish.
- Kevin Lloyd to take over as the strategic lead for Tandridge, replacing Liz Lawrence.

Date of Next Meeting:

Monday 4th December, 2pm – 4pm
Conference Room 3, Tandridge District Council
1. Apologies and minutes from last meeting
   - Apologies were received from Kathy O’Leary (TDC), Piers Mason (TDC), Doug Hill (SCC).
   - The minutes from the last meeting were agreed.

3. Warlingham School / Primary Schools in Tandridge
   i) Warlingham: Application due by end of March. School comms team to help draft final press release. SCC cannot commit to solution for existing site until sure school going ahead. **Peter** to check with TDC planners if wording re site and the Green Belt has been previously agreed upon (as TDC working on exceptional circumstance evidence base paper). At the next meeting of SCC Assets, **Peter** to request high level database / GIS layer of sites in Tandridge district which SCC are most likely to bring forward / investigate for disposal / development over the next 5 – 10 years.
Louise requests that it contains all sites if possible. **Clive** to lead on this project from the TDC end.

ii) Hurst Green Primary Schools – Sue updates group that there are no plans currently to amalgamate the two school sites in Hurst Green.

4. CIL Update
   i) The current financial position for CIL was discussed, along with how the funding is allocated in the interim period without an adopted IDP.
   ii) Victoria and Sue to share Mole Valley documents regarding the Joint Committee and how CIL is prioritised.
   iii) Mark to bring a draft version of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to the next JIT meeting (6 March).

5. Flood Scheme Update
   i) Lesley provided an update to the group on behalf of Doug Hill:
      - Smallfield: Outline business case ongoing.
      - Caterham on the Hill: Outline business case ongoing.
      - Caterham Valley: Modelling complete. Options to come out soon.
      - Woldingham Road: Landowner issues preventing work to begin until March 2018.
   ii) Mark Bristow (TDC) to attend future Flood Action Group meetings.

6. Infrastructure / Transport Schemes – Development of Proposals
   i) Surrey Futures Board hasn’t met since the last JIT meeting so no update available.
   ii) All Surrey Economic Development and Planning Policy Officers to meet at end of January to discuss the funding of future projects.
   iii) Belinda to invite Kevin and Sue to this meeting.

7. Regeneration Scheme Updates
   i) RegenOxted:
      - Working on planning application for the Ellice Road car park redevelopment, subject to consultation with local residents. Expect planning application to be submitted in February and work to commence, subject to permission, in May/June this year. Applications have closed for Major Regeneration / Transport Manager shared post. Gasholder application to be determined at Planning Committee on 11 Jan – officer recommendation is to permit. Zena is asked to attend next resident drop-in session for Ellice Road car park.
   ii) Caterham Masterplan:
      - The draft SPD is out for consultation until 22 January. We expect a pre-app re Church Walk to be submitted in March – they are looking to go with their ‘medium’ scheme which includes a cinema, larger retail units and resi on top. Belinda to ask Sarah Thompson (Head of Strategic Planning Policy) to set up a Project Initiation Meeting with Highways (Zena) so roles and responsibilities, project brief, timescales etc can be worked out for the feasibility study. Belinda to give update at informal local committee on 26 Jan.
   iii) Lesley and Kevin to be more involved with joint TDC / SCC projects to help improve internal communications in future.

8. Local Plan / Garden Villages Consultation Update
Garden Villages Consultation concluded on 9 October. Over 5000 comments received. Transport modelling due to be completed in March. March Planning Policy Committee will include report which will state which broad location the evidence suggests is most appropriate. JIT group to be kept updated.

9. Highways Update
   i) Belinda to invite Victoria to a meeting with David Curl (SCC) to discuss on-street parking and charging.
   ii) Louise requested that parking charges work / data from David Curl (SCC) is brought to the JIT group before Informal / Local Committee (March 2nd).

10. Any Other Business
   i) Louise requested that Children’s Centres are added to the agenda for the next meeting.
   ii) Lesley to check timescales of work investigating CRC preferred locations, as this is impacting TDC’s Warren Lane Depot relocation.

Date of Next Meeting:
Thursday 22 March, 2pm – 4pm
Conference Room 5, Tandridge District Council
Tandridge Joint Infrastructure Team

Thursday 22 March 2018

Present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tandridge District Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louise Round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clive Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnie Ngaluafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda Purcell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Peet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgina Brightwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Bristow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surrey County Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesley Harding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Hopkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Janota - via telephone link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Eade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Lloyd - via telephone link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zena Curry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tor Peebles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Apologies and minutes from last meeting
   - Apologies were received from Kathy O’Leary (TDC), Piers Mason (TDC), Doug Hill (SCC).
   - The minutes from the last meeting were agreed.

2. North Tandridge One Public Estate update
   - ITT about to be sent out, consultants should be appointed by end of April. Flexibility built into ITT to look at other relevant sites not originally identified. Consultants to work up a strategic outcome case. Draft plan for sites in Autumn and final Plan due Spring 2019. TDC members not aware, but scheme was mentioned at Local Committee. Belinda to brief Leader and Cllr David Hodge. Report to Resources Committee in June.

3. Warlingham Schools
   Needs to provide a 2 form entry school. Provide new school building for site. Have a good dialogue with developer. Informal pre-application advice but no formal pre-application. Expected by end of month (April). Piers to speak to landowner.

4. Children’s Centres
Wider review part of efficiency savings – had ‘cluster’ style meetings. In discussions with Ben Burn. RBBC interested to have similar conversations.

NAFFI – owned by Caterham Barracks Community Trust. Lease to expire soon. Louise chairing meeting to try resolve.

Planned SCC consultation in March has been pushed back. Around £2million reduction in funding. Jan Smith to send an update to Louise.

5. IDP / CIL
IDP still a working progress. Document will be available for Regulation 19 consultation.

CIL – Formal sub-committee set up, purpose is to look at bids and have a validation process. Will be a public meeting and public information. Belinda and Vicky to pick up discussions on Joint Committee after May elections as more likely to know recommendations by that point.

6. Flood Scheme Updates
a) Caterham on the Hill – Best case scenario would only reduce risk by one quarter. Local Plan to update policies to include SuDS on minor applications. Outline business case sent to Environment Agency – total project cost on options is £6.2million over 4 years. Tor to discuss Hillcroft site with Belinda and Lesley.

b) Bourne – Outline business case due with London Borough of Croydon in 6 weeks.

c) Smallfield – Strategic Business Case – due end of April.

Tor confirms it is worth pursuing to outline business case but further work will be needed to do a full cost/benefit analysis.

7. HIF / Schemes
a) HIF – Kevin reports that 4/5 Surrey schemes made it through the 1st sift of bids. Quite a number of bids (£16bn worth of schemes vs £4bn available funding). Approximately 6 months to build each business case, some are more advanced than others. C2C LEP don’t have a feasibility fund to help these projects along (unlike Enterprise M3). Kevin to speak to C2C LEP regarding this and report back. Strategic CIL could form part of feasibility funding pot.

b) Surrey Futures – report went to Surrey Chief Executives – Simon Bland is working on further detail (scale of funding etc).

8. Regeneration Schemes
a) RegenOxted: Planning application to be decided at Planning Committee on 5th April. No response from Surrey Highways on application at this time. Gasholder planning application being consulted on currently through planning application process. Regen Oxted Programme Manager Cherrie to begin in April/June and will be a joint resource to SCC and TDC.

b) Caterham Masterplan: SPD has been adopted. Highways have been in conversations with Atkins. Cherrie to lead when starts.

9. Local Plan
Team still in the evidence gathering stage. Regulation 19 Plan to be taken to committee on 3rd July. An Update Report was taken to March committee on the evidence gathered so far and the three garden village sites.
10. Highways and Parking

a) Local Committee to receive increase in revenue funding. Not decided how to be spent yet (approximately £127,000). Each member receives £7500 and can choose how it’s spent. SCC Leader bringing forward £5million for worst winter damaged roads.

b) Parking charges and enforcement: Phased plan to introduce charging but prioritising enforcement; Belinda discussing options with Paul Anderson at Mole Valley; Sue Hogg to run RBBC cluster numbers; Vicky to chase David Curl regarding Caterham on the Hill machines.

11. Any Other Business

Kate highlighted surplus sites such as Beech Grove Depot – Piers and Kate to undertake site visit.

Date of Next Meeting:
Tuesday 26 June, 2pm – 4pm
Conference Room 3, Tandridge District Council
Present: Louise Round (LR), Piers Mason (PM), Belinda Purcell (BP), Mark Bristow (MB), Georgina Brightwell (GB), Lesley Harding (LH), Zena Curry (ZC), Sue Janota (SJ), Peter Hopkins (PH), Doug Hill (DH), Victoria Eade (VE), Kevin Lloyd (KL), Philip Roach (PR), Cherrie Mendoza (CM), Alison Boote (AB)

Apologies: Kathy O’Leary, Clive Moore, Chris Carey, Minnie Ngaluafe

1. Introductions, apologies and minutes from last meeting
   - The minutes from the last meeting were agreed.

2. Infrastructure / transport schemes – development of proposals
   - Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF): Unclear how Homes England could help in developing bids. Final date to spend all funding pushed from March 2021 to March 2023. Other Surrey authorities are more advanced in preparing their business cases so are likely to submit in September or December 2018. TDC need to consider the timetabling of the Local Plan and the HIF bid, as deliverability of Local Plan has added weight with submitted bid.
   - Due to resourcing, TDC should look to submit their business case in March 2019 (which is the last tranche date).
   - KL and BP to organise a scoping meeting.
   - LR and PM to join KL at Homes England meeting.
   - PH and KL to have conversations with their contacts at Homes England.

3. Flood Alleviation Schemes
   - Caterham Bourne: DH and MB update group. Progress is slow; Atkins project team are still working on model which will test options for the scheme. Results will likely show no cost-effective solution but many minor schemes, including improved emergency planning, to result from scheme.
   - MB and DH to work on and bring a communications plan to the next meeting, for both members and residents.
4. Schools in Tandridge District

- St Mary's School: Temporary solution which will be funded separately from main scheme currently going through planning application process. No expectation that CIL funding will be required for either temporary or full scheme. SCC currently out to tender looking at alternative schemes. Once tender results back (likely August / early September), SCC will feed back to TDC on costs and likelihood of requesting CIL.

- Warlingham School: Developer working on 'very special circumstances' case and viability for new and old site.

5. Draft IDP / CIL update

- The IDP has been published as part of the statutory documents for the upcoming Regulation 19 consultation on the Local Plan. MB highlights key areas of documents, states that as it is a live document it can be updated and when new information comes available, and asks SCC / Highways to share data and any schemes that aren't included when making representations on the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

- SJ, ZC, MB and Paul Druce to set up meeting and discuss s106 / s278 / CIL etc

- “Funding to be identified” agreed to replace wording in rows (in IDP) where no inward development or commitments have been made.

6. Local Committee / JIT Review

- LH, VE and BP working together to improve communications with / to Local Committee. SCC Councillor-led review of Local Committee's underway. Next Local Committee will include a visioning exercise led by SCC Leader David Hodge.

- JIT to split into Part A (Place) and Part B (People – children's centres, early help, health etc) to improve joined-up working across public sector in Tandridge.

7. Property Update

- SCC is actively looking for sites for extra care housing.
108x759 - Alison Boote introduced to team. AB employed as Head of Strategic Asset Management at TDC.

8. Regeneration schemes
   a) RegenOxted
      - Cherrie Mendoza introduced to team. CM employed by SCC for 2.5 days per week, and seconded to TDC 2.5 days per week and in role of RegenOxted Programme Manager.
      - Gasholder (and Johnsdale car park) planning application to be determined at Planning Committee on 28 June. If approved, work will commence on site in Autumn 2018.
      - Ellice Road car park: A further planning application to be submitted in July, to be determined at September Planning Committee.
      - Urban Redesign Project: Feasibility work to begin – CM to lead.
   b) Caterham and North Tandridge: One Public Estate
      - NTOPE and Caterham Masterplan to be more aligned. Governance meetings set up and to begin soon.
      - CRC: SCC working on an options appraisal for CRC sites.
      - Masterplan: Pre-feasibility work for Station Avenue ongoing; Church Walk owners working on scheme.

---

9. Warren Lane Depot
   - Warren Lane: Progress still delayed as search for suitable alternative site continues.
   - Godstone Salt Depot: On-site surveys delayed as awaiting SCC to agree to contribute 50% of costs in order to survey the entire site area.
   - LR asks that SCC commit and make decision / get back to TDC by end of the week (29 June).
   - ZC suggests investigating the Highways England site at Godstone (adjacent to J6).
     ZC to share an on-site contact with LH.

