



## CHILDREN & LEARNING OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE AGENDA (SPECIAL)

7.30 pm

Thursday  
11 October 2012

Town Hall

Members 14: Quorum 6

**COUNCILLORS:**

Sandra Binion (Chairman)  
Gillian Ford (Vice-Chair)  
Nic Dodin

Peter Gardner  
Robby Misir  
Pat Murray

Frederick Thompson  
Melvin Wallace  
Keith Wells

**CO-OPTED MEMBERS:**

**Statutory Members  
representing the Churches**

Phillip Grundy, Church of  
England  
Jack How, Roman Catholic  
Church

**Statutory Members  
representing parent  
governors**

Julie Lamb, Special Schools  
Anne Ling, Primary Schools  
Garry Dennis, Secondary  
Schools

Non-voting members representing local teacher unions and professional associations:  
Margaret Cameron (NAHT), Keith Passingham (NASUWT), Bev Whitehead (NUT)

**For information about the meeting please contact:  
Sean Cable 01708 432436  
sean.cable@haverling.gov.uk**

## **What is Overview & Scrutiny?**

Each local authority is required by law to establish an overview and scrutiny function to support and scrutinise the Council's executive arrangements. Each overview and scrutiny committee has its own remit as set out in the terms of reference but they each meet to consider issues of local importance.

They have a number of key roles:

1. Providing a critical friend challenge to policy and decision makers.
2. Driving improvement in public services.
3. Holding key local partners to account.
4. Enabling the voice and concerns of the public.

The committees consider issues by receiving information from, and questioning, Cabinet Members, officers and external partners to develop an understanding of proposals, policy and practices. They can then develop recommendations that they believe will improve performance, or as a response to public consultations.

Committees will often establish Topic Groups to examine specific areas in much greater detail. These groups consist of a number of Members and the review period can last for anything from a few weeks to a year or more to allow the Members to comprehensively examine an issue through interviewing expert witnesses, conducting research and site visits. Once the topic group has finished its work it will send a report to the Committee that created it and it will often suggest recommendations to the executive.

## **Terms of Reference**

The areas scrutinised by the Committee are:

- School Improvement (BSF)
- Pupil and Student Services (including the Youth Service)
- Children's Social Services
- Safeguarding
- Adult Education
- 14-19 Diploma
- Scrutiny of relevant aspects of the LAA
- Councillor Calls for Action
- Social Inclusion

## **AGENDA ITEMS**

### **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

(if any) - receive.

### **2 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

Members are invited to declare any interests in any of the items on the agenda at this point of the meeting. Members may still declare an interest in an item at any time prior to the consideration of the matter.

### **3 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman will announce details of the arrangements in case of fire or other events that might require the meeting room or building's evacuation.

### **4 PRIMARY SCHOOL EXPANSIONS 2012-13 - CALL-IN OF CABINET DECISION** (Pages 1 - 48)

**Ian Buckmaster  
Committee Administration &  
Member Support Manager**

This page is intentionally left blank

## CHILDREN & LEARNING OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

11 October 2012 (Special)

<b>Subject Heading:</b>	Requisition of Cabinet Decision regarding Primary School Expansions 2013/14
<b>CMT Lead:</b>	Sue Butterworth Director of Children's Services
<b>Report Author and contact details:</b>	Sean Cable Committee Officer <a href="mailto:sean.cable@havering.gov.uk">sean.cable@havering.gov.uk</a>
<b>Policy context:</b>	This decision has implications for all schools, located across all wards in the Borough.

In accordance with Paragraph 17 of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Rules, a requisition signed by two Members representing more than one Group (Councillors Clarence Barrett and Keith Darvill) has called in a decision of Cabinet dated 26 September 2012. The text of the requisition appears at the end of this report:

### **CABINET DECISION**

At its meeting on 26 September 2012 Cabinet considered a report on the proposals for primary school expansions in the borough for 2012-13, owing to a projected shortage of primary school places for September 2013, and made the following decisions:

1. the 15 schools listed in Appendix 1 (of the Cabinet Report) for proposed permanent expansion from September 2013 to meet the projected deficit of primary places;
2. statutory processes to be initiated to permanently expand the capacity of eight of those 15 schools by September 2013: Harold Court Primary; Harold Wood Primary; Pyrgo Priory Primary; St Patrick's Primary; Rise Park Infant and Junior schools; and Towers Infant and Junior schools;
3. the proposal to expand Branfil Primary School from 1 September 2013, following the Representation Period which ended on 31 August 2012;
4. Officers to take all necessary steps in order to deliver the expansion programme, including the submission of planning applications
5. the commencement of a tendering process for construction/ refurbishment works at issue of tenders for Harold Court Primary, Harold Wood Primary, Mead Primary, Parsonage Farm Primary, Rise Park Infant and Junior

schools, Towers Infant and Junior schools, together with all associated investigations e.g. soil survey

- 6 that the final allocation of available Capital funding as detailed within this report be delegated to the Lead Members for Children and Learning and Value, and the Group Directors of Children's Services and Finance and Commerce.

**Reasons for decisions:**

These decisions are necessary to provide sufficient additional primary places to meet the forecast rise in primary pupil numbers projected from September 2013 and beyond. The reasons for proposing specific schools for expansion are given in Appendix 1 of the Cabinet report.

**Other options considered and rejected:**

The option of adapting existing accommodation for 'bulge' (temporary) classes to respond to the projected deficit of primary places was considered because this would be more affordable and avoid the risk of providing permanent accommodation that might then become surplus in the foreseeable future.

This option was rejected because of the high level of confidence in the latest pupil forecasts for 2012 that project the birth rate will be sustained at the current high level for the medium term and the corroboration of these projections by the latest ONS forecasts. Given the long term confidence in forecasts the permanent expansion proposals were considered to provide best value for money and the preferred option of schools for responding to expansions.

In some planning areas there was more than one option for deciding on a school to expand for September 2013 and a clear rationale was given for each school being proposed and which is specified in Appendix 1. As projections of rising pupil numbers is forecast to continue, all schools that were not proposed for expansion in 2013 will be fully considered for any future programme.

The decision to proceed with planning applications and tendering arrangements in parallel with the statutory consultation process is a necessity in order to avoid delays in delivering the required capacity. In the event of the statutory consultation being unsuccessful, the planning permission and contract award will not be implemented.

## **REASONS FOR REQUISITION**

The reasons for the requisition were detailed on the formal notification and were detailed as follows:

1. to review the selection of 15 schools and Branfil School set out in the Report to Cabinet for permanent expansion;
2. to consider the capital and revenue financial risks predicted for the cost of expansion of the schools;
3. to review the timetable to deliver the proposed expansions.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Committee considers the requisition of the decision of Cabinet and determine whether to uphold it.**

This page is intentionally left blank





## CABINET

## REPORT

**26 September 2012**

**Subject Heading:**

Primary School Expansions 2013/14

**Cabinet Member:**

Cllr Rochford

Cllr Ramsey

**CMT Lead:**

Sue Butterworth

Group Director Children's Services

Andrew Blake-Herbert

Group Director Finance & Commerce

**Report Author and contact details:**

Mary Pattinson

Head of Learning & Achievement

01708 433808

Mark Butler

Head of Asset Management

01708 432947

**Policy context:**

The proposals have implications for all wards in the borough.

**Financial summary:**

The permanent expansions are estimated to cost £11.1m funded by £9.9m approved funding for primary expansions as per the 12/13 capital programme £1.1m Dedicated Schools Grant funding, and £0.1m additional S106 allocations.. In addition costs of the Branfil expansion and ks1 replacement are expected to be contained within the £5.5m funding available. The revenue implications for schools will be funded via the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) contingency. The revenue implications for the LA are still being quantified and will be raised through the appropriate channels.

**Is this a Key Decision?**

Yes

**Is this a Strategic Decision?**

Yes

**When should this matter be reviewed?**

September 2014.

**Reviewing OSC:**

Children's Services

Finance & Commerce

**The subject matter of this report deals with the following Council Objectives**

Ensuring a clean, safe and green borough	<input type="checkbox"/>
Championing education and learning for all	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Providing economic, social and cultural activity in thriving Towns and villages	<input type="checkbox"/>
Valuing and enhancing the lives of our residents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Delivering high customer satisfaction and a stable council tax	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*This version of the report is prepared in anticipation of the outcome of the consultation on the Commissioning School Places Strategy and the statutory consultation on expansion of Branfil P.S. and must be viewed as provisional only and subject to change.*

**SUMMARY**

The report to Cabinet on 11 July 2012 on Commissioning School Places recommended consultation on a draft strategy for ensuring the sufficiency of school places over the next five years. That consultation has now concluded and the Strategy finalised with some minor amendments. The report highlighted the shortage of primary school places projected for September 2013 and indicated that this further report would be presented to Cabinet in September 2012 offering specific proposals to address the projected shortage of places.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

That Cabinet approves:

1. the 15 schools listed in Appendix 1 for proposed permanent expansion from September 2013 to meet the projected deficit of primary places;
2. statutory processes to be initiated to permanently expand the capacity of eight of those 15 schools by September 2013: Harold Court Primary; Harold Wood Primary; Pyrgo Priory Primary; St Patrick's Primary; Rise Park Infant and Junior schools; and Towers Infant and Junior schools;
3. the proposal to expand Branfil Primary School from 1 September 2013, following the Representation Period which ended on 31 August 2012;

4. Officers to take all necessary steps in order to deliver the expansion programme, including the submission of planning applications
5. the commencement of a tendering process for construction/ refurbishment works at issue of tenders for Harold Court Primary, Harold Wood Primary, Mead Primary, Parsonage Farm Primary, Rise Park Infant and Junior schools, Towers Infant and Junior schools, together with all associated investigations e.g. soil survey
- 6 that the final allocation of available Capital funding as detailed within this report be delegated to the Lead Members for Children and Learning and Value, and the Group Directors of Children's Services and Finance and Commerce.

**REPORT DETAIL**

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 Cabinet, at its meeting on 11 July 2012, noted that there was a projected need for 103 permanent Year Reception classes for September 2013 and to meet this projected growth it was proposed to expand the capacity of a sufficient number of schools each by 15 or 30 pupils per year group, that is by either 0.5 or 1 form of entry (FE) for September 2013.
- 1.2 Therefore the proposals set out in this report detail the way in which the Local authority is proposing to meet that agreed need. It sets out the individual schools which have been selected to expand, the rationale for their inclusion and the indicative costs of each scheme. The schools have been selected based on the local authority's Commissioning School Places Strategy the draft of which was presented to Cabinet in July 2012 and then subject to consultation, being approved in slightly amended form by the Lead Member for Children & Learning on 17 September 2012.
- 1.3 For those schools with accommodation that can be brought back to general teaching use the Council can decide to admit pupils beyond their Published Admission Numbers ('PAN'). For those schools however that need additional accommodation to admit 200 pupils or more than 25% (as long as this is more than 30 pupils) of their existing 'net capacity' (whichever is the smaller figure), a statutory process of consultation will be necessary before the Council is able to agree the expansion. Therefore the second element that has been included is those school requiring a statutory consultation process.
- 1.4 For the Upminster area Branfil Primary is proposed school for expansion. A statutory process is required and this process was started much earlier than for the remaining eight schools in need of statutory proposals because

major building works were already planned and there was a need to complete the statutory process as soon as possible to enable expansion works to be included within the major project and thereby achieve best value.

**2. Expansion Proposals**

2.1 Details of the 15 expansion proposals for September 2013 are included in Appendix 1.

2.2 The table below summarises the projected deficit of forms of Entry (FE) for September 2013 for each planning area and indicates the shortfall remaining after the expansion proposals are considered.

Planning area	Deficit of FEs	Sum of proposed FEs	Balance
Romford	3	2	-1
Collier Row & Mawney	2	2.5	+0.5
Harold Hill	2	1.5	-0.5
Hornchurch	2	1.5	-0.5
South Hornchurch, Elm Park & Rainham	2	1.5	-0.5
Upminster	1	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>12</u></b>	<b><u>10</u></b>	<b><u>-2</u></b>

2.3 In Romford there is a remaining deficit of 1FE and options are currently being considered for providing a new 2FE (or larger) Free school or Academy by September 2014. Expansion proposals for neighbouring Collier Row and Mawney are a half a form of entry above the projected deficit which is expected to give sufficient flexibility to accommodate the additional pupil numbers in Romford in September 2013.

2.4 The shortfall of a half form of entry in each of the planning areas of Harold Hill, Hornchurch and South Hornchurch, Elm Park and Rainham will be made up by inviting a further school in each area to permanently admit 0.5 or 1FE from September 2013. This could be done for example by phasing building works and spreading the cost of expansions over a number of financial years or by looking at the feasibility of providing a bulge where possible.

2.5 Longer term the Council has successfully applied to rebuild and enlarge both Hacton Primary and Suttons Primary through the DFE's Priority Schools Building Programme and the latest indication is that both these projects would be completed in time for admitting additional numbers in September 2015.

**Branfil Primary School**

- 2.6 The consultation process has been completed and the Council is now at Stage 4 (of the statutory process required for changes for mainstream maintained schools (stages set out in paragraph 3.1 below). Stage 1 (statutory consultation) was undertaken between 11 June 2012 and 13 July 2012. Following consideration, by officers, of the outcome of that consultation the Head of Learning and Achievement concluded that there was no viable alternative to the expansion of this school and consequently gave approval to the publication of a statutory notice (Stage 2) setting out the Council's legal proposal to expand this school. Stage 3 of the statutory process comprised the 'Representation Period' from 3 August 2012 – 31 August 2012 during which further comments could be made. This stage marks the final opportunity for people to express views or raise relevant issues before the decision (Stage 4) is made.
- 2.7 In considering the proposal to expand Branfil Primary School the Council, as decision maker has four options. The Council can decide to approve the proposal, reject the proposal, approve the proposal with a modifications (e.g. the implementation date) or approve the proposal subject to meeting a specific condition from a range of circumstances set out the DfE Guidance. Officers have reviewed these options and, on the basis of the substantive rationale for expansion and in the light of the representations received, have concluded that the best option is to approve the proposal.
- 2.8 For Branfil the Council, as Decision Maker, is expected to undertake a number of 'procedural' checks on the formal statutory proposal before making a decision. These checks relate to the 'completeness' of the proposal in accordance with DfE guidance, compliance with statutory requirements, the quality of the consultation undertake at statutory stage 1 and whether the proposal is related in any way to other published statutory proposals. Officers can confirm that the statutory process covering the Branfil proposal complies with national guidance and requirements.
- 2.9 The Branfil Proposal must also be judged on the effect it has on school standards and improvement. Colleagues in HSIS have confirmed that expanding Branfil in the way being proposed will make a major contribution to further raising standards at the School leading to improved achievement for the young people it serves. The proposed new accommodation and the refurbishment of existing premises will provide greatly improved and more efficient education facilities, designed in full consultation with the School. Pupils, staff and the wider community will all benefit from an outstanding new and upgraded learning environment complementing and greatly enhancing the original building.
- 2.10 There are also a number of other benefits that the Proposal can provide to the education of pupils at Branfil Primary School providing yet further positive impact on school standards and effectiveness. There are considerable economies of scale that can enable the School to use the

additional funding in a flexible or targeted way. This can allow for the further development of learning resources, additional and specialist staffing, and more flexibility in class grouping arrangements and the deployment of teaching staff and learning assistants. It could also enable the School to expand and innovate its curriculum offer, offering a wider range of educational, sporting, musical or artistic opportunities. Increases in staffing numbers also provide additional options in terms of developing leadership areas within the school, and providing additional capacity to tackle any emerging priorities.

- 2.11 During the Representation Period for Branfil a total of fourteen representations were received and a petition signed by 308 local residents, included as Appendix 3. A summary of the representations made together with comments is shown as Appendix 2.
- 2.12 The objections made to the proposal within the petition centred on the arguments that while it is agreed Havering needs additional primary school places that need is in other parts of the Borough and not in Upminster. Also it was argued that the evidence presented by the Council for the need for places in Upminster was non-existent, incorrect, factually flawed and contradictory.
- 2.13 In response to the objections it should be made clear that the basis of the Council's proposal for providing places in Upminster is the substantial rise in the number of births *within* the Upminster locality and not related to housing developments or inward migration from neighbouring local authorities.
- 2.14 Births in the Upminster & Cranham area rose by 15.6% in the five year period 2006/07- 2010/11 and this is projected to lead to a deficit of pupil places equating to one form of entry (30 per year group) in Year Reception by Sept 2013; and potentially a further one form of entry deficit by 2016/17, based on existing trends. To meet the shortage of places in this planning area for Sept 2013 consideration was given to all primary phase schools in this planning area and Branfil was proposed because it was popular and successful, judged by OfSTED as Good, it was central rather than periphery to the growth area, and the Headteacher and Governing Body fully supported expansion. A more detailed response to the many substantial points made in the petition is included in Appendix 2.
- 2.15 In response to the separate objections made by local residents, the Council was very aware of the need to address the impact of the expansion on the local environment and commissioned Traffic and Transportation specialists Robert West to carry out traffic surveys, attend local resident and parent consultations and to support the school in producing a new Travel Plan for the enlarged school. This Plan promotes safer routes to school, discourages car journeys, and identifies the steps that will be taken to achieve these aims.

- 2.16 The Council carried out a full public consultation between 11 June and 13 July which included consultation meetings on 3 and 5 July. During this period it was made clear that the Representation period would take place during the summer from 3-31 August and consultees were alerted of the need for their representations to be made within this period and a large number of representations have been received. In common with most London Boroughs, Havering is experiencing a major growth in birth rate that has led to the need for additional primary places in all localities, including Upminster. The Council has a statutory duty to provide sufficient school places and every effort is made to listen to the comments and representations made by the school and local residents to ensure the school remains successful and the impact on the local environment is minimalised.
- 2.17 Cabinet is therefore recommended to approve the expansion proposals for Branfil Primary School

### **3. Next steps**

- 3.1 Where there is a need to apply the statutory process to increase the capacity of a primary school to enable it to admit additional numbers, the following timescale will be adopted:

<b>Key milestones</b>	<b>Date</b>
Cabinet decision to undertake statutory consultation	26 Sept 2012
<b>Statutory Stage 1</b> - Consultation period	15 Oct – 23 Nov 2012
Decision by Head of Learning & Achievement to publish Statutory Notices and Proposals	17 Dec 2012
<b>Statutory Stage 2</b> – Publication of Statutory Notices	4 Jan 2013
<b>Statutory Stage 3</b> – Representation Period	4 Jan 2013 – 1 Feb 2013
<b>Statutory Stage 4</b> - Decision on proposals by Head of Learning & Achievement	13 Feb 2013
<b>Statutory Stage 5</b> - Implementation	1 Sept 2013

- 3.2 Whilst every effort will be made to procure the technical supply chain for the capital element of the proposed school expansions to completion for 1 September 2013, the timetable for statutory consultation as detailed above results in there being a maximum of 6 months (February - August 2013) within which to undertake all building works, secure the cooperation of any utility companies, complete all internal finishes, install fixed furniture and equipment and render the site safe for occupation by pupils and staff. Consequently there is likely to be a significant programme risk to delivering the proposed expansion by September 2013 at those eight schools requiring a statutory consultation process in advance of construction works

commencing. The statutory process for enlarging Branfil Primary will be completed by September 2012, with the decision of Cabinet at this meeting.