10. Local Plan
    - TDC and SCC to enter into a Statement of Common Ground.

11. Highways
12. None to add.

Next meeting:
Monday 17 September 2018, 2pm – 4pm
Conference Room 5, Tandridge District Council
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Foreword from the Assistant Director of Schools and Learning

The publication of the School Organisation Plan (SOP) is an important milestone in Surrey County Council’s school planning activities. Whilst no longer a statutory document, the council continues to consider it as an important document in setting out the policies and principles underpinning school organisation in Surrey. It forecasts the supply and demand for school places over the next decade and highlights the areas this will impact in the county and our plans to manage this.

Surrey has seen a sharp rise in the number of births within the county over the last decade. Whilst the pace of this growth in births has now receded, it still leaves a rising number of children who will require entry to primary and secondary school in the foreseeable future, creating a continuing basic need for additional school places.

The council has responded to this need with an unprecedented programme of school expansion, with very few areas of the county unaffected. In the last five years, over 16,000 additional school places have been provided, predominantly in the primary sector. This significant investment programme has come with considerable strain on the county council’s finances and on the school community. We thank the Surrey family of schools for their professional and helpful response to this issue.

During this challenging period, the council has always maintained its statutory duty of offering school places to all children that want one, and has been successful in continuing to meet parental preference. For September 2017, Surrey County Council was able to offer a place at a preferred school to 97.1% of reception applicants, 94.9% of junior applicants and 95.3% of secondary applicants.

Reflecting the increase in the primary sector, growth in the secondary school population should be the major focus of work and investment over the next five years. The Department for Education (DfE) currently provides some capital grant funding for additional school places. However, the grant funding does not cover the total cost of the school basic need capital programme and recent reductions in the grant for Surrey severely constraints the council’s ability to manage this programme.

The county council is facing a very serious financial situation, whereby there are still substantial savings to be identified and delivered to achieve a balanced budget in the current year and a sustainable budget plan for future years. With government not funding the total cost of basic need, the capital required to meet this plan cannot be guaranteed at this stage.

We will continue to work closely with our district and borough councils to ensure that appropriate contributions from developers are received to meet the future education infrastructure demands of additional housing. We will also continue to work with the Department for Education for a fairer funding settlement from central government.

Given the size and diverse nature of Surrey, changes in pupil population will not be uniform throughout the county and whilst there will be areas of acute demand, the council will also be working with schools facing different challenges associated with falling rolls and a transient population. It is important to note the specific pressures that this can put on school leadership and organisation. Surrey County Council has a reputation for being active in its school planning, and this plan signals an intention to maintain that approach as part of a commitment to continuing to raise standards.

The public education system in Surrey is large and now much more diverse. It is no longer solely managed by the county council. Of the 389 schools and education settings, 34% are now academies or Free Schools and, like the Voluntary Aided and Trust schools, they are
their own admissions authority. They also have responsibility for their land and buildings, and are publicly funded directly by the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) within the Department for Education (DfE). The School Commissioning Team therefore now has to negotiate with the various providers to ensure a sufficiency of places across the county.

All data included in this report is correct at the time of publication and is reflected in our statutory returns to the DfE.

Liz Mills
Assistant Director of Schools and Learning
Introduction and the purpose of this plan

Surrey County Council has a statutory duty to ensure that there are enough school places in the county to meet demand. The council must therefore plan, organise and commission places for all state-funded schools in Surrey so that high standards are maintained, diverse school communities created and fluctuating pupil numbers are managed efficiently.

Education in Surrey can be divided into three overlapping, age-determined phases:

- **EARLY YEARS**
  A range of private, voluntary, independent (PVI) and maintained providers (including nurseries and children’s centres) provide the free entitlement for 2 - 4 year olds.

- **5 - 16 YEAR OLDS**
  This is compulsory school age, during which schools are the main providers.

- **14 - 25 YEAR OLDS**
  Both colleges and schools offer substantial provision, with colleges as the sole provider for young people aged 19-25.

The purpose of this document is to understand the projected need and demand for future school places for 5 - 16 year olds in Surrey. Information relating to the statutory provision of Early Years education and 14 - 25 education are covered in other documents which can be found on the Surrey County Council website.

The demand for school places changes over time - this document is considered to be ‘live’ and, as such, will require regular updates. It sets out where the council currently thinks there will be a need to provide more school places and if there may be a need to provide fewer places over the next ten years. Increases in demand can lead to the creation of a new school or the expansion of schools, whereas decreases in demand can lead to a reduction in school provision; which needs to be managed very carefully.

Predicting school demand is a complex task because where children go to school involves a range of different and often conflicting factors and, as a result, planning for school places is based on probabilities, not certainties. This means that while projections may be made from robust calculations, they do not offer any guarantees.

It is important for us to be as open and transparent as possible when considering school organisation decisions. We strive to communicate effectively with schools and school communities about the school place pressures in their area. However, the council must also endeavour to manage expectations regarding school organisation proposals that are less certain. This document does not seek to definitively set out all the actions the council intends to take in the future, but rather is intended to provide an overview of issues that may arise in Surrey. Generally speaking, the council will only name particular schools in this document when there is sufficient assurance that a proposal will be implemented or where this has already taken place.
Duties to provide for students aged 5-16
The law requires that a child is in receipt of an education and that provision is made for that education from the first term they begin as a five year old to the end of the academic year in which their sixteenth birthday falls, either at a school or otherwise. Some parents will choose to educate their children independently, either at independent schools, via parental provision or otherwise, whereas others will send their children to maintained schools inside or outside of Surrey. Some children are educated in special schools or in a setting other than a school because of their special educational needs. Surrey County Council offers a school place to any resident applicant between 5 and 16 years old, whether they end up accepting the school place or not.

Duties to provide for students aged 14-19
The Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009 places Local Authorities as the lead strategic commissioners of 14-19 education and training. Surrey County Council therefore has a duty to ensure that sufficient and appropriate education and training opportunities are accessible to this age group. Details of Surrey's 14-19 policy can be found on the public website at www.surreycc.gov.uk in the 14-19 Education and Training section.

Legislation
The main legislation governing school organisational changes is found in sections 7 - 32 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006, as amended by the Education Act 2011. In addition, the Schools Organisation Maintained Schools Guidance for proposers and decision makers, dated January 2014 and issued by the Department for Education (DfE), accompanies new School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013 and (Establishment and Discontinuance of Schools) Regulations 2013, which came into force on 28 January 2014. The Academies Act 2010 is also relevant, with further guidance (Making significant changes to an open academy) issued in March 2016.

In changing or increasing provision, the council is required in certain circumstances to seek and consider bids from external providers including trusts and other educational organisations. Government legislation dictates that any new schools must be either an Academy or a Free School, so the county council welcomes approaches from appropriate bodies proposing sponsorship arrangements for new or reorganised schools or academies. The council values diversity in its school provision and, within our guidelines, individual cases will always be judged on their merits.

Under Surrey County Council’s scheme of delegation, decisions relating to school organisation within the remit of the council are delegated to the Cabinet Member for Education, except in the case of opening or closing schools, where the Leader of the Council makes the final decision.
The Process of School Commissioning

Primary Planning
Provision for children aged 4 – 11 at primary, infant and junior schools
In considering changes to provision or the creation of new provision in the primary sector, the council will plan on the following principles:

- Published Admissions Numbers (PANs) for primary schools will not normally be less than 30 or greater than 180, and will normally be multiples of 30 or 15.
- The council will avoid arrangements that involve large admission intakes outside the common admission points at Reception and Year 3.
- The council prefers to provide all through primary schools, rather than separate infant and junior schools, to provide continuity between Key Stages 1 and 2.
- However, the council will have to regard existing local arrangements where these are clearly beneficial to education, such as to maintain a feeder link between an infant and a junior school, or reducing transport needs in rural areas.
- The council will seek to strengthen existing links between feeder schools if the opportunity arises.
- At present, all primary school provision is co-educational, and the council anticipates that future arrangements will conform to this pattern.
- The council will seek to maintain smaller schools where the quality of provision is high and where the school offers value for money.
- The council will encourage arrangements that allow for the management of small local schools within a single institutional framework (a federation) under a single governing body and one head teacher.

Secondary Planning
Provision for children aged 11 – 16 at secondary schools
In considering changes to provision or the creation of new provision in the secondary phase, the council will plan on the following principles:

- PANs for secondary schools will not normally be less than 150 or greater than 360, and will normally be multiples of 30.
- The majority of current Surrey secondary provision is co-educational and the council expects any new provision to conform to this pattern. This is because the creation of a single sex school in isolation gives rise to gender inequalities in the provision of school places.
- Before commissioning additional provision, it will be considered whether demand could be met through use of latent and vacant capacity in neighbouring planning areas, where these are within a reasonable distance.

Special Educational Needs Planning
In planning provision for children with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND), the council will be guided by the following principles:

- The council will ensure that provision is available for Surrey children and young people aged between 0 and 25 years who have an Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP) or a Statement of Special Educational Needs (SSEN). Access to specialist provision will also be made available for pre-school children without an EHCP, where this is necessary.
- The council aims to increase the inclusion of children with SEND into mainstream settings, with appropriate support, so that both those with SEND and the mainstream cohort receive the educational benefits of inclusion.
• We aim for as few pupils as possible with an EHCP or a SSEN to be placed at non-maintained and independent special schools.
• Future planning of provision is influenced by the objectives outlined in the SEND 2020 Development Plan. You can reference the Development Plan under the 'Improving special educational needs and disability services' section on the Surrey County Council website.

**Pupil Referral Unit Planning**
• The council will provide Pupil Referral Units (PRU) and other services/provisions for children temporarily unable to attend mainstream school due to temporary or permanent exclusion, attendance, behaviour or other needs.
• PRUs will not be used as long-term substitutes for mainstream or special schools. In general, the function of PRUs will be to provide short-term provision. However, for some children in Years 10 or 11, PRUs will provide support from the point of admission to the conclusion of Key Stage 4.

**What factors do we consider in making school organisational changes?**
A variety of factors may lead to the council making proposals for changes in school provision (these would apply to nursery and college provision too). As the list below indicates, the supply and demand of school places is only one of the factors that the council will consider, other factors include:
• Changes in the population and/or the continuing demand for places in an area
• Opportunities to make positive educational developments
• Opportunities to regularise local arrangements to accord with general Surrey arrangements
• The quality of education provided by the school according to recent performance data and Ofsted inspections
• The objective results and data for the institution in question in relation to public examinations or national tests
• The comparison of these results to those of other local and/or other similar schools
• The value that the school can be shown to be adding to the educational achievement of pupils
• The popularity of the school with local residents and wider user groups
• Parental preference for the school
• The prospects for the school of remaining or becoming viable in terms of admission numbers
• Indicators that the institution has a good understanding of the challenges it faces and the ability and determination to tackle these challenges
• Indicators as to whether the institution is able to make a sound educational offer within its allocated budget
• The feasibility of physical capacity of the school site
• Compliance with planning regulations
• Financial feasibility
• Maintaining or enhancing the diversity of provision

Proposals to change nursery, school or college organisation will be designed to ensure that the interests of existing pupils, students and service-users are protected and advanced. The council will not, however, refuse to take action necessary to the long-term interests of Surrey residents because this causes short-term difficulties or disruption.
Schools operate most efficiently and effectively when full or nearly full. To this end, the council seeks to keep the number of vacant places (those that are surplus to requirements) to a minimum. The Audit Commission recommends that there should be approximately a 5% surplus of places in an area to allow flexibility in responding to parental preference and to account for unexpected changes in pupil numbers (such as pupils moving into the area). Where the surplus is higher than this, normally the council will seek to take action to lower this number, but there may be certain circumstances where a higher number of surplus places are accepted.

**Working with schools and other local authorities**

The council wishes to work closely with all schools in Surrey, irrespective of their school status. This includes maintained, voluntary aided/controlled, foundation, free schools and academies. The council has built and maintains a strong professional relationship with all current Surrey free schools and academies, and places at these schools are taken into account within strategic planning to ensure a sufficiency of school places.

There is a good track record of schools working together in Surrey to address the needs of all children in an area. Almost all Surrey schools are part of a cross phase local confederation, in addition to the twelve ‘14-19’ Learning Networks which comprise all secondary schools. These voluntary collaborative partnerships have developed strong local models for improving outcomes through shared continued professional development, joint working groups and strategic planning. As well as the above, there are a number of different models of leadership and partnerships that exist at a school level (amalgamation, federation, partnership etc.). School organisation issues rarely affect schools in isolation; therefore school partnerships are important to understanding the impact school organisation decisions may have on education in an area.