- 3.3 An appropriate contingency plan will therefore be required if pupil projections for these schools exceed current capacity before September 2013. It is considered that the earliest feasible date for the expanded capacity to be available is the start of the January 2014 term
- 3.4 For Branfil Primary School the next step would be for the Council, as proposer, to implement its decision to expand the school on the date specified (1 September 2013) in the statutory notice.

### **Planning Applications**

- 3.5 Planning approval for proposed works at Branfil was granted by Regulatory Services Committee in June of this year. Separate planning applications will be required for the remaining schools where expansion is proposed and will be submitted later this year, with supporting studies and reports where required.

### **Tender Arrangements**

- 3.6 Havering, in common with other east London boroughs, has recently been party to the procurement of a new construction framework agreement for education and other services, procured in accordance with European procurement rules by the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
- 3.7 Use of the framework agreement offers the scope for tendering periods and costs to be reduced for the benefit of the expansion programme. Seven contractors have been approved within the framework, ensuring both that competitive tenders are achieved and that adequate capacity exists. The Council is also free to procure outside of the framework if circumstances warrant.
- 3.8 Given the tight timescales surrounding the programme, Cabinet are asked to give agreement in principle to the use of this construction framework to tender for the expansion of the schools detailed here. . The final award of individual tenders (and hence the commitment to expenditure) will be the result of separate approvals in due course, subject to a positive outcome from the statutory consultation process where applicable.



**REASONS AND OPTIONS**

**4. Reasons for the decision:**

- 4.1 These decisions are necessary to provide sufficient additional primary places to meet the forecast rise in primary pupil numbers projected from Sept 2013 and beyond. The reasons for proposing specific schools for expansion are given in Appendix 1.

**5. Other options considered:**

- 5.1 The option of adapting existing accommodation for 'bulge' (temporary) classes to respond to the projected deficit of primary places was considered because this would be more affordable and avoid the risk of providing permanent accommodation that might then become surplus in the foreseeable future.
- 5.2 This option was rejected because of the high level of confidence in the latest pupil forecasts for 2012 that project the birth rate will be sustained at the current high level for the medium term and the corroboration of these projections by the latest ONS forecasts. Given the long term confidence in forecasts the permanent expansion proposals are considered to provide best value for money and the preferred option of schools for responding to expansions.
- 5.3 In some planning areas there was more than one option for deciding on a school to expand for September 2013 and a clear rationale was given for each school being proposed and which is specified in Appendix 1. As projections of rising pupil numbers is forecast to continue, all schools that were not proposed for expansion in 2013 will be fully considered for any future programme.
- 5.4 The decision to proceed with planning applications and tendering arrangements in parallel with the statutory consultation process is a necessity in order to avoid delays in delivering the required capacity. In the event of the statutory consultation being unsuccessful, the planning permission and contract award will not be implemented.

**IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

**6. Financial implications and risks:**

**CAPITAL**

6.1 Implementation of the above expansions is dependant on the outcome of the statutory consultation process/a decision to formally expand the schools. However, at this stage, estimated costs are set out below. It should be noted that in some cases these are high level estimates as detailed design work has not taken place at all schools, so the actual costs will be subject to change. Fee levels may also impact on the estimates. Estimates also assume that despite the tight timescales it will be possible to deliver the expansion programme without the need for temporary accommodation. Should this not be possible then costs would increase further.

<b>School</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>
Towers Infant & Junior	1,750,000
Wykeham Primary	750,000
Pinewood Primary	500,000
St Patrick's Catholic Primary (see note 1)	400,000
Rise Park Infant & Junior	1,750,000
Mead Primary	1,000,000
Harold Court Primary	1,200,000
Harold Wood Primary	1,500,000
Parsonage Farm Primary	1,000,000
Scargill Infant & Junior	750,000
bulge classrooms - per ED	455,000
	<hr/>
	(see note 4)
	<hr/>
<b>Funding available</b>	
2012/13 Capital Programme allocation for primary expansions.	9,876,000
<b>DSG Allocation</b> (see note 2)	<b>1,060,000</b>
<b>Further Anticipated S106 Allocations</b> (see note 3)	<b>119,000</b>
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<b>11,055,000</b>
<b>Costs</b>	
Branfil Primary*	5,500,000
<b>Funding available</b>	
2012/13 Capital Programme allocation for Branfil primary – replacement of KS1 accommodation and expansion of 1.0FE	<b>5,500,000</b>

Note 1: St Patricks is a voluntary aided catholic school and will be procuring their own expansion, financially supported by the Council. Details of their specification and cost estimate are awaited.

Note 2: £1.36m was previously top sliced from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) to fund bridge funding costs associated with the primary review programme. However this was not needed as funding was available within the Councils overall treasury fund management. The Schools Forum subsequently agreed in 2012 that the funding could be reallocated to the primary expansion programme (£1,060k) and schools asbestos surveys (£300k). It should be noted that DSG funding can only be deployed on certain criteria per the grant stipulations.

Note 3: When preparing the 2012/13 Capital Programme it was envisaged that nine permanent expansions would be required in addition to the Branfil programme. At this stage a shortfall of £1m was envisaged which it was anticipated would be largely covered by the DSG allocation identified above. However, following further review 15 permanent expansions are now proposed. This increase in classrooms, coupled with more detailed design work has resulted in the need for additional funding. The Council is expecting to receive further S106 allocations, over and above those already anticipated within the £9,876,000 approved funding and as such it is recommended that they are allocated to the primary expansion programme.

Note 4: It should be noted that costs do not include estimates for the outstanding proposals for Romford (para 2.3)/additional 0.5 Forms of entry Harold Hill, Hornchurch and South Hornchurch, Elm Park and Rainham (para 2.4).

There is no cost listed related to Pyrgo Primary as the school already has capacity to admit 2FE.

6.2 It should be noted that exact costs of individual schemes may fluctuate as designs are clarified and tender processes undertaken. Every effort will be made to maintain costs within the funding currently identified. However, if final costs exceed £11.1 m and/or further expansion is required there are further potential options available to bridge any future shortfall, albeit they are not confirmed funding streams. The potential options are:

- Future years basic need grant allocations (if based on a similar level to 2012/13 – funding would be £8m per year) however this may be needed to fund future years expansion programmes. The first call on this grant would need to be the 2013/14 expansion programme should the gap not be addressed via other means, which could lead to similar issue arising in future years.
- Further Additional S106 allocations. The 2012/13 primary expansion Capital Programme was originally intended to be funded from £6.2m of

anticipated S106 allocations. However, to significantly reduce the risk of basing a capital programme on unconfirmed receipts £4.1m of this was replaced with additional 2012/13 basic need grant allocation received, leaving only £2.1m of S106 to be identified. To date we have received approximately £1.7m S106 monies and there are further agreements in place which may generate in excess of the £0.4m still to be identified. Arrangements are currently in place to review this situation. The Council is expecting to receive further S106 allocations, over and above those already allocated to this scheme, agreements exist for a number of schemes where the trigger levels for paying the Council have yet to be reached.

- 6.3 It may be possible to implement expansions in 2 phases, firstly providing KS1 (infant) accommodation and then providing KS2 (junior) provision at a later stage. This would allow further time to resolve any funding gaps.
- 6.4 Officers will continue to monitor the financial position of the expansion programme and should a shortfall of funding be identified raise this through the appropriate channels.,

## **REVENUE**

### **Implications for Schools**

- 6.5 The revenue implications for schools are that, in creating an additional class from September (eg Sept 12), additional resources will be incurred particularly for teaching and support staff. From the following financial year (eg 2013/14) the schools will receive additional funding through their budget shares as the pupils will be on roll at the date of the pupil census that is used to calculate funding. For the period September to March, however, additional resources will need to be provided. These will be met from a contingency held within the Schools Budget (funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant) as agreed by the Schools Funding Forum. As referred to above, the DSG will be increased from the following financial year as the Year R pupils are on roll; the bulk will be allocated to schools however there may be some available to fund LA services.
- 6.6 The contingency “pot” may reduce as a result of schools becoming academies and as such be insufficient to fund remaining schools for additional pupils.
- 6.7 It is proposed that from 2013/2014, the funding regime will be changing and contingency funds will be delegated to schools unless the schools forum approve otherwise. If a central contingency is not approved schools will be funded on the basis of pupils on roll in the previous January and will need to manage the in year financial consequences of any increase in admissions.

- 6.8 Schools may face financial difficulties if they have significant spare capacity as the level of funding attracted on a per pupil basis may not be sufficient to employ the required staffing levels. At present there is a factor within the schools funding formula to allow additional funds to be allocated in these circumstances. However this will no longer be permitted in future years.

**Implications for the Local Authority**

- 6.9 An increase in school admissions across the Borough may also have a 'knock-on effect' on other budgets such as free school meals, home to school transport, special school places and pupil referral units. The details of this are currently being quantified and any pressures will be dealt with accordingly.
- 6.10 The financial implications of the whole primary expansion programme will be kept under review as detailed plans for delivery of additional school places become clearer. This will consider the estimated capital costs and funding sources plus the revenue implications for schools and local authority. Any significant issues will be reported through the appropriate channels as necessary.

**7. Legal implications and risks:**

- 7.1 The draft Commissioning School Places Strategy approved by Cabinet at its meeting on 11 July has formally been approved by the Lead Member for Children Services, subject to some minor changes, following the formal consultation period.
- 7.2 The Council has a statutory duty to secure that efficient primary and secondary education are available to meet the needs of the population of their area. (section 13 Education Act 1996). It is clear that without the implementation of a strategy to increase the provision within the Borough over the next few years the Council may fall into breach of its statutory duty.
- 7.3 Under Schedule 11 of the Education Act 2011 (1) if a local authority in England thinks a new school needs to be established in their area, they must seek proposals for the establishment of an Academy.
- 7.4 Individual proposals are now being submitted to Cabinet for those six schools requiring statutory approval to expand their accommodation to admit additional pupil numbers ie above 200 pupils or 25%(provided this is more than 30 pupils) of all school places, whichever is the lesser. Any such proposals will be subject to consultation which must be meaningful. In other words sufficient time and information must be given to consultees to respond meaningfully and then their responses must be conscientiously considered before a final decision is taken.

7.5 The tendering and procurement processes for the construction and refurbishments will require separate advice in due course.

**8. Human Resources implications and risks:**

8.1 As a result of a decision supporting the expansion programme, there is a need to recruit additional teaching and support staff within the relevant schools. These schools will directly manage the recruitment and selection process in accordance with the existing and relevant HR policies and procedures. Schools' HR support in relation to these processes will be provided as appropriate.

**9. Equalities implications and risks:**

9.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment has been conducted and the conclusion is that there would be no identified adverse impacts.

**10. Appendices**

1. Details of the expansion proposals for September 2013
2. Summary of representations received to the Council's proposal to expand the capacity of Branfil Primary to admit three forms of entry from September 2013.
3. Petition from local residents.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- Havering School Planning Data Pack Spring 2012
- Havering Commissioning School Places Strategy 2012/13-2016/17
- Representations received in response to the publication of the statutory notice to expand Branfil Primary School.
- Executive Decision 91/12 – Use of Education and other Services Framework and commencement of tender process

Appendix 1						
Proposed Permanent Primary School Expansions for September 2013.						
<u>Planning area</u>	<u>Projected FE deficit 2013</u>	<u>Proposed school</u>	<u>Additional places provided</u>	<u>Statutory process required</u>	<u>Rationale for proposing</u>	<u>Capital implications</u>
Romford	3	Towers Infant & Junior	1FE (2-3FE)	✓	<p>These linked schools border a growth area and have sufficient site area to expand by 1FE. Both governing bodies are willing to expand. Ofsted judge the infants to be good and the juniors as satisfactory. Juniors have, however, improved their results significantly in 2012.</p> <p>A proposal to expand the junior school at a later date would need to be linked to the infant school proposal.</p>	An allocation of £1,750,000 is proposed however detailed design work and discussion with the schools is currently on going. Final allocation will be determined once design work is completed. There is currently no surplus capacity within these schools.
		Wykeham Primary	1FE (2-3FE)	x	The school has sufficient site area to expand by 1FE and significant surplus accommodation that can be efficiently utilised. Governors are willing to expand. New Headteacher has stabilised the school since it came out of an Ofsted category.	An allocation of £750,000 is proposed for the KS2 expansion in 2014-15 as the KS1 element of the expansion can be delivered by the use of surplus accommodation.
Collier Row & Mawney	2	Pinewood Primary	1FE (1-2FE)	x	The school has significant surplus capacity and governors are keen to permanently expand. Ofsted consider the school to be satisfactory but with good capacity.	It is proposed to allocate £500,000 for improvement works and classroom refurbishment in 2014-15
		St Patrick's Catholic	0.5FE (1.5-2FE)	✓	This popular and successful VA Catholic school is in a growth area and the governors are willing to expand with	A £400,000 allocation is proposed, the expansion will be delivered directly by the school.

		Primary			appropriate capital support to provide additional class bases. Ofsted judge the school to be good, with above average standards.	
		Rise Park Infant & Junior	1FE (2-3FE)	✓	These linked schools border a growth area and have sufficient site area to expand by 1FE. Both governing bodies are willing to expand. Infants judged as good by Ofsted, with the juniors as satisfactory. Standards usually above average. A proposal to expand the junior school at a later date would need to be linked to the infant school proposal.	An allocation of £1,750,000 is proposed however detailed design work and discussion with the schools is on going. Final allocation will be determined once design work is completed. There is currently no surplus capacity within these schools.
Harold Hill	2	Mead Primary	1FE (2-3FE)	x	This popular and successful school is within a growth area, with surplus accommodation in KS2 and the governors are willing to expand. Judged good by Ofsted with significant improvements in recent years.	It is proposed to allocate £1,000,000 to extend the existing KS1 block and refurbish the KS2 block in 2013-14
Hornchurch	2	Harold Court Primary	0.5FE (1.5-2FE)	✓	The school is within a growth area, has site capacity to expand by 0.5FE and is close to a major new housing development. Governors are willing to expand. Standards broadly average with Ofsted judging the school as satisfactory.	A £1,200,000 allocation is proposed for new build extension to match existing together with toilet upgrade for 2013-14.
		Harold Wood Primary	1FE (2-3FE)	✓	A popular and successful in a growth area and governors have agreed to permanent expansion subject to capital investment. Judged by Ofsted as good, the school has standards that are above average.	An allocation of £1,500,000 is proposed however this is a constrained site and may necessitate a more expensive build solution.
South	2	Parsonage	1FE	x	A popular and successful in a growth	It is proposed to allocate £1,000,000



Hornchurch Elm Park & Rainham		Farm Primary	(2-3FE)		area, with significant surplus accommodation and the governors are willing to expand. Ofsted judge the school as good.	for a KS1 extension in 2014-15.
		Scargill Infant & Junior	0.5FE (2.5-3FE)	x	Popular and successful linked schools within a growth area, with a surplus class base in the Infants. Governors of both schools are willing to expand. The infants is judged as outstanding by Ofsted, with the juniors as good. Standards in both schools are above average.	A £750,000 allocation is proposed for new build expansion in 2014-15.
Upminster	1	Branfil Primary	1FE (2-3FE)	✓	A popular and successful school where the opportunity of a major capital project presents the opportunity to expand. Statutory consultation ended on 13 July 2012. Judged by Ofsted as good. Statutory procedures have already begun for the proposed expansion of Branfil Primary.	£5,500,000 has been allocated for the rebuild of the KS1 block and refurbishment/remodelling of the KS2 block in 2013-14.
Harold Hill		Pyrgo Priory	0.5FE (1.5-2FE)	✓	This popular and successful school is within a growth area and the governors are willing to expand. Judged as good by Ofsted. The school has increased capacity to accommodate 2FE and there now needs to be a statutory process to confirm this expansion.	The school already has sufficient capacity for a 2FE (420 places) school.

<b>Appendix 2</b>		
Responses to the Representation Period for the Proposals to expand Branfil Primary School.		
Representation	Author	Comments
<p>1. The argument for the expansion of Branfil to take pupils from the Upminster area (or even Havering) is fatally flawed. That Havering as a whole need more school places is not in doubt, but the need is in other parts of the Borough, not Upminster. The evidence for the need in this area is non- existent or contradictory. The London Borough is spending £5M at Branfil on the basis of incorrect and misleading information.</p>	Local resident	<p>The local resident has made a number of points supporting the objection to the proposal. Assertions are made that the birth rate for 'Branfil feeder wards' is falling or stable; the birth rate is falling in Upminster &amp; Cranham; the Year Reception (YrR) population for Upminster and Cranham is due to rise by a very small amount; and Havering is providing places for other Boroughs rather than for local need.</p> <p>The statistical data referred to indicates that in Havering for the period 2006/07 to 2010/11 there has been a 16.2% increase in births and for the same period in Upminster &amp; Cranham the increase was 15.5%. These projections also show that by Sept 2012 there will be a shortfall of YrR and that the shortfall in this Year group rises to -36 by 2016/17. This projection takes into account the rising numbers of births by Havering residents, housing product in the vicinity, as well as migration. However the forecasters are clear that the main factors generating the projected growth are the substantial increase in the number of births; the growth of the cohort group between birth and YrR; and an increase across all primary year groups.</p>
<p>2. We do not object to the building of the school were it for children in this catchment area but considering it would not be then we think the school should remain for the capacity at present. Should you bring more children in and also more teachers the road and surrounding roads would not be sufficient at present each morning lunchtime and afternoon we cannot get in and out of the road if we can get off our drive has parents park across our drives ad if we ask them to move we are given abuse. Why should we pay high house prices and community charge so that we can live in an area and have better schooling and then people are brought in from outside perhaps schools should not be</p>	Local resident	<p>As outlined above, there is strong forecast data to indicate the need for an additional form of entry at primary stage in Upminster and an increase in births is a primary cause of the forecast rise in demand.</p> <p>Traffic and transportation advisory consultants were commissioned to survey existing traffic at school times and to provide the school with recommendations on how to discourage car journeys to school and make walking and travel by other forms of transport easier. The school has produced a revised travel plan for an enlarged school and will be robustly engaging with parents and pupils to discourage car journeys to and from school.</p>