In planning the provision of school places, the council will take account of demands from residents of other local authority areas and vice versa. This information is shared with other local authorities and will increase or decrease the estimates of demand within the county according to where these pressures occur geographically.

**How do we forecast the demand for school places?**

The council works with schools and governing bodies to address supply and demand issues in the shorter and longer term. Early Years projections and 14-19 education are planned through a different process, and the relevant documents can be found on the Surrey County Council website under the appropriate sections.

Surrey covers a large area and so in order to carry out pupil forecasts effectively, the county must be split up into different ‘planning areas’. Any decisions on changes to school provision (such as the expansion or contraction of schools) are taken within the context of these planning areas. In Surrey, there are both primary and secondary planning areas, and you can find more details of these in the individual borough and district reports.

Primary planning areas are typically made up of between three and eight schools and vary in size depending on the rural or urban nature of the area. Where possible, primary planning areas are made up of complete electoral wards, however sometimes the geography of an area or the historical patterns of schooling means a planning area could span more than one or only part of a ward. School place planning does not take into account district or borough boundaries, and there are occasions where one planning area may cover parts of two different boroughs or districts.

Usually, a number of primary planning areas are grouped together to form a single secondary planning area, although in some areas geography dictates the need for multiple secondary planning areas, such as in Tandridge or Waverley.
Birth data underpins all forecasts. Birth data is collected by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) by electoral ward. Alongside birth data, the council also collects data on pupil movement trends from the School Census and examines pupil movement between schools; in and out of the county, and between educational stages i.e. transferring from primary to secondary school. These trends are combined with birth and housing data in specialist demographic forecasting software called 'Edge-ucate', which creates pupil projections or forecasts. These pupil projections allow the council to commission adequate educational provision to ensure that every Surrey child who requires a school place is offered one.

Although school place demand is based on planning areas, there is no direct link between the number of children living in a particular planning area and the number of school places located there. This is because, when it comes to applying for a school place, parents/carers are under no obligation to apply for their nearest maintained school, and could instead express a preference for a school outside of their town, borough/district or county, or choose independent schooling for their child. The council strives to meet parental preference where possible, and analysing historic pupil movement trends enables the planning of school places to take preference patterns in an area into consideration. Surrey County Council's planning is effective in this regard and for September 2017, the council was able to offer a place at a preferred school to 97.1% of reception applicants, 94.9% of junior applicants and 95.3% of secondary applicants. Pupil movement trends also allows the council to understand whether there is a significant export or import in the area.

This document largely focuses on the 'intake' years – Reception year for infant and primary schools; Year 3 for junior schools and Year 7 for secondary schools. These are the most recently admitted year groups, and so the first that will show the effects of a change in birth rate and the best reflection of current parental attitudes to schools. Therefore, pupil projections or forecasts are based on how many children are predicted to require a school place in these 'intake' year groups in a given area. This number is then evaluated against the number of school places in the relevant year group in that planning area and action is then required if the demand significantly outstrips the supply (or vice versa).
The current position in Surrey

Surrey’s population

Surrey is the most densely populated shire county in England. The population density is 683 per km², compared with a South East average of 450 per km² and a UK average of only 255 per km².

Surrey’s population has increased every year since 1987. In the 2011 census, there were 1.13 million people living in Surrey, an increase of 7% from the 2001 census. The population in Surrey is estimated to continue to grow to 2037.

This upward trend can largely be explained by the birth rate and net inward migration, as Surrey is a net importer of people. Between the 2001 and 2011 census, the fastest growing borough in terms of overall population was Epsom & Ewell, followed by Woking. London and Surrey are increasingly interconnected - the flow of migrants from London into Surrey is nearly 2:1 currently. Between 2002 and 2015, Surrey received a net increase of 149,300 people from London.

The impact of this varies across Surrey, ranging from Elmbridge, which received 17% of migrants from London, to Surrey Heath, which received 3%.
87% of Surrey's inhabitants live in urban areas, and yet 73% of land in Surrey is green belt and 26% is designated as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The council’s approach to school planning must therefore adapt to support small and isolated populations in the more rural areas, as well as the more concentrated urban populations.

Surrey is made up of diverse rural and urban communities, including minority ethnic communities. Data from the 2011 census indicates that 83% of Surrey's population identify themselves as being White British. The remaining 17% is made up of people from minority ethnic communities as follows:

- **7%** Other White
- **3%** Other Asian
- **2%** Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups
- **2%** Asian/Asian British - Indian
- **1%** Asian/Asian British - Pakistani
- **1%** Black/African/Caribbean/Black British
- **1%** Other Ethnic Groups

---

Surrey's school population – January 2017

There are 193,263 pupils in Surrey's schools

1 Others 2% - includes pupils in maintained nursery schools, pupil referral units and special schools
In total, 188 languages other than English are spoken by children and young people in the county’s schools as per the school census from January 2017. Approximately 12% of Surrey’s school population have English as an additional language.

The majority of pupils in Surrey attend a school which has no religious character. However, there are 123 schools in Surrey which profess to have a religious character, either Church of England, Roman Catholic or mixed Christian denominations. These schools make up nearly 32% of Surrey’s schools, which is broadly in line with national proportions. Schools with a religious character are made up in the main of Voluntary Aided Schools, but also include the majority of Voluntary Controlled Schools and some Academies, where schools have converted to that status having previously held a Faith basis.

In January 2017, 5 out of 30 pupils in Surrey’s state funded schools identified themselves as being from a non-white ethnic group.

In January 2017, in Surrey, 9 out of 30 children attended a school with a religious character, compared to only 7 nationally.
On 1 October 2017, the Surrey schools included the following school types:

Surrey schools are broadly grouped into phases, usually by the age range of children that they teach, or the type of education that they provide e.g. those providing a specialist education for pupils with special educational needs or alternative learning requirements.

**Surrey Schools as at 1 October 2017**

- 81 infant schools
- 43 junior schools
- 175 primary schools
- 54 secondary schools
- 22 special schools
- 2 all through schools
- 8 pupil referral units
- 4 maintained nursery schools

There are also 31 sixth forms in schools, 5 sixth form colleges and 4 general further education colleges. In addition, there are also 109 independent schools in the county. Independent schools provide places for 20% of Surrey pupils and independent schools within the county also provide education for many pupils who normally reside in other Local Authority areas.
Surrey Births

Births in Surrey fell significantly from the academic year 1997 to reach a low point of 11,626 in 2002. This was followed by significant increases, reaching a peak across the county of 14,237 in 2012 - an increase of just over 22% in a decade. The largest percentage increases in births during this time period were in Elmbridge, Reigate & Banstead, Guildford and Woking.

From 2012 to date, the birth rate decreased significantly in Surrey for the first time since 2001. Indeed, the ONS identified the 2013 calendar year births as having the largest nationwide decrease since 1975 and in Surrey, most boroughs or districts saw a fall in the number of births.

Following the decline in 2013, the birth rate in Surrey has reached a state of plateau in the last three years. But, there are no guarantees that this is a general trend for future years and there is some caution as to whether this is the start of a plateauing trend, or whether these are simply outliers as there are still some pockets of increasing birth rates in Surrey, even against an overall decline. Based on ONS population estimates and projected fertility rates, births are projected to follow a trend of increase overall but at a shallower rate than first anticipated. As such, we would expect most areas of Surrey to at least maintain the current level of demand.

In the short term in Surrey, the birth rate will mean the number of children requiring school places is likely to have peaked in 2016/17, mirroring the peak in birth rate. After that time, increases in demand at a county level will largely be as a result of inward migration and housing, although there still could be some localised demand pressures from pockets of high births in certain areas.

The below table shows which year a child starts in each of the three cohorts, based on the academic year in which they were born:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reception in</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 in</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7 in</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>2029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surrey housing

New housing developments will result in an increase in the number of pupils that need a place at Surrey schools. The effects are twofold: families that move into new houses in Surrey are likely to enrol their children in a local Surrey school. This will result in a short term increase in the number of pupils on roll in Surrey schools across all year groups. Secondly, a study of the pupil yield from new houses, commissioned by Surrey County Council in 2014, has shown that new houses are more likely to produce children between the ages of 0-4 as couples move into the area to start or increase their family. This will result in an increase in pupils entering Reception year in future years.

Housing falls within the remit of the 11 district and borough councils within Surrey. To support the projecting of pupil numbers, district and borough council share information with Surrey by way of completions data (e.g. when houses are sold) which is used for historic data, and housing permissions and trajectories (e.g. actual and forecast planning permissions for new housing developments) which are used for making long term forecasts.

According to the most recent Surrey Infrastructure Study, over 65,000 new homes are currently planned in the county by 2031. However, we recognise that this figure is ever-changing and therefore liaise with the borough and district councils on a regular basis. The chart below shows existing housing stock per borough and district, alongside the forecasts for new housing to 2031.

Regional plans and government policies seek to increase the level of housing that the county should provide and this shapes the school planning challenges that the council now faces, as demand for housing puts pressure on all services and public infrastructure – particularly schools. There are also associated environmental challenges to be considered when trying to meet this pressure. Further information can be found in the Surrey Infrastructure Study which is available on the Surrey County Council website, in the Environment, Housing and Planning section.
By using information on births, pupil movement trends, housing and local knowledge it is possible to forecast the need for school places in Surrey in the future. However, forecasts are not certainties - they are estimates, and the information in this plan is subject to change and update. As a result, we cannot offer any guarantees.

Demand patterns are not uniform, and overall numbers sometimes mask the school place needs of individual areas. Projected spare capacity in a borough/district does not mean that all the schools will be able to meet demand in the area – there may be a surplus of places at Year 4 for example, but there may be a deficit of places in the Reception year. In this case, additional provision will still be needed to ensure that there are enough places for children starting school. Furthermore, if there is an oversupply in one area but an under supply in another (the north vs. the south, for example) additional provision may still be required in one particular town or area even though numbers for the borough/district as a whole indicate that there is adequate capacity.

The following sections of this document describe the current pupil numbers and school place numbers in each of the eleven boroughs and districts in Surrey. They also set out forecasts for how it is thought pupil numbers will change alongside the general changes in school organisation and the PANs that will be needed to meet the changing pupil population. Further information about schools in Surrey, parental preferences and the allocation of school places for the last four years can be found on the Surrey website at www.surreycc.gov.uk/admissions in the 'Admissions Arrangements and Outcomes' section.

When looking at the projections in each of the subsequent chapters it is important to understand that these forecasts are not statements of fact. It is also important to note that whilst the council will seek to meet parental preferences, projections are primarily concerned with the number of available school places in a given area. It may be the case that there are some schools in an area that are consistently oversubscribed against parental preferences, giving the impression that there is a shortage of school places in this area when this is not the case overall as other schools have capacity. The principal factor is the number of school places in an area compared to the number of children that are seeking to start school and it is this which the council seeks to predict and to respond.

**How accurate are Surrey’s forecasts overall?**

It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, our forecasts for the total school-aged population achieved a 99% accuracy for the county, meaning a margin of error of only 1%.
Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND)

In Surrey, the majority of pupils with special educational needs or disability are educated in one of our 355 mainstream primary or secondary schools.

However, on occasions, a child's needs may require specialist educational provision, either in a special school or in a specialist centre attached to a mainstream school.

The current school place situation

In Surrey, there are 22 special schools and 47 specialist centres, which cater for a range of special education needs and disabilities. These are broadly divided into eight main categories:

- **COIN**: Communication and Interaction Needs
- **CSCN**: Complex Social and Communication Needs
- **HI**: Hearing Impairment
- **LAN**: Learning and Additional Needs
- **SEMH**: Social, Emotional and Mental Health
- **SLDD**: Severe Learning and Developmental Difficulties
- **VI**: Visual Impairment
- **PD**: Physical Disability

In Surrey there are currently:

**11 primary special schools**

**32 primary specialist centres**

In addition, there are two secondary SEMH special secondary schools which provide a primary transition in Year 5 and Year 6.
11 secondary special schools

14 secondary specialist centres

7 all-through special schools

What have we done?