<p>demolished then this would not happen.          The birth rate in Upminster cannot be that high unless pensioners are having babies!          Finally there isn't public transport to the school so parents would therefore drive as for parking and walking. We could not imagine this has most parents need to get as close to the school gates as they can.</p>		
<p><b>3.</b> A request is made to not disturb an Acacia tree planted on the school site in memoriam and the school railings that have survived the various scrap metal drives of the war years and are of historical importance.</p> <p>The proposed car park has spaces that although presumably within the size specified in outdated regulations, are too small and inaccessible in several areas for many modern cars, thus are likely to remain empty, while teachers continue to park in the road as at present.</p> <p>The parking chaos prevails in Cedar Avenue and beyond would be exacerbated significantly by additional intake. It is a complete fallacy to believe that any proposed advice on travelling to school will change the character of any parent. Without legislation and enforcement, people will continue to do as they wish.</p> <p>The proposed building extension is not in architectural harmony with the existing school, and better use could be made of the existing classrooms; one, for example, is currently used as a spacious office.</p> <p>The proposal appears to reduce the recreation area still further whilst significantly increasing the number of pupils.</p>	<p>Local resident</p>	<p>While no assurances can be given for the future, there are no plans to disturb either the tree or the railings as a part of the expansion proposals.</p> <p>The car park provision for the expanded school will fully meet the planning permission specifications.</p> <p>The school will operate a new Travel Plan for expanded numbers to discourage car journeys to and from school.</p> <p>The design of the new building has been approved by Planning control.</p> <p>Designs and space standards for all external areas of the expanded school, including playing fields and play grounds, conform to DFE</p>

		area guidelines.
<p><b>4.</b> Currently at Branfil there are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 62 out of Borough pupils, the equivalent of over two classes</li> <li>• 49 in Borough pupils with several primary schools between them and Branfil, 1.75 classes</li> <li>• 137 pupils from Hacton and St Andrews, 40 of which should attend a closer school, 1.6 classes</li> <li>• 15 fewer first choice applications in 2011/12 than places, 0.5 class</li> </ul>	<p>Chairman of the Cedar &amp; Lime Avenue Residents Association.</p> <p>Petition supported by 308 signatures.</p>	<p>Admissions to schools are not limited to pupils residing in the local area. The national framework ensures a system of open enrolment whereby parents are encouraged to consider schools that meet their requirements and they are through legislation free to apply to their preferred school. This policy aims to raise educational standards. Furthermore, projected pupil growth in the Upminster area is forecast a shortage of 30 places in Year Reception from Sept 2013 onwards, while the objection suggests there are currently places available across the range of year groups.</p> <p>Branfil is over subscribed by 118 first preferences for 2012/13.</p>
<p><b>4. (cont.)</b> Havering's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) 2010 states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the population of Havering is set to rise however the populations for Upminster, Hacton, and St Andrew's are due to fall 2010-2015</li> <li>• the majority of increase is in wards well away from Upminster</li> <li>• Upminster has the oldest population in the Borough and the overall number of elderly residents is set to rise, therefore the opportunity for lots of school children in Upminster is limited</li> <li>• The expected rise in population in the Borough is in wards where that are currently undergoing considerable residential development, Upminster has no land available for development</li> </ul>	<p>Chairman of the Cedar &amp; Lime Avenue Residents Association.</p> <p>Petition supported by 308 signatures.</p>	<p>The JSNA refers to the population as a whole while the Council's Pupil forecasts refer to the pupil population which determines the number of places needed in schools in future years.</p> <p>Births <i>within</i> the Upminster &amp; Cranham area rose by 15.6% in the five year period 2006/07- 2010/11 and this is projected to lead to a deficit of pupil places equating to one form of entry (30 per year group) in Year Reception by Sept 2013 in the area; and potentially a further one form of entry deficit by 2016/17. The main determinant of the projected rise in pupil numbers in Upminster is the substantial increase in births and not an increase in housing developments.</p>

<p><b>4. (cont.)</b> Council documents and statistics show the policy of increasing the size of Branfil is based on faulty information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The birth rate for all Branfil feeder wards (Upminster, Hacton, Cranham, and St Andrews is going down or stable</li> <li>• The birth rate by locality is falling in Upminster &amp; Cranham</li> <li>• Year Reception numbers for Upminster &amp; Cranham are due to rise by a small amount until 2016/17. However the graphs show the birth rate falling between 2009/10 and 2010/11</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Havering is a net importer of children from Thurrock, 508 in 2010/11. Aveley is the nearest centre in Thurrock to Branfil, up to 4 miles away. A 4 mile radius from Branfil would lead to a catchment area that extends to Rush Green, through Romford to Gallows Corner; difficult to believe Havering cannot find the pupils with that radius within the Borough</li> <li>• Branfil currently has 62 pupils out of Borough, along with the net importing of pupils from out of Borough shows Havering is providing places for other Boroughs rather than local need</li> </ul>	<p>Chairman of the Cedar &amp; Lime Avenue Residents Association.</p> <p>Petition supported by 308 signatures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council's data shows that while births in Hacton fell by 12.8% in the period 2006/07-2010/11, births in all other wards referred to within this period rose significantly: Upminster +8.8%, Cranham +26.1%, St.Andrews 5.9%</li> <li>• The number of births in the Upminster &amp; Cranham locality rose by 15.6% during the period 2006/07-2010/11</li> <li>• While the number of births falls in one year between 2009/10 and 2010/11, over the five year period 2006/07 to 2010/11 births rose by 15.6% which is the basis for projecting growth in YrR. By 2016/17 YrR numbers are projected to exceed the number of YrR places by 36. Class size legislation prohibits class sizes for Years R-2 going above 30 and therefore by this time there would be a need for an additional two forms of entry in Upminster, especially when we consider the need to provide some additional places to allow for flexibility in forecast numbers.</li> <li>• Admissions to schools are not limited to pupils residing within the Borough boundary and the legally binding Greenwich Judgement has decided that local authorities cannot give preference to children residing within their boundary.</li> <li>• The basis for proposing the need for an additional form of entry in Upminster in YrR from Sept 2013 is the increase in the number of births <i>within</i> the Upminster &amp; Cranham locality and not inward migration of pupils.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.</b> There is already enough space at Branfil to cover the Upminster area, so the children attending would be from out of the area. Do they pay the same contributions as we do? Our council tax is considerably higher which is therefore unfair that they use our schools and don't have to pay the same as us.</p>	<p>Local Resident</p>	<p>Births <i>within</i> the Upminster &amp; Cranham area rose by 15.6% in the five year period 2006/07- 2010/11 and this is projected to lead to a deficit of pupil places equating to one form of entry (30 per year group) in Year Reception by Sept 2013 in the area; and potentially a further one form of entry deficit by 2016/17.</p>

<p><b>6.</b> Although the school is in need of refurbishing I object most strongly to the expansion of the school to accommodate children from outside of the Upminster area.</p> <p>This will cause inconvenience to all residents as there is lack of parking, lack of access roads which has already been terrible since our own children were at the school, over 25 years ago. This money could be put to better use elsewhere in the borough.</p>	<p>Local Resident</p>	<p>Births <i>within</i> the Upminster &amp; Cranham area rose by 15.6% in the five year period 2006/07- 2010/11 and this is projected to lead to a deficit of pupil places equating to one form of entry (30 per year group) in Year Reception by Sept 2013 in the area; and potentially a further one form of entry deficit by 2016/17.</p> <p>Traffic consultants have been commissioned to investigate the impact of expansion of the school on the local community. The Travel Plan that will be produced as a result of this investigation will be adopted by the school.</p>
<p><b>7.</b> There is no proven need for the increase in numbers for Branfil School within the Upminster or Cranham area.</p> <p>I do not want increased traffic issues in front of my house, as students are driven to and from the school each day, as there is not proven local need.</p>	<p>Local Resident</p>	<p>Comments as for 6 above.</p>
<p><b>8.</b> There is no proven need for the increase in places at Branfil School from within the Upminster or Cranham area. The vast majority of the increase in Havering's population is in wards well away from Upminster meaning this school expansion would generate large amounts of extra traffic as pupils are transported in. Gaynes Park Road is already excessively congested at peak times. It will not cope with increased traffic. How can this be consistent with the council's sustainable transport obligations? The evidence for the need in this area is non-existent meaning the expense and negative environmental impact cannot be justified. The council should not proceed with this plan in Upminster.</p>	<p>Local Resident</p>	<p>Comments as for 6 above.</p>
<p><b>9.</b> There are currently pupils attending Branfil School from out of Havering however the populations for Upminster, Hacton and St, Andrews, the three Wards that provide most of Branfil's pupils, are due to fall between 2010 and 2015. This means that more pupils</p>	<p>Local Resident</p>	<p>Comments as for 6 above.</p>

<p>from out of the area will be taking up the places at Branfil's and not from the Upminster area.</p> <p>There is a very big problem of parking in the area from people bringing children to Branfil's by car and as these extra places will be taken by more children out of the area it will get worse also inconsiderate parking and not being able to make journeys by car until the area has been cleared of traffic.</p> <p>Emergency services also have a problem getting through if needed.</p>		<p>The London Emergency Planning Authority and Fire Service were consulted during the planning stage of the project and approval to the plans was given.</p>
<p><b>10.</b> There is no proven need for additional spaces in the Upminster Area.</p> <p>I also query the fact that this consultation is taking place after Planning Permission has been granted for new and expanded building for Branfil School.</p>	<p>Local Resident</p>	<p>Comments as for 6 above.</p> <p>The Council needed the assurance, through the approval of its planning application that the project could proceed once the statutory school organisation proposal had been approved.</p>
<p><b>11.</b> We are local residents and parents of a child at Branfil School. We consider Branfil to be a good school in pleasant surroundings. We object to an increase in pupil numbers for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be an increase in traffic in and around Cedar Avenue which already gets quite heavily congested with some children travelling in from Thurrock and Grays. This not only causes annoyance to local residents and parents but increased traffic could also pose a safety issue for the children.</li> <li>• Upminster has an ageing population so the proposed expansion will see more children coming into Upminster from outside the area. If there is a need for extra school places due to an increase in Havering's birth rate then from an eco - friendly point of view, a new school or school expansion should take place in these areas of higher birth rate.</li> <li>• Building on the Junior playground will remove some of the outdoor space and the smaller playground will need to accommodate more children.</li> </ul>	<p>Local Resident</p>	<p>Traffic consultants have been commissioned to investigate the impact of expansion of the school on the local community. The Travel Plan for an expanded school that will be produced as a result of this investigation will be adopted by the school.</p> <p>Branfil School has sufficient land and capacity for expansion and the Head and Chair of Governors have been fully consulted on the building works proposed and support the project scheme.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The additional building work will create noise and other disruption for the children. If only the damaged part of the infant block was demolished and replaced this would be a quicker project and therefore less disruptive.</li> <li>• From an aesthetic point of view, the new building is unlikely to blend in with the local area and will look as if it's been "crammed in".</li> <li>• The demand for extra school places should be met by a school with more land than Branfil or the development of a new school elsewhere in Havering.</li> </ul>		<p>Branfil has sufficient land for a three form entry school, including the detached playing field.</p>
<p><b>12.</b> An increase to the pupil intake of the school, of children from outside the local area, will increase the traffic volume and heighten the existing parking problems local residents already experience.</p> <p>Havering Council claims the proposed extension to Branfil School in Upminster, which will increase the number of pupils from 420 to 630, is urgently needed because of local and national birth rate projections. The council is being economical with the truth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In a Freedom of Information request, the council has had to supply the latest figures from the school census (January 2011) and the Havering Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (2010). Contrary to public statements from the council and cabinet members, the populations of Upminster, Hacton and St Andrews wards – the three wards providing most of Branfil pupils - are due to fall between 2010 and 2015. The same figures show that the increase in population is occurring in wards well away from Upminster.</li> <li>• The latest Office of National Statistics figures show the expected rise in Havering's population is in wards currently undergoing residential development, i.e. Harold Wood, Brooklands, Romford and South Hornchurch.</li> <li>• Havering Council's own 2012/13 school intake data for Branfil states it had 60 places available for the 2012/13 reception</li> </ul>	<p>Local Resident</p>	<p>Traffic consultants have been commissioned to investigate the impact of expansion of the school on the local community. The Travel Plan for an expanded school, that will be produced as a result of this investigation, will be adopted by the school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The JSNA refers to the population as a whole while the Council's Pupil forecasts refer to the pupil population which determines the number of places needed in schools in future years. Births <i>within</i> the Upminster &amp; Cranham area rose by 15.6% in the five year period 2006/07- 2010/11 and this is projected to lead to a deficit of pupil places equating to one form of entry (30 per year group) in Year Reception by Sept 2013 in the area; and potentially a further one form of entry deficit by 2016/17.</li> <li>• The main determinant of the projected rise in pupil numbers in Upminster is the substantial increase in births and not an increase in housing developments.</li> <li>• Branfil is over subscribed by 118 first preferences for 2012/13.</li> </ul>



<p>year. All of the 52 children in Havering who applied to Branfil as their first choice were accepted. An additional seven applied from Thurrock and one pupil from Barking &amp; Dagenham. So Havering is not short of places. Indeed, there are currently 62 pupils at Branfil from outside of Havering. On this basis, the school expansion is not needed for local Upminster children. I am all for improving schools, particularly Branfil which has some very dilapidated buildings that need replacing, but school extensions should be in the wards that need them the most.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Branfil School is in a very quiet residential area and may become one of the largest in the borough simply so the council can get additional funding from central government to re-build dilapidated classrooms and replenish dwindling local authority coffers. As a result, local residents will have an increased volume of traffic and street parking in the roads surrounding the school. The narrow side streets in the area surrounding the school were not built for high volumes of traffic. If the school enlargement goes ahead, these streets will now need to handle an additional 210 parental cars and an additional 30+ staff cars. The staff car parking provision in the application is not sufficient for the anticipated increase in staff numbers. The roads impacted by the proposal are not just Cedar Avenue, Acacia Gardens and South View Drive - i.e. the roads mentioned in the traffic study - but also Gaynes Park Road which is already very busy during the school run in the morning and afternoon, and gets clogged with parked cars, so much so that it can be difficult to safely get out of my drive. Visibility down the street is poor when cars are parked by the roadside during school drop off/pick up and this will only get worse. Consequently I am concerned with the increased risk of a child being injured or even killed by a car. In addition, I am not happy with the prospect of the increased noise elevated</li></ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Traffic consultants have been commissioned to investigate the impact of expansion of the school on the local community. The Travel Plan for an expanded school, that will be produced as a result of this investigation, will be adopted by the school.</li></ul>
---	--	---

<p>traffic levels will bring to Gaynes Park Road. Like many other people in Upminster, we chose to live in this area because it is a quiet residential area. We want to keep it that way.</p>		
<p><b>13.</b> I chose Branfil Primary school for my children not because it was the nearest school to me as I was also considering Upminster Infants school, but primarily due the fact that it was a small school which gave it an advantage over other schools in the area. At present the teachers know all the pupils, the Head also knows all the pupils and parents, this is vital when problems need to be addressed. The head knows who his pupils are rather than a name on a list. It also leads to a friendly atmosphere and a sense of cohesion and community. The increase of 210 pupils will have a negative impact on this community and I believe on the quality of the teaching and I can see Branfil's performance falling as a result which would be a dreadful shame.</p> <p>The argument is that Havering needs more school places, this may well be but it should be targeted at the areas that are in the greatest need. This is not Upminster. We have the highest proportion of elderly in the borough and that is unlikely to change as it is becoming increasingly harder for young couples to get on the housing ladder at all let alone in an affluent area such as Upminster. As Branfil already has some pupils from outside the area mainly being Aveley and South Ockendon this would indicate that under the admission guidelines there are certainly enough places for Upminster children other wise they would have had priority distance wise than those living further away.</p> <p>The council is also ignoring the environmental impact of this proposal. The government wants everyone to reduce their carbon footprint and green issues are very high profile, how then can it be environmentally friendly to make pupils travel longer distances none of which will be on foot. The parents of these children if they have a car will be forced to drive to school which at that time of the</p>	<p>Local Resident &amp; Parent</p>	<p>Branfil is a successful school, judged by OfSTED to be good, and the Head and Chair of Governors who fully support the proposal, believe an enlarged school will be able to sustain these high standards.</p> <p>Births <i>within</i> the Upminster &amp; Cranham area rose by 15.6% in the five year period 2006/07- 2010/11 and this is projected to lead to a deficit of pupil places equating to one form of entry (30 per year group) in Year Reception by Sept 2013 in the area; and potentially a further one form of entry deficit by 2016/17. The main determinant of the projected rise in pupil numbers in Upminster is the substantial increase in births and not an increase in housing developments.</p> <p>The Council was very aware of the need to address the impact of the expansion on the local environment and commissioned Traffic and Transportation specialists Robert West to carry out traffic surveys, attend local resident and parent consultations and to support the school in producing a new Travel Plan for the enlarged school. This Plan promotes safer routes to school, discourages car journeys, and identifies the steps that will be taken to achieve these aims.</p>

day is a long, fuel consuming journey. Then where will they park? Of course most will want to park as near as possible to the school which means either Cedar Avenue itself or the surrounding roads. Currently Cedar Avenue is heavily congested at school times with double parking, blocking of drives and general inconsideration very much the norm. Surrounding roads are affected at the moment too, it is already a dangerous situation. If an ambulance or fire engine needed to gain access to the school at these times it would fail thereby putting children's lives at risk that is not acceptable. If you add another 210 cars into the mix I shudder to think what the outcome will be. I live in Lime Avenue which at present has some school traffic parking in it but generally is much less than Cedar, 8 weeks ago 2 ambulances needed to attend to my neighbour in an emergency at school start time, if this had happened with the proposed volume of traffic and parking they wouldn't have stood a chance.