Primary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portesbury School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Relocation and rebuild of school on new site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadmere Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Closure of hearing impaired centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wishmore Cross School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Change of age range to admit Year 5 and 6 pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Nicholas School (now Chart Wood)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Change of age range to admit Year 5 and 6 pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Grove Primary School specialist centre</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Reduction of places from 20 to 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ridgeway School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Development of purpose built nursery on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hill School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Change of age range and initial intake of Reception aged pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freemantles School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Provided an additional 9 reception places for 2016 entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linden Bridge School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Provided an additional 8 reception places for 2016 entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklands School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Provided an additional 8 reception places for 2016 entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cobbett Primary School specialist centre</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Provided an additional 2 reception places for 2016 entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakfield Junior School specialist centre</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Update and enhancement of facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loseley Fields Primary School specialist centre</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Update and enhancement of facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford Park Primary School specialist centre</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Update and enhancement of facilities. Provided an additional 4 reception places for 2017 entry and 2 further places in other year groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freemantles School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Provided an additional 9 reception places and 9 junior places for 2017 entry. Provided 8 additional places across multiple year groups for COIN high children who will be accommodated at the Freemantles site initially.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furzefield Primary School specialist centre 2017 Provided an additional reception place for 2017 entry.
Eastwick Junior School specialist centre 2017 Provided an additional 2 junior places for 2017 entry.
The Orchard Infant School specialist centre 2017 Provided an additional 2 reception places for 2017 entry.
William Cobbett Primary School specialist centre 2017 Provided an additional 4 reception places for 2017 entry and 2 further places in other year groups.
The Hythe School specialist centre 2017 Provided an additional 4 reception places for 2017 entry and 2 further places in other year groups.
Pond Meadow School (all-through) 2017 Provided an additional 4 places across all year groups.

**Secondary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Bishop David Brown School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Closure of hearing impaired centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsheld Grange School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Redesignation from Emotional and Learning Difficulties to COIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesian RC School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Opening of National Autistic Society (NAS) Cullum Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodborough School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Opening of National Autistic Society (NAS) Cullum Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinchley Wood Secondary School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Opening of National Autistic Society (NAS) Cullum Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chart Wood School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Amalgamation of St Nicholas and Starhurst schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnydown School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Redesignation from Emotional and Learning Difficulties to COIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodfield School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Provided an additional 10 Year 7 places for 2016 entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsom and Ewell High School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Provided an additional 5 Year 7 places for 2016 entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodfield School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Provided an additional 10 Year 7 places for 2017 entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Park School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Provided an additional 4 Year 7 places for 2017 entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John the Baptist Catholic</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Provided an additional 4 Year 7 places for 2017 entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What are we doing?**

Two new special free schools have been agreed in Surrey; one of which will provide cross-phase education for pupils aged 7-19 years old with Communication and Interaction Needs (COIN) and will be located in the west of the county. The other will provide cross-phase education for pupils aged 4-19 years old with Complex Social and Communication Needs (CSCN) and will be located in the east of the county. The council is working with the promoting trusts and the Education Funding and Skills Agency, the government agency delivering the capital builds for both of the new schools, as these schemes progress.

In order to plan effectively for pressures in demand, we are currently considering data to develop new and additional provision. We will aim to have localised discussions with headteachers and governing bodies at the identified schools at the appropriate time.
Elmbridge

Schools in Elmbridge
There are 28 primary phase schools in Elmbridge, nine of which have nursery provision. There are four secondary academies, three with sixth forms. The Cobham Free School is an all-through school offering both primary and secondary places, eventually up to sixth form. Post-16 provision is also provided by Esher Sixth Form College, and on the Weybridge campus of Brooklands College.

There is one junior school and one secondary school which host specialist centres that support students with a range of special educational needs within a mainstream environment. The borough also has a special school providing education for children with severe learning and development difficulties and a secondary short-stay Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) situated in Hersham.

Elmbridge is made up of six individual primary planning areas as identified in the map to the left. Each primary phase school is allocated to one of these planning areas.

Elmbridge is a single secondary planning area. This means that demand for secondary places is estimated across the whole borough.

Births in Elmbridge
The graph below shows the number of births in Elmbridge each year.

Data provided by the Office for National Statistics shows that births in Elmbridge steadily increased from 2001 to a peak in 2010, a period which saw the birth rate rise quite significantly. Since 2010, demand has decreased and in 2014 we saw a drop in the number of births to below 1,800 for the first time since 2009. The 2016 birth rate has continued to fall back to 1,646.
The need for primary school places largely depends on the local child population and, to a much less extent, on pupils coming into the borough from adjacent areas. The increase in the birth-rate and some new housing development in parts of Elmbridge led to rising demand for school places between 2008 and 2016. However we are now seeing a fall in the number of children starting primary school in some planning areas and this is likely to continue for the foreseeable future. As the demand is not uniform across planning areas there are still some schools in Elmbridge likely to experience more pressure for places than others; but overall we now seem to have reached a situation where we have sufficient primary places to meet the forecast demand.

The graph shows the number of pupils that started school in Elmbridge in the academic years 2011 - 2016. It then estimates the number of pupils that will require a Reception place in a primary school in Elmbridge between 2017 and 2026.

On the basis of the known decrease in the birth rate between 2011 and 2016, and projected housing completions, the number of children entering primary schools in Elmbridge is already falling, but this will then plateau; the demand being sustained at a lower level than the peak cohort of 2015. It is therefore likely that we will see some surplus places for the first time in over ten years.

The forecast includes both known housing developments (with planning permission) and the borough’s housing trajectory up to 2026. Any additional significant developments (ie those not yet agreed and not in the overall housing trajectory) would therefore have an impact on the predicted demand. We work with the borough to ensure that our data is as up to date as possible.

What have we done?
In the last three years, the following projects have been commissioned to meet demand with some of the temporary (bulge) classes leading to permanent expansions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hurst Park Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Alban's Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley CE Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Farm Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleves Junior School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinchley Wood Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews CE Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews CE Primary School (Year 3)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Ditton Infant School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Ditton Junior School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton Oak Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Manby Lodge Infant School 2015 Permanent 60 90
Cranmere Primary School 2016 Permanent 60 90
Hinchley Wood Primary School 2016 Permanent 60 90
Ashley CE Primary School 2016 Bulge class 60 90
Walton Oak Primary School 2016 Bulge class 60 90
Bell Farm Primary School 2016 Bulge class 90 120
Cobham Free School 2016 Bulge class 24 48
St James CE Primary School 2016 Bulge class 60 90
Cleves Junior School 2016 Bulge class 150 180
St Andrew's CE Primary School (Reception) 2016 Bulge class 52 60
St Andrew's CE Primary School (Year 3) 2016 Bulge class 8 18
Cleves Junior School 2017 Permanent 150 180
St Andrew's CE Primary School (Reception) 2017 Bulge class 52 60
Grovelands Primary School 2017 Bulge class 60 90
Long Ditton St Mary's CE Junior School 2017 Bulge class 60 90
Ashley CE Primary School 2017 Permanent 60 90

What are we doing?
There were 1,655 on time primary applications for a reception place in Elmbridge schools for September 2017, fewer than the 1,703 received in the previous year, which may indicate the start of a plateau. Following discussions with Headteachers and Chairs of Governors, the following project has been commissioned to meet demand for primary school places in 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thames Ditton Junior School</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How accurate were our primary numbers?
In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 1,671 children on roll at Elmbridge primary schools in reception. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 1,624 children on roll, giving an over-estimation of 3%.

In previous years the demand for school places in Elmbridge had been underestimated. However pupil movement into the borough and application trends from recent years are now taken into account in the forecasting methodology. The three year trend also factors in around a 12% loss of pupils to the independent sector each year, as this has been the case.

It remains difficult to predict exceptional demand generated by unquantifiable factors like inward migration. The forecasts also take into account any school organisation changes, such as changes of status from infant to primary or where a school has expanded or a temporary 'bulge' class been provided.

SECONDARY
The need for secondary school places is based on the local population of secondary age pupils. The forecast incorporates the numbers of children in local primary schools and factors in the historic patterns of pupils taking up secondary places, plus those joining Elmbridge secondary schools from outside the local area. Typically in Elmbridge a small number of students from neighbouring local authorities join the children from the local primary schools at the start of secondary education and, whilst remaining small, this number has increased in recent years.
The following graph estimates the number of pupils that will require a secondary school place in Elmbridge from 2017 – 2026.

This is based on the current primary cohorts, the historic trends of pupils moving from primary to secondary education and is combined with projected housing completions and the housing trajectory up to 2026. The number of young people entering secondary education is expected to reflect the sharp increase seen in the corresponding primary cohorts over the last decade.

What have we done?
Year 7 numbers are now on an upward trend as larger cohorts begin to transition from the primary sector. This trend is predicted to continue to increase for a further seven years.

Currently there is only just sufficient capacity in Year 7 in Elmbridge and the council has been monitoring the situation closely and will be working with local secondary schools in order to ensure that a sufficient number of secondary places are available to meet the demand in 2018 and 2019. Beyond this, the council is aware of a number of Education Funding and Skills Agency schemes that will increase the available places within existing and new academies. The council, whilst not responsible for any of these projects, is fully supportive of them.

If all three schemes are delivered as expected, the council will be able to meet the forecast demand for secondary places up to 2027-28.

How accurate were our secondary numbers?
It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 963 children on roll at Elmbridge secondary schools in Year 7. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 903 children on roll, giving an over-estimation of 6%. This difference may be attributed to a higher number of applicants taking up places in the independent sector or accepting out of borough offers, or indeed a reduction in the number of out of borough applications in relation to the previous three year trend.
Epsom & Ewell

Schools in Epsom & Ewell
There are 19 primary phase schools in Epsom & Ewell, seven of which have nursery provision. There are four secondary schools, all with post-16 provision. North East Surrey College of Technology (NESCOT) also provides sixth form provision to the surrounding area.

Four primary schools and one secondary school host specialist centres that support students with special educational needs within a mainstream environment. There is also a special school providing education for pupils with complex social communication needs.

Epsom & Ewell is made up of four primary planning areas as identified on the map. Each primary phase school is allocated to one of these planning areas. Epsom & Ewell borough forms a single secondary planning area. This means that demand for secondary places is estimated across the borough.

Births in Epsom & Ewell
The graph below shows the number of births in Epsom & Ewell each year:

Data provided by the Office for National Statistics shows that births in Epsom & Ewell reached a low point in 2001 before then fluctuating and increasing steadily to 2007. Since then, births have fluctuated, with dips in 2009 and 2013 against a general trend of increase. The borough reached a current peak in births in 2015.

PRIMARY
The need for primary school places depends on the local child population. An increase in the pupil population in Epsom & Ewell has led to an increase in demand for school places. This demand will peak between the academic years 2016 and 18, in correlation with the peak in the birth rate five years previously. It is then predicted to remain steady at this level. It should be noted that this demand is unlikely to be evenly spread across the borough and therefore some areas will experience more pressure for school places than others.
The graph below shows the number of pupils starting school in Epsom & Ewell in each of the academic years 2011 - 2016, and then estimates the number of pupils that will require a Reception place in a primary school in Epsom & Ewell between 2017 and 2026.

![Graph showing number of students requiring reception places in Epsom & Ewell, forecast from 2017 onwards](image-url)

On the basis of the known birth rate and projected housing completions, the number of children entering primary is set to plateau, but at a higher level than previously thought. As demographic demand plateaus, the volume of housing development agreed in the borough in forthcoming years could therefore have a significant impact on the level of demand for school places, as new housing is known to yield more children.

**What have we done?**

In the last three years, the following projects have been commissioned to meet demand, with some of the temporary (bulge) classes leading to permanent expansions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danetree Junior School Y3</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsom Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford Green Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Martin’s CE Junior School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford Green Primary School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danetree Junior School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Expansion to primary school</td>
<td>128 (4 year groups)</td>
<td>90 (7 year groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewell Grove Infant School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Expansion to primary school</td>
<td>70 (3 year groups)</td>
<td>60 (7 year groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ewell Infant School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Expansion to primary school</td>
<td>90 (3 year groups)</td>
<td>60 (7 year groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danetree Junior School (Yr R)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Permanent expansion</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What are we doing?**

In 2017, there were 1,021 on time primary applications for a Reception place in Epsom & Ewell and it is possible that the level of demand will increase in 2018 onwards to mirror the birth rate. No further provision is planned at this stage, although this situation will be kept under review.
How accurate were our primary numbers?

It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 1,037 children on roll at Epsom and Ewell primary schools in reception. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 1,021 children on roll, giving an over-estimation of 2%.

The forecasts are based on historic trends so where a school organisation change has occurred in an area, such as a school being expanded or a temporary ‘bulge’ class provided, these trends can be affected thus reducing their accuracy. The organisational changes planned for 2017 are also likely to affect forecasts in Ewell, so this area will be monitored closely.

Where historic patterns of demand for school places fluctuate, as they have frequently done in Epsom & Ewell, this can increase the likelihood of under or over-estimation in forecasts. Forecasts are always tempered using local knowledge to enable places to be commissioned when demand exceeds supply. This has increased the number of temporary classes in comparison to permanent expansions.

SECONDARY

The need for secondary school places is based on the local population of secondary age children. The forecasts incorporate the numbers of children in local primary schools and factors in the historic patterns of students joining secondary schools from outside the local area. Epsom & Ewell is a net importer of secondary age pupils, meaning that more pupils attend secondary schools in the borough than there are on roll at the borough's primary schools. The graph below estimates the number of pupils who will require a secondary school place in Epsom & Ewell from 2017-2026.

According to the numbers on roll, the number of pupils entering Year 7 declined to a low point in 2012/13. However 2014/15 saw the beginning of what is expected to be an overall rising trend for the forthcoming decade as the larger cohorts from primary schools transfer into the secondary sector.

What have we done, and what are we doing?

Additional provision will be needed from 2019, with potentially 5 forms of entry required by 2022. Discussions with local schools to determine the most appropriate way to provide these required places are ongoing.
How accurate were our secondary numbers?
In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 941 children on roll in Epsom and Ewell secondary schools in Year 7. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 899 children on roll, giving an over-estimation of 4%.
**Guildford**

**Schools in Guildford**

There are 38 primary phase schools in the borough of Guildford, four of which have nursery provision. There are seven secondary schools, six with post-16 provision. Guildford College also provides sixth form provision to the local and surrounding area. There are two short-stay Pupil Referral Units (PRUs) in Guildford, one of which operates over two sites.

Four primary schools and one secondary school host specialist centres that support students with a range of special educational needs within a mainstream environment. There are three special schools - one catering for children with severe learning and development difficulties, one for pupils with learning and additional needs and the last for students with social, emotional and mental health needs.

Guildford is made up of 9 individual primary planning areas as identified in the map on the right. Each primary phase school is allocated to one of these planning areas.

Guildford Borough covers a large geographic area and so is split into three secondary planning areas shown on the map below. Secondary planning areas are used to forecast secondary pupil numbers.

Planning areas are 'border-blind' so do not take into account the borough border, but are formed by the location of the schools. There are four Guildford schools which are considered in school place planning areas outside of their home borough: St Mary’s CE Primary Shackleford is considered in the Godalming planning area (Waverley); Pirbright Primary School is considered in the Knaphill planning area (Woking); Ash Manor Secondary School is considered in the Farnham and Ash secondary planning area (Waverley) and The Howard of Effingham School is considered in the Leatherhead planning area (Mole Valley). In return, there are two schools located outside of the borough which are considered in Guildford school place planning areas: Bramley CE Infant School and Wonersh and Shamley Green Primary School (both Waverley schools) are considered in the Tillingbourne Valley planning area.

**Births in Guildford**

The graph below shows the number of births in Guildford each academic year:
Data provided by the Office for National Statistics shows that births in Guildford have fluctuated for some years. Births in the borough reached a low point in 2002, and then fluctuated in the 1,400s for a number of years, before spiking in 2008. This fluctuating trend continued with a dip in 2009 followed by a peak in 2012. Since then, births have dipped to reach a plateau in the mid-1,500s.

**PRIMARY**

The need for primary school places depends on the local child population. The current birth forecasts indicate that the birth rate across the borough is likely to remain in the region of between 1,600 and 1,700 for the next five years, although this will vary across the area. The increase in pupil population in Guildford leads to an increase in demand for school places, although it should be noted that this increase is unlikely to be evenly spread across the borough. Therefore some of the areas in Guildford will experience more pressure on school places than others.

The number of school places across Guildford as a whole is tight, and, following the peak of births seen in 2012, a number of school expansions have taken place. The vacant places that exist tend to be concentrated in schools in some of the rural areas, with a shortage of primary places in the Guildford Town area. Pressure on places will be increased by new housing, either through planning applications or through determination of the Guildford Local Plan which is yet to be adopted by the borough council.

The graph below shows the number of pupils starting school in Guildford in each of the academic years 2011 to 2016, and then estimates the number of pupils that will require a reception place in a primary school in Guildford between 2017 and 2026:

![Graph showing number of students requiring reception places in Guildford, forecast from 2017 onwards](image)

On the basis of the known increase in birth rate and projected housing completions, the number of children entering primary is set to dip in 2019 and then steadily increase again over forthcoming years.

**What have we done?**

The following projects have been commissioned to meet demand since 2015, with some of the temporary (bulge) classes leading to permanent expansions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merrow CE Infant School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northmead Junior School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of students requiring Year 7 places in Guildford, forecast from 2017 onwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queen Eleanor’s CE Junior School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton Infant School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Grange Primary School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clandon C of E Primary School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Expansion to primary</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15 (7 year groups, PAN change from 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worplesdon Primary School (Year 3)</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are we doing?
There were 1,546 on time primary applications for a reception place in Guildford in 2016. With demand for places likely to dip and then steadily increase again, projections will be closely monitored to assess any future need for additional places.

Additional housing created by the Guildford Local Plan will increase the requirement for primary places. School Commissioning is working closely with local planning officers to ensure land for additional education infrastructure is set aside alongside the strategic development sites, to ensure sufficient future provision.

How accurate were our primary numbers?
It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 1,577 children on roll at Guildford primary schools in reception. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 1,509 children on roll, giving an over-estimation of 4%.

SECONDARY
The need for secondary school places is also based on the local population of secondary age children. The forecasts incorporate the numbers of children in local primary schools and factor in the historic patterns of children joining secondary schools from outside the local area. Typically in Guildford, a number of children from outside the local area join the children from the local primary schools at the start of secondary education.

The graph below shows the number of pupils starting secondary school in Guildford in each of the academic years 2011 to 2016, and then estimates the number of pupils that will require a Year 7 place in a secondary school in Guildford between 2017 and 2026. This is based on historic trends of children moving from primary to secondary education and is combined with projected housing completions:

Graph showing number of students requiring Year 7 places in Guildford, forecast from 2017 onwards
The number of children entering secondary education is likely to see a period of fluctuation, reflecting the trend of increase that has been seen in the primary sector over the last 10 years.

It is important to note that while Ash is located in Guildford borough, for the purposes of secondary school place planning it is considered in a planning area with Farnham town due to its close proximity. A significant number of applications for schools in Ash also come from pupils who are resident in Hampshire. This trend is accounted for in the forecasts. There are a number of housing developments that are proposed or have already received permission in the Ash area. Although there is currently some capacity in secondary phase, demand is reviewed regularly to determine if additional places will be required.

In the Effingham planning area, pressure for secondary school places increases for a few years and then decreases to reach a plateau.

What have we done, and what are we doing?
There were 1,489 on time secondary applications for a Year 7 place in Guildford in 2017. In the past there have been an adequate number of places within the borough to accommodate all students, so no action has been required to provide additional places. However, the increase in primary cohorts is now beginning to impact on the secondary sector.

Following discussions with Headteachers and Chair of Governors, the following projects have been commissioned to meet the demand for secondary school places:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guildford County School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter’s Catholic School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional housing created by the Guildford Local Plan will increase the requirement for secondary places. School Commissioning is working closely with local planning officers to ensure land for additional education infrastructure is set aside alongside the strategic development sites, to ensure sufficient future provision.

How accurate were our secondary numbers?
It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 1,271 children on roll at Guildford secondary schools in Year 7. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 1,292 children on roll, giving an under-estimation of 2%.
Schools in Mole Valley
There are 24 primary age schools in Mole Valley, two of which have nursery provision. There are four secondary schools, all with post-16 provision. Sixth form provision to the local and surrounding area is mainly provided by East Surrey and Reigate colleges in the adjacent borough.

Four primary schools and one secondary school have specialist centres that support students with a range of special educational needs within a mainstream environment. There are two special schools - one catering for children with severe learning and development difficulties and one for pupils with learning and additional needs.

Mole Valley is made up of 6 individual primary planning areas as identified in the map to the left. Each primary age school is allocated to one of these planning areas.

Given its geographical nature, Mole Valley is split into two secondary planning areas shown in the map to the right. This means that the need for secondary places is estimated for the north of the district (Leatherhead) as well as in the centre/south (Dorking) rather than across the district as a whole.

Planning areas are 'border-blind' so do not take into account the borough border, but are formed by the location of the schools. There is one school located outside of the borough which is considered in a Mole Valley school place planning area: The Howard of Effingham School (Guildford) is considered in the Leatherhead planning area (Mole Valley).

Births in Mole Valley
The graph below shows the number of births in Mole Valley each academic year:

Data provided by the Office for National Statistics shows that births in Mole Valley reached a low point in 2002. Until 2006, the birth rate fluctuated at around 800, before increasing sharply to a peak in 2010. Since then, the district has seen a relatively steady decline in births each year.
The need for primary school places depends on the local child population. Any increases in pupil population in Mole Valley will lead to an increase in demand for school places.

The graph below shows the number of pupils starting school in Mole Valley in each of the academic years 2011 - 2016 and then estimates the number of pupils that will require a reception place in a primary school in Mole Valley between 2017 and 2026.

The forecasts indicate there will be sufficient places in Mole Valley for the foreseeable future. However, this masks considerable variation across the district as demand is not uniform and largely reflects the differing urban and rural nature of the district. To the south, there is considerable spare capacity and this is forecast to continue. On the other hand, to the north of the district in the Ashtead and Leatherhead planning areas, pressure in places is much greater and there has been the need for additional places to be provided.

We are conscious that the district council is undertaking a review that could impact on future housing across the area that would inevitably lead to an increase in future demand on school places. We will continue to work with the district council to identify how future demand would be met through increases in provision. In addition, neighbouring authorities may come forward with plans that will impact upon provision in this area and we continue to monitor this position closely.

**What have we done?**
In the last three years, the following projects have been commissioned to meet demand:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Peter's Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Greville Primary School (Reception)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What are we doing?**
There were 826 on time primary applications for a reception place in Mole Valley in 2017, which were comfortably accommodated within the existing provision. Forecasts indicate that pupil numbers will not exceed the present level to any significant degree in the foreseeable future and, as such, no further provision is planned at this stage.
How accurate were our primary numbers?
It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 889 children on roll at Mole Valley schools in Reception year. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 836 children on roll, giving an over-estimation of 6%.

SECONDARY
The need for secondary school places is also based on the local population of secondary age children. The forecasts incorporate the number of children in local primary schools and factor in the historic patterns of children taking up secondary places. There is a Catholic secondary school located in north Mole Valley, which tends to have a wider geographical intake of children, so forecasts also take into account children joining secondary schools from outside of the local area. However, overall there are usually fewer pupils starting secondary schools in Mole Valley than there are in the last year of primary schools in the district.

The graph below estimates the number of pupils that will require a secondary school place in Mole Valley from 2017 to 2026:

This includes information regarding planned housing completions and predicted housing trajectories in the district, which could yield additional children who require school places.

What have we done, and what are we doing?
In the past there have been an adequate numbers of places within the borough to accommodate all students, so there has been no action to provide additional places. However, the increase in applications in the primary sector has now begun to impact on the secondary sector.

As with primary, an overall surplus in secondary capacity masks the specific pressures that are felt within the more urban areas of Mole Valley. Secondary places are tight in the Dorking area and, after a dip in numbers, a shortage is projected. Although there is also pressure in the Leatherhead area, this is lower than it otherwise may be, as a number of residents in this area historically apply for secondary school places in the adjacent Effingham area of Guildford borough. Therefore, demand patterns and potential changes in that borough as their local plan comes forward will need to be monitored to ensure a sufficiency of school places.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Priory Church of England (VA) School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Priory Church of England (VA) School</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How accurate were our secondary numbers?**

It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 713 children on roll in Mole Valley secondary schools in Year 7. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 726 children on roll, giving an under-estimation of 2%.
Reigate & Banstead

Schools in Reigate & Banstead
There are 33 primary age schools in Reigate & Banstead, 10 of which have nursery provision. There are six secondary schools, three with post-16 provision. The surrounding area is served by East Surrey College and Reigate College located in the Reigate and Redhill areas.

Three primary schools and one secondary school host specialist centres that support students with a range of special educational needs within a mainstream environment. There are three special schools - one catering for children with severe learning and development difficulties, one for pupils with learning and additional needs and the last for students with social, emotional and mental health needs. There are two short stay Pupil Referral Units (PRUs) in the borough.

Reigate & Banstead is made up of seven individual primary planning areas, as identified on the map on the left. Each primary age school is allocated to one of these planning areas.

Reigate & Banstead is split into three secondary planning areas, which match the areas into which the borough council divides the borough. This means that demand for secondary places is estimated separately for the three areas shown to the right.