The council were happy to ignore Branfil's failing building needs for many years and it has now only acted due to parent pressure in the past year over the state of the classrooms. These parents who acted on their children's interests have been cheated. All we wanted were suitable classrooms for our children to be taught in, mainly the rebuilding of the KS1 site, I don't think anyone who campaigned for this to happen would think it would lead to a larger school and most do not want this to happen. Unfortunately due to some clever propaganda by both the council and the school, a lot of parents think that the funding will only become available for new classrooms if the school becomes 3 form entry. Why was the public notice giving details of the proposal and how to object posted on the school gate at a date when the council knew no parents would see it as the school is closed for the summer holiday and the deadline for objections to the proposal ends before the school re-opens. Forgive me for being cynical but the

The Council carried out a full public consultation between 11 June and 13 July which included consultation meetings on 3 and 5 July. During this period it was made clear that the Representation period would take place during the summer from 3-31 August and consultees were alerted of the need for their representations to be made within this period and a large number of representations have been received.

In common with most London Boroughs, Havering is experiencing a major growth in birth rate that has led to the need for additional primary places in all localities, including Upminster. The Council has a statutory duty to provide sufficient school places and every effort is made to listen to the comments and representations made by the school and local residents to ensure the school remains successful and the impact on the local environment is minimalised.

<p>planning of that publication date couldn't have worked out better for the council. Luckily those residents with children at the school may have seen it and I for one have passed on the information to anyone I know.</p> <p>Branfil is not the right school for expanding. I believe it will destroy the very thing that made most parents choose it in the first place. Branfil is in the middle of a quiet residential area with no direct public transport links. The school spaces are not needed in Upminster, they should be made available where the most need is.</p>		<p>To meet the shortage of places in this planning area for Sept 2013 consideration was given to all primary phase schools in this planning area and Branfil was proposed because it was popular and successful, judged by OfSTED as Good, it was central rather than periphery to the growth area, and the Headteacher and Governing Body fully support expansion.</p>
<p><b>14.</b> We support the proposal to expand Branfil Primary School from two to three form entry as set out in the statutory notice.</p>	<p>Various</p> <p>Online petition supported by 61 individuals</p>	<p>Signatories included the Chair of Governors and Headteacher.</p>
<p><b>15.</b> I am very concerned that there is no capacity in this location to cope with such an enlargement. Access to the school is mostly in Cedar Avenue which is not wide enough to take the school traffic at present. Any increase will be unacceptable.</p> <p>Regular control of the traffic will be needed even at the present pupil numbers let alone an increase. The particular rudeness of parents already attending the school with regard to the lack of consideration shown to local residents should be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Cars arriving (at the school) as early as 7.30am....would pose a nuisance with noise and disturbance...</p>	<p>Local Resident</p>	<p>Every effort will be taken to minimise the impact of the expansion on local residents. Traffic consultants have been commissioned to investigate the impact of expansion of the school on the local community. The Travel Plan for an expanded school, which will be produced as a result of this investigation, will be adopted by the school.</p>
<p><b>16.</b> I do not feel that adequate research has been carried out into the impact on traffic conditions and the environmental impact of increased vehicle traffic. The traffic conditions at school opening</p>	<p>Local Resident</p>	<p>Traffic consultants have been commissioned to investigate the impact of expansion of the school on the local community. The Travel Plan for an expanded school, which will be produced as a result of this</p>

<p>and closing times are currently too much and possibly dangerous. Cedar Avenue is blocked every day and if an emergency vehicle needs to access Cedar (Avenue) it is impossible and any proposed expansion will exacerbate this problem. Cedar Avenue itself is a narrow road and only takes two vehicles to park opposite each other for the road to be blocked. This is unacceptable, Emergency services should have good and free access to the school, I doubt this is the case at present and if the pupil numbers are increased then unencumbered access for emergency services needs to be essential.</p> <p>Pupils from outside the borough should not be taken in (to Branfil Primary School), if there is a lack of space for Havering Children then it can be addressed by stopping children attending schools who do not live in the borough.</p> <p>...birth rates...are not increasing in Upminster, Upminster has one of the oldest generations in Havering. The Councils own documentation shows that only 1 pupil per year is coming from new developments in Upminster, that is because Upminster has no residential development opportunities that will generate more families.</p> <p>The councils own documentation shows that population increases will be in Harold Wood, Romford and South Hornchurch and so any school developments should be local to these areas so that they can serve the local community.</p> <p>Branfil is not served by public transport. The nearest bus stop is some 15 - 20 minutes walk. This will mean an unacceptable increase in vehicle transport and the resulting emissions that will bring. School expansion should be on roads that are served</p>	<p>investigation, will be adopted by the school.</p> <p>Emergency Services were consulted during the planning stage of the project and approval to the plans was given.</p> <p>The Council, as admissions authority for Branfil Primary School, is legally bound to offer places at schools according to national guidelines and requirements. It would not be possible to refuse to offer a school place on demand simply because a child lived in a different local authority from that in which the school is located.</p> <p>Births <i>within</i> the Upminster &amp; Cranham area rose by 15.6% in the five year period 2006/07- 2010/11 and this is projected to lead to a deficit of pupil places equating to one form of entry (30 per year group) in Year Reception by Sept 2013 in the area; and potentially a further one form of entry deficit by 2016/17. The main determinant of the projected rise in pupil numbers in Upminster is the substantial increase in births and not an increase in housing developments.</p> <p>Yes there is increased demand for additional places in these areas and the Council already has proposals in place for dealing with this.</p> <p>It would not be practicable to limit the provision of additional school places to those schools located on roads served directly by public transport.</p>
--	---

<p>directly by public transport.</p> <p>One major concern is the lack of Playing fields at Branfil. The playing field is a 5 minute walk away from the school and means pupils crossing a busy road. The playing fields are not accessible by pupils at break times and so no large soft play area is available. The playing field at the moment is not that big and with the proposed increase in pupil numbers I question if it will be big enough. Has a risk assessment been carried out on the fact that pupils will need to be walked on foot from the school to the playing field each time for field sports and activities?</p> <p>I object to this proposal, it is not required in Upminster and a more suitable location should be sought.</p>		<p>Branfil School has sufficient land and capacity for this proposed expansion</p> <p>No alternative options for dealing with the need for additional places were identified during the consultation stage relating to this proposal.</p>
<p><b>17</b> Gaynes Park Road is a very busy road. This year I have had early hospital appointments, and have not been able to pull out into the road because of cars and traffic jam. This proposal to enlarge Branfil is going to make this situation much worse.</p>	<p>Local Resident</p>	<p>Emergency Services were consulted during the planning stage of the project and approval to the plan was given.</p>

**Appendix 2**

## Responses to the Representation Period for the Proposals to expand Branfil Primary School.

Representation	Author	Comments
<p>1. The argument for the expansion of Branfil to take pupils from the Upminster area (or even Havering) is fatally flawed. That Havering as a whole need more school places is not in doubt, but the need is in other parts of the Borough, not Upminster. The evidence for the need in this area is non- existent or contradictory. The London Borough is spending £5M at Branfil on the basis of incorrect and misleading information.</p>	Local resident	<p>The local resident has made a number of points supporting the objection to the proposal. Assertions are made that the birth rate for 'Branfil feeder wards' is falling or stable; the birth rate is falling in Upminster &amp; Cranham; the Year Reception (YrR) population for Upminster and Cranham is due to rise by a very small amount; and Havering is providing places for other Boroughs rather than for local need.</p> <p>The statistical data referred to indicates that in Havering for the period 2006/07 to 2010/11 there has been a 16.2% increase in births and for the same period in Upminster &amp; Cranham the increase was 15.5%. These projections also show that by Sept 2012 there will be a shortfall of YrR and that the shortfall in this Year group rises to -36 by 2016/17. This projection takes into account the rising numbers of births by Havering residents, housing product in the vicinity, as well as migration. However the forecasters are clear that the main factors generating the projected growth are the substantial increase in the number of births; the growth of the cohort group between birth and YrR; and an increase across all primary year groups.</p>
<p>2. We do not object to the building of the school were it for children in this catchment area but considering it would not be then we think the school should remain for the capacity at present. Should you bring more children in and also more teachers the road and surrounding roads would not be sufficient at present each morning lunchtime and afternoon we cannot get in and out of the road if we can get off our drive has parents park across our drives ad if we ask them to move we are given abuse. Why should we pay high house prices and community charge so that we can live in an area and have better schooling and then people are brought in from outside perhaps schools should not be demolished then this would not happen. The birth rate in Upminster cannot be that high unless pensioners are having babies!</p>	Local resident	<p>As outlined above, there is strong forecast data to indicate the need for an additional form of entry at primary stage in Upminster and an increase in births is a primary cause of the forecast rise in demand.</p> <p>Traffic and transportation advisory consultants were commissioned to survey existing traffic at school times and to provide the school with recommendations on how to discourage car journeys to school and make walking and travel by other forms of transport easier. The school has produced a revised travel plan for an enlarged school and will be robustly engaging with parents and pupils to discourage car journeys to and from school.</p>