Births in Reigate & Banstead
The graph below shows the number of births in Reigate & Banstead each academic year:

Figures provided by the Office for National Statistics show that the number of births in Reigate & Banstead has seen a sustained period of increase since a low point in 2001. After fluctuating, there was a sharp spike in births to a peak in 2010. In 2011, the birth rate reached a plateau, before dropping marginally in 2013 and stabilizing since that point.
**PRIMARY**

The need for primary school places depends on the local child population. Consequently, the increase in pupil population in Reigate & Banstead described above leads to an increase in demand for school places. It should be noted that this increase is not evenly spread across the borough. For example, the outlying areas of Banstead and Horley have not seen as sharp an increase as the town areas of Reigate and Redhill. Also, rising figures are not solely attributable to an increasing birth rate and additional demand is being generated from inward migration and a higher pupil yield resulting from additional housing. Some areas of the borough where the birth rate has not increased so dramatically, such as Horley, are seeing pressure on places from additional housing developments and inward migration into these developments. These factors can be more difficult to track and evaluate.

The graph below shows the number of pupils starting school in Reigate & Banstead in each of the academic years 2011-2016, and then estimates the number of pupils that will require a reception place in a primary school in Reigate & Banstead between 2017 and 2026.

![Graph showing number of students requiring reception places in Reigate & Banstead, forecast from 2017 onwards](image)

Reigate & Banstead is experiencing a significant increase in the demand for school places reflecting both acute rises in birth rate and increased house building and migration within the area. However, some small areas of surplus are masked by the exceptional increases in the more central town areas. The Banstead and Woodmansterne area is forecast to have a small surplus of places in the medium- to long-term, although increased demand for places from residents of Netherne-on-the-Hill may reduce this.

The central areas of Redhill, Merstham, Earlswood and Salfords are expected to experience the most pressure for places, with significant shortfalls of provision in the area. Given the urban nature of the area, and the close proximity of schools, increased demand in one planning area is likely to overflow easily into adjacent areas. The situation in the Horley area is dependent upon the rate of house building, which is monitored very closely.

**What have we done?**

In the last three years, the following projects have been commissioned to meet demand:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wray Common Primary</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate Priory Junior School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover's Green Infant School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horley Infant School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merstham Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are we doing?
There were 1,759 on time primary applications for a reception place in Reigate & Banstead in 2017, and this demand is likely to remain at similar levels in 2018 and 2019. Following meetings with Headteachers, Chairs of Governors and other interested stakeholders, it has been decided that the best means of meeting future forecast excess demand is via the location of one or more Free Schools in suitable proximity to where this demand is projected to arise. To this end, a new 2FE Primary Free School is scheduled to open in Redhill in 2018.

How accurate were our primary numbers?
It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 1,861 children on roll at Reigate & Banstead schools in Reception year. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 1,741 children on roll, giving an over-estimation of 6%.

SECUNDARY
Estimations of the future need for secondary places are based on the local population of secondary aged children. The forecasts incorporate the numbers of children in local primary schools and factor in the historical patterns of children taking up secondary places. In recent years, the number of children transferring from primary provision in the borough to secondary provision has fallen, indicating that some pupils are moving out of the borough or are taking up places in the independent sector for secondary provision.

The graph below estimates the number of pupils that will require a secondary school place in Reigate & Banstead from 2017 – 2026:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2016 Bulge class</th>
<th>2016 Permanent</th>
<th>2016 Expansion to Primary 60 (3 year groups) 60 (7 year groups)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salfords Primary School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furzefield Primary School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Joseph's RC Primary School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover's Green Infant School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate Parish Infant School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Expansion to</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 (3 year groups) 60 (7 year groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wray Common Primary School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manorfield Primary School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandcross Primary School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What have we done, and what are we doing?
In the past there have been an adequate numbers of places within the borough to accommodate all students, so there has been no action to provide additional places. However, the pressure on secondary places is expected to sharply increase to reflect the sharp increase in numbers already experienced in the primary sector.

The county council has been working with secondary schools in the borough to identify how additional places can be provided in Reigate & Banstead. From 2018 and beyond, significant additional provision will be required and this will be met (in part) by a new free school in the borough. Expansion of existing secondary schools to assist in catering for this increased demand is also being implemented alongside this, as shown in the below table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Bede's Secondary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Bede's Secondary School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Bede's Secondary School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Warwick School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Warwick School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merstham Park Free School</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>New school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Bede’s Secondary School</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood School</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood School</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How accurate were our secondary numbers?
It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, the number of Year 7 pupils forecast to require a school place in the borough was 1,270, whereas the number on roll at Reigate & Banstead secondary schools in October 2016 was 1,297. This shows an under-estimation of 2%.
Runnymede

Schools in Runnymede

There are 24 primary age schools in Runnymede, four of which have nursery provision. There are four secondary schools, two with post-16 provision. Strodes Sixth Form College is located in the north of the borough. Post-16 students in the south of the borough are served by Brooklands College at the Weybridge Campus in the neighbouring borough of Elmbridge.

Four primary schools and two secondary schools host specialist centres that support students with a range of special educational needs within a mainstream environment. There are no short stay Pupil Referral Units in the borough, but there is one special school catering for pupils with learning and additional needs.

Runnymede is made up of five individual primary planning areas as identified in the map. Each primary age school is allocated to one of these planning areas. Runnymede is a single secondary planning area. This means that demand for secondary places is estimated across the whole borough.

Births in Runnymede

The graph below shows the number of birth in Runnymede each academic year:

Figures provided by the Office for National Statistics show that births in Runnymede have fluctuated for some years. Births rose from a low point in 2002, and reached a peak of over 1,000 in 2011. In between this there was a steady increase, with fluctuation in some years. There was a sharp decline in 2013, but numbers have increased slightly and appear stable, at this stage.

PRIMARY

The following graph shows the number of pupils starting school in Runnymede in each of the academic years 2011 - 2016, and then estimates the number of pupils that will require a reception place in a primary school in Runnymede between 2017 and 2026.
Demand is forecast to fluctuate in forthcoming years, in 2016/17 echoing the peak in the birth rate of five years previously. After this, the forecast demand appears to decrease slightly and then plateau, mirroring the trend established in births.

What have we done?
In the last three years, the following projects have been commissioned to meet demand:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Hythe Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Ann's Heath Junior School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyne and Longcross Infant School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Expansion to primary</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30 (7 year groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Church Infant School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Bulge</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are we doing?
There were 809 applications who expressed a first preference for a reception place in Runnymede in 2017, this was a significant drop from the peak of applications received in 2016 and has meant that there are surplus places across the borough.

Current forecasts indicate the numbers will steadily rise from with demand numbers potentially challenging current capacity by 2021.

As a consequence, the council retains an option to provide 1FE (30 places per year within the borough) subject to forecast demand. The council will continue to work closely with borough officers to ensure an appropriate infrastructure response to potential housing arising from Local Planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional 1FE in Chertsey or Addlestone area</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How accurate were our primary numbers?
It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 926 children on roll at Runnymede schools in Reception year.
The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 868 children on roll, giving an over-estimation of 6%.

SECONDARY
The need for secondary school places is also based on the local population of secondary age children. The forecasts incorporate the number of children in local primary schools and factor in the historic patterns of children taking up secondary places. There is a Catholic secondary school located in the borough, which tends to have a wider geographical intake of children from feeder schools in the Elmbridge deanery, so forecasts also take into account children joining secondary schools from outside of the local area.

The following graph estimates the number of pupils that will require a secondary school place in Runnymede from 2017 – 2026.

![Graph showing number of students requiring Year 7 places in Runnymede, forecast from 2017 onwards](image)

The number of secondary aged children is forecast to steadily increase in line with the increases already seen in the primary sector. It is anticipated that demand will first peak in 2020/21 to reflect the 2013/14 spike in primary cohorts, before tailing off and spiking again in 2023 to accommodate the 2016/17 peak from the primary sector.

What have we done, and what are we doing?
In the past there have been an adequate number of places within the borough to accommodate all students, so there has been no action to provide additional places. However, the increase in applications in the primary sector has now begun to impact on the secondary sector and will continue to do so in forthcoming years.

Alongside potential free school providers, the county council has been working with secondary schools in the North West of Surrey to identify how additional places can be provided in Runnymede. The following projects have been commissioned, either by the council or by the Department for Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chertsey High School (Free School)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>New free school</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesian School</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Permanent expansion</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How accurate were our secondary numbers?
It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 908 children on roll at Runnymede secondary schools in Year 7. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 888 children on roll, giving an over-estimation of 2%.
Spelthorne

Schools in Spelthorne

There are 21 primary phase schools in Spelthorne, nine of which have nursery provision on site. There are six secondary schools, two with post-16 provision. Brooklands College has a campus in Ashford that serves the local area.

Two primary schools and one secondary school have specialist centres that support students with a range of special educational needs within a mainstream environment. There is one special school catering for pupils with severe learning and development difficulties, and there is also one short-stay Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) in the borough.

Spelthorne is made up of five individual primary planning areas as identified in the map. Each primary phase school is allocated to one of these planning areas. Spelthorne is a single secondary planning area. This means that demand for secondary places is estimated across the whole borough.

Births in Spelthorne

The graph below shows the number of births in Spelthorne each year:

Data provided by the Office for National Statistics shows that births in Spelthorne have fluctuated for some years, reaching a low point in 2002. Since that time, births have consistently increased. In the calendar year of 2013, where births fell overall in Surrey, Spelthorne was one of the only boroughs to see a large increase in its birth numbers and have continued their upward trajectory in 2016.

PRIMARY

The need for primary school places depends on the local child population. The increase in pupil population in Spelthorne, as described above, has led to an increase in demand for school places in some areas. However, demand is not solely attributable to an increasing
birth rate; inward migration from the London boroughs and additional yield from housing developments are also factors and so some areas in Spelthorne have experienced more pressure for school places than others.

The following graph shows the number of pupils starting school in Spelthorne in each of the academic years 2011 - 2016, and then estimates the number of pupils that will require a Reception place in a primary school in Spelthorne between 2017 and 2026.

![Graph showing number of students requiring reception places in Spelthorne, forecast from 2017 onwards](image)

On the basis of the known increase in birth rate, and projected housing completions, the number of children entering primary schools is set to peak in 2017 and then stabilize throughout the rest of the planning period. This will need to be closely monitored given the increase in births recorded in 2016.

**What have we done?**

In the last three years, the following projects have been commissioned to meet demand with some of the temporary (bulge) classes leading to permanent expansions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashford Park Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Farm Primary School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon Primary School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Primary School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkedale Infant School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Expansion to primary</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3 year groups)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7 year groups)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What are we doing?**

The future need for additional places will not be uniform across the borough. For example, it is anticipated that there will be small shortfalls in Sunbury and in the Staines and Laleham area, whilst the Shepperton area is forecast to have spare places over the immediate planning period.

The programme of work undertaken to this point is forecast to meet the demand patterns currently anticipated. The Council will continue to monitor this position and reflect any changes in trends in future forecasts and work plans.

**How accurate were our primary numbers?**

It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 1,208 children on roll at Spelthorne primary schools in Reception year. The
school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 1,158 children on roll, giving an over-estimation of 4%.

SECONDARY
The need for secondary school places is based on the local population of secondary age children. The forecasts incorporate the number of children in local primary schools and factor in the historic patterns of pupils taking up secondary places. There is a Catholic secondary school located in the borough which tends to have a wider geographical intake of children from out of the county so forecasts also take into account children joining secondary schools from outside of both the borough and county.

The graph below estimates the number of pupils that will require a secondary school place in Spelthorne from 2017 – 2026.

[Graph showing number of students requiring Year 7 places in Spelthorne, forecast from 2017 onwards]

What have we done, and what are we doing?
In the past there has been an over-supply of places within the borough, thus all students have been accommodated and there has been no need to provide additional places. However, the increase in applications in the primary sector has now begun to impact on the secondary sector and will continue to do so in future years.

The Council has agreed plans to provide 3 forms of additional entry (90 places per year) up to 2020 and will continue to work with the schools within the borough to provide plans for meeting any further demand increases beyond that point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Knyvett College</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunbury Manor</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How accurate were our secondary numbers?
In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 1,071 children on roll at Spelthorne secondary schools. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 1,043 children on roll, giving an over-estimation of 3%.
Surrey Heath

Schools in Surrey Heath
There are 25 primary age schools in Surrey Heath, five of which have nursery provision. There are four secondary schools, three of which have post-16 provision. There is no college provision in the borough.

Two primary schools and one secondary school host specialist centres that support students with a range of special educational needs within a mainstream environment. There are three special schools - one for pupils with social, emotional and mental health needs, one for children with severe learning and development difficulties and one for students with learning and additional needs.

Surrey Heath is made up of six individual primary planning areas as identified in the map to the left. Each primary age school is allocated to one of these planning areas.

Surrey Heath is split into two secondary planning areas shown in the map to the right. Forecasts are made for Gordon’s School in the east of the borough separately from the remaining secondary schools in the west of the borough in Camberley/Frimley.

Births in Surrey Heath
The graph below shows the number of births in Surrey Heath each academic year.

Figures provided by the Office for National Statistics show that births in Surrey Heath reached a low point in 2001. Since then, births have fluctuated following a rise then fall trend, before peaking in 2008 - earlier than all other boroughs and districts in Surrey. From 2008 onwards, births have decreased, and fallen again in 2016.
**PRIMARY**

The need for primary school places depends on the local child population. Any increase in pupil population in Surrey Heath, as described above, leads to an increase in demand for school places. It should be noted that this increase is unlikely to be evenly spread across the borough and some primary areas in Surrey Heath will experience more pressure for school places than others.

The graph below shows the number of pupils starting school in Surrey Heath in each of the academic years 2011 - 2016, and then estimates the number of pupils that will require a reception place in a primary school in Surrey Heath between 2017 and 2026.

On the basis of the known increase in birth rate and projected housing completions, the number of children entering primary was set to peak in 2016, before declining and reaching a stable level throughout the planning period. From 2017 onwards, any increases in demand will be dependent on the volume of housing developments that is agreed by the borough council.

**What have we done?**

In the last three years, the following projects have been commissioned to meet demand, with some of the temporary (bulge) classes leading to permanent expansions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bisley CE Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connaught Junior School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What are we doing?**

Currently, Surrey Heath has a small, but in some areas significant, number of surplus of primary places having reached its peak of primary cohorts earlier than other boroughs or districts. However, there is a potential shortage of places when housing developments, such as in Deepcut, are completed. A new 2FE primary school (420 places) is being planned as part of the redevelopment of Princess Royal Barracks but the timing of its opening will depend on the pace with which the proposed housing comes forward.

Historically, there tends to be an overflow of school applications between Surrey Heath and its neighbouring Hampshire schools, and so developments in neighbouring authorities are monitored closely for any impact that these may have on the borough.
Any school organisation changes that are planned in the borough are primarily to rectify historical imbalances between infant and junior provision, or to equalise a school’s PAN into infant class size groups. The latter applies to South Camberley Primary School, where the PAN increased from 110 to 120 in September 2016. The Council will need to monitor the impact of the reductions in birth rate and the existence of surplus places within the schools throughout this planning period.

How accurate were our primary numbers?
It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 1,044 children on roll at Surrey Heath primary schools in Reception year. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 1,010 children on roll, giving an over-estimation of 3%.

SECONDARY
The need for secondary school places is also based on the local population of secondary age children. The forecasts incorporate the number of children in local primary schools and factor in the historic patterns of children taking up secondary places. Over the last three years, only 87% of the cohorts from Surrey Heath primary schools have attended Surrey Heath secondary schools. This suggests that a number of pupils are either choosing independent provision or attending secondary schools out of the borough. It is worth noting that, although there is a Catholic primary school in the borough, children preferring a Catholic secondary education will attend Catholic secondary schools in either Woking or Waverley, as there is no Catholic secondary school in Surrey Heath.

The graph below estimates the number of pupils that will require a secondary school place in Surrey Heath from 2017 – 2026.

What have we done, and what are we doing?
It is anticipated that there will be a shortage of places by the peak in secondary demand towards the end of this decade, and discussions will need to take place with local secondary schools to determine the most appropriate way to provide these required places.

How accurate were our secondary numbers?
It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 806 children on roll at Surrey Heath secondary schools in Year 7. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 828 children on roll, giving an under-estimation of 3%.
Tandridge

Schools in Tandridge
There are 25 primary age schools in Tandridge, eight of which have nursery provision. There are three secondary schools in the district, two with post-16 provision and there is no college provision.

Two primary schools and two secondary schools host specialist centres that support students with a range of special educational needs within a mainstream environment. There are three special schools in the district - two for pupils with communication and interaction needs, and the other for students with severe learning and development needs.

Tandridge is made up of five individual primary planning areas as identified in the map to the left. Each primary age school is allocated to one of these planning areas.

Tandridge is a single secondary planning area. This means that demand for secondary places is estimated across the whole district.

Births in Tandridge
The graph below shows the number of births in Tandridge each academic year:

Data provided by the Office for National Statistics shows that births in Tandridge reached a low point in 2002. Since then, the borough has seen a small but steady increase in births, with spikes in 2007, 2012 and 2015.

PRIMARY
The need for primary school places depends on the local child population. Any increase in pupil population in Tandridge, as described above, leads to an increase in demand for school places. Whilst the rise in births is relatively modest compared to other boroughs and districts in Surrey, it is not spread evenly across the district and therefore some areas in Tandridge may experience more or less pressure for school places than others. This is not solely attributable to an increasing birth rate as additional demand is also being generated from inward migration and additional housing.
The graph below shows the number of pupils starting school in Tandridge in each of the academic years 2011 - 2016 and then estimates the number of pupils that will require a reception place in a primary school in Tandridge between 2017 and 2026.

We are conscious that the district council is undertaking a review that could impact on future housing across the area that would inevitably lead to an increase in future demand on school places. We will continue to work with the district council to identify how future demand would be met through increases in provision.

What have we done?
In the last three years, the following projects have been commissioned to meet demand, with some of the temporary (bulge) classes leading to permanent expansions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downs Way School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Francis Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downs Way School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marden Lodge Primary School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are we doing?
Whilst there are expected to be spare places in Tandridge as a whole, this disguises the pressure on places locally. In line with the additional capacity provided at Infant level, there is expected to be a pressure on junior places in Oxted & Limpsfield in the short- to medium-term.

In addition, there is anticipated to be a short- and long-term need for additional primary school places in north Tandridge. This situation remains under constant review and provisional discussions are taking place with schools to determine the appropriate strategy moving forward, bearing in mind the need to ensure that there isn’t an over-provision of places in the medium-term.
The future requirements for primary provision in Tandridge are outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s C of E Junior School</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional 1FE in northern Tandridge</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How accurate were our primary numbers?
It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 938 children on roll at Tandridge primary schools in Reception year. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 944 children on roll, giving an under-estimation of 1%.

SECONDARY
The need for secondary school places is based on the local population of secondary age children. The forecasts incorporate the numbers of children in local primary schools and factor in the historic patterns of children joining secondary schools from outside the local area. On average, historically around 90% of the district's Year 6 cohorts have transferred to secondary schools in the district. The remaining 10% of children choose to pursue independent secondary schooling, or apply to schools outside of the borough. However, overall, the district is a net importer of students from outside of the county. This means that there are more children from outside of Surrey attending Tandridge secondary schools than there are Tandridge children attending out of county secondary schools. This is largely because the location of schools near to the county boundary means that catchment areas include parts of the neighbouring London Borough of Croydon.

The graph below estimates the number of pupils who will require a secondary school place in Tandridge from 2017 to 2026.

What have we done and what are we doing?
Secondary provision is located towards the northern half of the district. In the shorter term, whilst schools in the borough are oversubscribed, it should be noted that this includes significant subscription from adjoining authorities for whose applicants Surrey is not obliged to provide a place if applicants do not meet the admissions criteria. Therefore, overall it is expected that current provision will be sufficient to meet demand. Admissions in the recent past have exceeded the total Published Admissions Numbers (PAN) and numbers are expected to once again rise from a low in 2014, with the shortage of places becoming pronounced by 2018.
With additional provision needing to be considered from 2018, discussions are taking place with local schools to determine the most appropriate way to provide these required places. In outline, the following provision is required:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>de Stafford School</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How accurate were our secondary numbers?**

In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 720 children on roll at Tandridge secondary schools in Year 7. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 693 children on roll, giving an over-estimation of 4%.
Waverley

Schools in Waverley
There are 38 primary phase schools in the borough of Waverley, four of which have nursery provision. There are seven secondary schools, one with post-16 provision. Farnham and Godalming Colleges provide sixth form college provision to the east and west of the borough.

Four primary schools and two secondary schools host specialist centres that support students with a range of special educational needs within a mainstream environment. There are two special schools - one catering for students with severe learning and development difficulties and one for pupils with learning and additional needs.

Waverley is made up of seven individual primary planning areas as identified in the map to the left. Each primary phase school is allocated to one of these planning areas.

Given the diverse geographical nature of the borough, Waverley is split into four separate secondary planning areas, as identified in the right hand map. This means that demand for secondary places is estimated in the north, east, south and west of the borough.

Planning areas are 'border-blind' so do not take into account the borough border, but rather are formed by the location of the schools. There are two Waverley schools which are considered in school place planning areas outside of their home borough: Bramley CE Infant School and Wonersh and Shamley Green Primary School are considered in the Tillingbourne Valley planning area (Guildford). In return, there are two schools located outside of the borough which are considered in Waverley school place planning areas: St Mary's CE Primary School at Shackleford (Guildford) is considered in the Godalming planning area and Ash Manor Secondary School is considered in the Farnham and Ash secondary planning area.

Births in Waverley
The graph below shows the number of births in Waverley each year:
Figures provided by the Office for National Statistics show that, from low points in 2001 and 2005, births in Waverley have fluctuated for a number of years. Since the spike of 2012, births have steadily decreased and in 2013 dropped below 1,300 for the first time since 2005. In 2014, births decreased further still but were followed by a small increase in 2015.

**PRIMARY**

The need for primary school places depends on the local child population. The current birth forecasts indicate that the birth rate across the borough is set to remain under 1,300 for the next five years, although this will vary across the area. The more rural nature of the borough does mean that birth rates and pupil populations fluctuate more significantly than in urban areas. This can be seen clearly in the recent cohorts of school starters in the graph below. It should be noted that demand is unlikely to be evenly spread across the borough. Therefore some of the areas in Waverley will experience more pressure on school places than others.

Although the birth rate is due to steady, additional demand may be generated from inward migration and housing. In certain areas of the borough, the rate of growth will depend solely on the volume of new housing development, either through planning applications or through determination of the Waverley Local Plan, which is yet to be adopted by the borough council.

The graph below shows the number of pupils starting school in Waverley in each of the academic years 2010 to 2016, and then estimates the number of pupils that will require a reception place in a primary school in Waverley between 2017 and 2026:

![Graph showing number of students requiring reception places in Waverley, forecast from 2017 onwards](image)

**What have we done?**

In the last three years, the following projects have been commissioned to meet demand:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farncombe Infant School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loseley Fields Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shottermill Infant School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Hill Primary School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loseley Fields Primary School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley Abbey CE Junior School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chandler CE Junior School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s CE Primary School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, South Farnham Primary Academy expanded in 2015, creating a further 30 permanent places. Highfield South Farnham Primary School created an additional bulge class of 30 places in 2016 and are offering a further 30 additional places in 2018.

**What are we doing?**

There were 1,388 on time primary applications for a reception place in Waverley in 2017. The forecasts show that the pattern of peaks and troughs of demand is likely to continue.

There is considerable overlap between some areas of Waverley and the border of Hampshire and West Sussex. It is important when responding to patterns of demand that we give regard to the potential impacts on these adjacent planning areas and vice versa.

**How accurate were our primary numbers?**

It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 1,428 children on roll at Waverley primary schools in reception. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 1,419 children on roll, giving an over-estimation of 1%.

Where historic patterns of demand for school places tend to fluctuate, as they do in Waverley, this can increase the likelihood of under or over-estimation in forecasts. Forecasts are always tempered using local knowledge to enable places to be commissioned when demand exceeds supply. This has increased the number of bulge classes in comparison to permanent expansions.

**SECONDARY**

The need for secondary school places is also based on the local population of secondary age children. The forecasts incorporate the numbers of children in local primary schools and factor in the historic patterns of children joining secondary schools from outside the local area. Typically in Waverley, a large number of children from outside the local area join the children from the local primary schools at the start of secondary education. Waverley is a net importer of secondary age pupils.

The graph below indicates the forecast number of pupils that will require a Year 7 place in a secondary school in Waverley between 2017 and 2026. This is based on historic trends of children moving from primary to secondary education and is combined with projected housing completions. The number of children entering secondary education is set to continue to increase over the next 7 years, reflecting the increase that has been seen in the primary sector in some parts of the borough:
What have we done and what are we doing?
In the past, although Year 7 numbers were expected to fluctuate year on year, they have stayed within the planned number of places. Moving forward, demand for places is increasing, however this is not uniform, and is more significant in some area than others.

In the last three years, the following projects have been commissioned to meet the demand for secondary school places:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weydon Academy</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weydon Academy</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnham Heath End*</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*subject to planning permission

Additional housing created by the Waverley Local Plan will increase the requirement for school places across the borough. The number of extra forms of entry required due to new housing will depend upon the housing developments that are agreed. School commissioning officers are exploring options that may be required to meet any increase in demand. This involves co-ordination with local schools as well as local planning officers and housing developers.

How accurate were our secondary numbers?
It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 1,318 children on roll at Waverley secondary schools in Year 7. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 1,302 children on roll, giving an over-estimation of 1%.
**Woking**

**Schools in Woking**
There are 25 primary age schools located in the borough of Woking, nine of which have nursery provision. There are four secondary schools, one with post-16 provision. Woking College also provides sixth form provision to the local and surrounding area.

Two primary schools and one secondary school host specialist centres that support students with a range of special educational needs within a mainstream environment. In addition, there are two Special Schools - one providing education for children and young people with complex social communication needs, and the other for pupils with learning and additional needs. There is one short-stay Pupil Referral Units (PRUs) operating over two sites in the borough.

Woking is made up of five individual primary planning areas as shown in the map to the left. Each primary age school is allocated to one of these planning areas. Woking is a single secondary planning area so demand for secondary places is estimated across the whole Borough.

Planning areas are 'border-blind' so do not take into account the borough boundary, but are formed by the location of the schools. There is one school located outside of the borough which is considered in a Woking school place planning area: Pirbright Primary School (Guildford) is in the Knaphill planning area.

**The current school place situation in Woking**
The graph below shows the number of births in Woking each academic year.

![](image)

Figures provided by the Office for National Statistics show that births in Woking have risen steadily year on year from a low point in 2001. Since then, there has been an overall trend of increase, peaking in 2012. After that, there was a sharp decline in 2013 and remaining stable in the following years. In 2015, births fell below 1,300 for the first time since 2006, although births in 2016 are still profoundly higher than those in 1999.
PRINCIPAL

The need for primary school places depends on the local child population. The increase in pupil population in Woking, as described above, leads to an increase in demand for school places. It should be noted that this increase is unlikely to be evenly spread across the borough and is not solely attributable to an increasing birth rate. Additional demand is also generated from inward migration and a higher pupil yield resulting from additional housing. These factors have specific impacts in different areas and as such some areas in Woking will experience more pressure for school places than others.

The graph below estimates the number of pupils that will require a reception place in a primary school in Woking between 2017 and 2026.

On the basis of the known increase in birth rate and projected housing completions, the number of children entering primary was forecast to peak in 2016/17, before a small but steady decline back to the level of demand seen in 2013/14. The birth rates in 2007/8 and in subsequent years do not entirely reflect the rate of increase to 2016/17, so it is likely that the recent increases in admissions applications are partly due to inward migration and pupils yielded from additional housing.

What have we done?

In the last three years, the following projects have been commissioned to meet demand:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Byfleet Infant School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sythwood Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfield Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaufort Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadmere Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadmere Primary School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byfleet Primary School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadmere Primary School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Bulge class</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are we doing?

Woking has seen an acute rise in applications throughout the start of this decade peaking in 2015. In line with a recent birth trends it is forecast that demand, whilst significantly above levels recorded in 2010, will begin to stabilize. For 2017, the schools within the borough
received 1,258 applications - a fall of 4.2% from the 2016 level. As a result, only 1 bulge class was commissioned.

In line with the forecast trends it is not anticipated that further bulge provision will be commissioned for entry in 2018.

Following meetings with Headteachers and Chairs of Governors, the following projects have been commissioned to meet the rising demand for primary school places:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Byfleet Junior School</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How accurate were our primary numbers?**

It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 1,334 children on roll at Woking primary schools in Reception. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 1,260 children on roll, giving an over-estimation of 6%.

**SECONDARY**

The need for secondary school places is also based on the local population of secondary age children. The forecasts incorporate the number of children in local primary schools and factor in the historic patterns of children taking up secondary places. There is a Catholic secondary school located in the borough, which tends to have a wider geographical intake of children from out of the borough, so forecasts also take into account the import of children from neighbouring boroughs.

The graph below estimates the number of pupils that will require a secondary school place in Woking from 2017 – 2026.
What have we done?
In the past there has been an adequate number of places within the borough to accommodate all students, so there has been no action to provide additional places. However, the sharp increase in applications in the primary sector has now begun to impact on the secondary sector and will continue to do so in forthcoming years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoe Valley Free School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>New free school</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bishop David Brown School</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department for Education has commissioned a new secondary free school, Hoe Valley Free School, which opened in temporary accommodation in September 2015. This school will grow incrementally over the next five to seven years to become a 4 form entry secondary school with sixth form, and is anticipated to move to its permanent site in Woking borough in 2018.

What are we doing?
Alongside potential free school providers, the council has been working with secondary schools in the north west of Surrey and Woking Borough Council to identify how additional places can be provided in Woking.

The following projects have been commissioned to meet demand:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bulge class or permanent expansion</th>
<th>Previous PAN</th>
<th>New PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St John the Baptist Catholic Comprehensive School</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How accurate were our secondary numbers?
It is useful to understand how accurate the forecasts are year on year. In 2016, it was forecast that there would be 991 children on roll at Woking secondary schools in Year 7. The school census from October 2016 showed that there were actually 946 children on roll, giving an over-estimation of 5%.
Hi All,

Lovely to meet with you all this evening.
As discussed, please find below the email thread from Julie Illes.
Do let us know if you need anything further.

We look forward to hearing from you with regards to the Educational justification report and letter from TLT.

Kind regards,
Sarah & Angela

Begin forwarded message:

From: Julie Iles CLR <julie.iles@surreycc.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Warlingham Village Primary School Proposal
Date: 23 January 2019 at 22:42:32 GMT
To: Sarah Johnson

You’re welcome Sarah and we will, as stated, keep you informed on any formal consultation process.

Regards
Julie

From: Sarah Johnson [mailto:]
Sent: 23 January 2019 22:31
To: Julie Iles CLR <julie.iles@surreycc.gov.uk>
Cc: Tim Oliver CLR <tim.oliver@surreycc.gov.uk>; Angela Hall
Subject: Re: Warlingham Village Primary School Proposal

Dear Julie,

Many thanks for taking the time to look into this for us and coming back with the below information.

It is good to have it confirmed that this has been led by SCC; with the encouragement of David Hodge; as a developer proposal which has subsequently been incorporated into the TDC Local Plan.
From the last 5 months of analysis and fact finding, we had drawn the conclusion that this was the case, as there was no educational reasoning that we could find to justify such a proposal. Given the length of time that this has been discussed at SCC (we have emails dating back to 2015), we do find it concerning that this had been sold to the public as being assessed, reviewed and something which was therefore inevitable.

We believe that had the campaign not highlighted or questioned various ‘facts’ which the public were being presented with, that this may well have already gone to a planning application, which would then, by it’s very nature, have omitted the crucial step of looking at the educational justifications, of which we believe there are none.

We have a public meeting this evening, where we will be taking the community through all of our findings. The minutes from this meeting will be summarised for those who can’t attend, so I will ensure that you are also sent a copy. We shall be continuing the campaign in the best interests of WVPS and working with whomever is elected at the By-Election next week to ensure that there is transparency in anything which is being proposed going forward.

Please do let me know if there are any developments towards a formal consultation process or anything which the wider community should be made aware of.

Kind regards,
Sarah

---

On 22 Jan 2019, at 18:15, Julie Iles CLR <julie.iles@surreycc.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Sarah
Apologies for the delay in getting back to you but I wanted to make sure I had checked with all relevant parties.

To date, SCC has been engaged with discussions with Tandridge District Council with respect to the inclusion of Warlingham Village Primary School on its Infrastructure Delivery Plan (associated with the wider Local Plan), as well as high-level discussions with potential developers who may be interested in taking this scheme forward, as part of wider housing development. However, at this stage, these discussions have so far only been exploratory and no formal plans presently exist to relocate/expand Warlingham Village Primary School. SCC officers will continue to consider the merits of this scheme as it develops over time. Therefore, we cannot provide you with the justification statements that you have asked us for as these do not currently exist. These statements will only be fully formulated should SCC decide to proceed with this scheme. If SCC decided to formally propose the relocation/expansion of the school in the future we would be required to issue the educational and property justifications as part of the formal consultation process, which your campaign group would be invited to respond to.

I hope this is helpful
Regards
Julie
This email and any attachments with it are intended for the addressee only. It may be confidential and may be the subject of legal and/or professional privilege. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender or postmaster@surreycc.gov.uk

The content may be personal or contain personal opinions and cannot be taken as an expression of the County Council's position. Surrey County Council reserves the right to monitor all incoming and outgoing mail. Whilst every care has been taken to check this e-mail for viruses, it is your responsibility to carry out any checks upon receipt.

Visit the Surrey County Council website - http://www.surreycc.gov.uk

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
Consultation on Tandridge District Council Local Plan – reference to:

**HSG18: Former Shelton Sports Ground, Warlingham / Green Belt Amendment / Infrastructure**

**Infrastructure**

VIII. In accordance with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), financial contribution to-onsite provision of the following infrastructure are relevant to the development of this site and will be a requirement of any proposal: Relocation and expansion of Warlingham Village Primary School to provide an 3FE primary school

We understand that challenges to these proposals may only be made on the basis of soundness. We would strongly challenge this proposal, under soundness principle b), that the proposal is ‘Justified – an appropriate strategy taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence.’

If our understanding of this brief statement is correct, you are proposing to close Warlingham Village Primary School’s present site, and to relocate it to this new site, changing it from being a one form entry village school to a three form entry school, and at the same time, incurring massive capital expenditure to create this new facility.

It is disappointing that the proposal seems to have failed to notice that there is already a primary school on land almost adjacent to this site that is capable of being - and indeed has been in the past – a three form entry school.

That is of course Hamsey Green Primary School, which since May 2017 has formed part of Tandridge Learning Trust. It’s also disappointing that no conversations about this have been had with either the governors, or the executive at Hamsey Green, or the CEO or Trustees of Tandridge Learning Trust, all of whom would be significantly impacted by the creation of a new school managed by GLF on our doorstep and competing for the same children. Perhaps because we are relatively new in formation, GLF seems to have been the only potential MAT considered in the consultation for this area.

Tandridge Learning Trust formed in May 2017, and is a multi-academy trust comprising Hamsey Green Primary School and Children’s Centre, Tatsfield Primary School, Woodlea Primary School, Bletchingley Village Primary School and Warlingham Secondary School, with permission for Sunnydown Special Needs School also to join in due course.

Hamsey Green school has struggled in recent years, with successive Ofsted reports evaluating it as ‘Requiring Improvement’. Since TLT took it on, we have changed many of the teaching and support staff, made significant changes to governance and brought in a new, dynamic and highly effective head teacher, Ms Annette Elstob, who has begun a complete transformation of the school, evidenced in significantly increased parental satisfaction and more children on roll. At the moment, Hamsey Green’s current PAN is 60 children and although in 2017 we ran a single form entry, in 2018 – 19 this year the school has demonstrated its increasingly popularity with numbers rising significantly as a result of the new Headteacher’s initiatives, and interventions put in place by Tandridge Learning Trust to support her and drive change in the school.

Hamsey Green used to run a three form entry of 90 children, and naturally the school is still able to accommodate such numbers, were there to be that level of local need.
As Hamsey Green and Warlingham schools share sites there is significant capacity to increase the PAN at both schools without requiring new land to be acquired, or without huge additional capital expenditure. This would also address the sixth form capacity that is required within the area.

**Our argument is therefore that the creation of a new school within a mile of two existing schools which could increase their capacity is not justified.**

Similarly, we took steps to explore the likely numbers of children predicted to need school places in our area by speaking to Oliver Gill, of Surrey County Council Admissions and School Place Planning team, which is responsible for ensuring that school places are available for the County’s children. Your consultation provides generic information about the county’s requirements, but Oliver’s specific guidance was that predicted numbers in our area of Tandridge only support an additional one form entry (which we contend could be provided by Hamsey Green) and that they would therefore strongly oppose the additional two form entry increase being proposed.

**Our argument is therefore also that the creation of an additional sixty school places is not justified by the council’s own analysis of pupil admission trends.**

We note also that there is growing opposition in the local area to the changes to Warlingham Village Primary School, with local parents keen for existing local schools to be supported before new ones are built. And would like to register our concern that this current proposal seems to disproportionately favour the GLF multi-academy trust whilst disadvantaging Tandridge Learning Trust, as referenced by our lack of consultation.

We very much hope that you will give proper consideration to these objections to this proposed aspect of the local plan. We are of course available should anyone wish to discuss this with us in greater detail.

Yours faithfully

Karen Quinton

Chair of Tandridge Learning Trust

Corinne Fernandes

Chair of Hamsey Green Governors

Karen Quinton

Warlingham School | Tithepit Shaw Lane | Warlingham | Surrey | CR6 9YB
Tel: 01883 624067 | Fax: 01883 624026 | Website: www.warlinghamschool.co.uk
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