<p>Finally there isn't public transport to the school so parents would therefore drive as for parking and walking. We could not imagine this has most parents need to get as close to the school gates as they can.</p>		
<p><b>3.</b> A request is made to not disturb an Acacia tree planted on the school site in memoriam and the school railings that have survived the various scrap metal drives of the war years and are of historical importance.</p> <p>The proposed car park has spaces that although presumably within the size specified in outdated regulations, are too small and inaccessible in several areas for many modern cars, thus are likely to remain empty, while teachers continue to park in the road as at present.</p> <p>The parking chaos prevails in Cedar Avenue and beyond would be exacerbated significantly by additional intake. It is a complete fallacy to believe that any proposed advice on travelling to school will change the character of any parent. Without legislation and enforcement, people will continue to do as they wish.</p> <p>The proposed building extension is not in architectural harmony with the existing school, and better use could be made of the existing classrooms; one, for example, is currently used as a spacious office.</p> <p>The proposal appears to reduce the recreation area still further whilst significantly increasing the number of pupils.</p>	Local resident	<p>While no assurances can be given for the future, there are no plans to disturb either the tree or the railings as a part of the expansion proposals.</p> <p>The car park provision for the expanded school will fully meet the planning permission specifications.</p> <p>The school will operate a new Travel Plan for expanded numbers to discourage car journeys to and from school.</p> <p>The design of the new building has been approved by Planning control.</p> <p>Designs and space standards for all external areas of the expanded school, including playing fields and play grounds, conform to DFE area guidelines.</p>
<p><b>4.</b> Currently at Branfil there are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 62 out of Borough pupils, the equivalent of over two classes</li> <li>• 49 in Borough pupils with several primary schools between them and Branfil, 1.75 classes</li> </ul>	Chairman of the Cedar & Lime	<p>Admissions to schools are not limited to pupils residing in the local area. The national framework ensures a system of open enrolment whereby parents are encouraged to consider schools that meet their requirements and they are through legislation free to apply to their preferred school.</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 137 pupils from Hacton and St Andrews, 40 of which should attend a closer school, 1.6 classes</li> <li>• 15 fewer first choice applications in 2011/12 than places, 0.5 class</li> </ul>	<p>Avenue Residents Association.</p> <p>Petition supported by 308 signatures.</p>	<p>This policy aims to raise educational standards. Furthermore, projected pupil growth in the Upminster area is forecast a shortage of 30 places in Year Reception from Sept 2013 onwards, while the objection suggests there are currently places available across the range of year groups.</p> <p>Branfil is over subscribed by 118 first preferences for 2012/13.</p>
<p><b>4. (cont.)</b> Havering's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) 2010 states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the population of Havering is set to rise however the populations for Upminster, Hacton, and St Andrew's are due to fall 2010-2015</li> <li>• the majority of increase is in wards well away from Upminster</li> <li>• Upminster has the oldest population in the Borough and the overall number of elderly residents is set to rise, therefore the opportunity for lots of school children in Upminster is limited</li> <li>• The expected rise in population in the Borough is in wards where that are currently undergoing considerable residential development, Upminster has no land available for development</li> </ul>	<p>Chairman of the Cedar &amp; Lime Avenue Residents Association.</p> <p>Petition supported by 308 signatures.</p>	<p>The JSNA refers to the population as a whole while the Council's Pupil forecasts refer to the pupil population which determines the number of places needed in schools in future years.</p> <p>Births <i>within</i> the Upminster &amp; Cranham area rose by 15.6% in the five year period 2006/07- 2010/11 and this is projected to lead to a deficit of pupil places equating to one form of entry (30 per year group) in Year Reception by Sept 2013 in the area; and potentially a further one form of entry deficit by 2016/17. The main determinant of the projected rise in pupil numbers in Upminster is the substantial increase in births and not an increase in housing developments.</p>

<p><b>4. (cont.)</b> Council documents and statistics show the policy of increasing the size of Branfil is based on faulty information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The birth rate for all Branfil feeder wards (Upminster, Hacton, Cranham, and St Andrews is going down or stable</li> <li>• The birth rate by locality is falling in Upminster &amp; Cranham</li> <li>• Year Reception numbers for Upminster &amp; Cranham are due to rise by a small amount until 2016/17. However the graphs show the birth rate falling between 2009/10 and 2010/11</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Havering is a net importer of children from Thurrock, 508 in 2010/11. Aveley is the nearest centre in Thurrock to Branfil, up to 4 miles away. A 4 mile radius from Branfil would lead to a catchment area that extends to Rush Green, through Romford to Gallows Corner; difficult to believe Havering cannot find the pupils with that radius within the Borough</li> <li>• Branfil currently has 62 pupils out of Borough, along with the net importing of pupils from out of Borough shows Havering is providing places for other Boroughs rather than local need</li> </ul>	<p>Chairman of the Cedar &amp; Lime Avenue Residents Association.</p> <p>Petition supported by 308 signatures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council's data shows that while births in Hacton fell by 12.8% in the period 2006/07-2010/11, births in all other wards referred to within this period rose significantly: Upminster +8.8%, Cranham +26.1%, St.Andrews 5.9%</li> <li>• The number of births in the Upminster &amp; Cranham locality rose by 15.6% during the period 2006/07-2010/11</li> <li>• While the number of births falls in one year between 2009/10 and 2010/11, over the five year period 2006/07 to 2010/11 births rose by 15.6% which is the basis for projecting growth in YrR. By 2016/17 YrR numbers are projected to exceed the number of YrR places by 36. Class size legislation prohibits class sizes for Years R-2 going above 30 and therefore by this time there would be a need for an additional two forms of entry in Upminster, especially when we consider the need to provide some additional places to allow for flexibility in forecast numbers.</li> <li>• Admissions to schools are not limited to pupils residing within the Borough boundary and the legally binding Greenwich Judgement has decided that local authorities cannot give preference to children residing within their boundary.</li> <li>• The basis for proposing the need for an additional form of entry in Upminster in YrR from Sept 2013 is the increase in the number of births <i>within</i> the Upminster &amp; Cranham locality and not inward migration of pupils.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.</b> There is already enough space at Branfil to cover the Upminster area, so the children attending would be from out of the area. Do they pay the same contributions as we do? Our council tax is considerably higher which is therefore unfair that they use our schools and don't have to pay the same as us.</p>	<p>Local Resident</p>	<p>Births <i>within</i> the Upminster &amp; Cranham area rose by 15.6% in the five year period 2006/07- 2010/11 and this is projected to lead to a deficit of pupil places equating to one form of entry (30 per year group) in Year Reception by Sept 2013 in the area; and potentially a further one form of entry deficit by 2016/17.</p>

<p><b>6.</b> Although the school is in need of refurbishing I object most strongly to the expansion of the school to accommodate children from outside of the Upminster area.</p> <p>This will cause inconvenience to all residents as there is lack of parking, lack of access roads which has already been terrible since our own children were at the school, over 25 years ago. This money could be put to better use elsewhere in the borough.</p>	Local Resident	<p>Births <i>within</i> the Upminster &amp; Cranham area rose by 15.6% in the five year period 2006/07- 2010/11 and this is projected to lead to a deficit of pupil places equating to one form of entry (30 per year group) in Year Reception by Sept 2013 in the area; and potentially a further one form of entry deficit by 2016/17.</p> <p>Traffic consultants have been commissioned to investigate the impact of expansion of the school on the local community. The Travel Plan that will be produced as a result of this investigation will be adopted by the school.</p>
<p><b>7.</b> There is no proven need for the increase in numbers for Branfil School within the Upminster or Cranham area.</p> <p>I do not want increased traffic issues in front of my house, as students are driven to and from the school each day, as there is not proven local need.</p>	Local Resident	Comments as for 6 above.
<p><b>8.</b> There is no proven need for the increase in places at Branfil School from within the Upminster or Cranham area. The vast majority of the increase in Havering's population is in wards well away from Upminster meaning this school expansion would generate large amounts of extra traffic as pupils are transported in.</p> <p>Gaynes Park Road is already excessively congested at peak times. It will not cope with increased traffic. How can this be consistent with the council's sustainable transport obligations? The evidence for the need in this area is non-existent meaning the expense and negative environmental impact cannot be justified. The council should not proceed with this plan in Upminster.</p>	Local Resident	Comments as for 6 above.
<p><b>9.</b> There are currently pupils attending Branfil School from out of Havering however the populations for Upminster, Hacton and St, Andrews, the three Wards that provide most of Branfil's pupils, are due to fall between 2010 and 2015. This means that more pupils from out of the area will be taking up the places at Branfil's and not from the Upminster area.</p>	Local Resident	Comments as for 6 above.

<p>There is a very big problem of parking in the area from people bringing children to Branfil's by car and as these extra places will be taken by more children out of the area it will get worse also inconsiderate parking and not being able to make journeys by car until the area has been cleared of traffic.</p> <p>Emergency services also have a problem getting through if needed.</p>		<p>The London Emergency Planning Authority and Fire Service were consulted during the planning stage of the project and approval to the plans was given.</p>
<p><b>10.</b> There is no proven need for additional spaces in the Upminster Area.</p> <p>I also query the fact that this consultation is taking place after Planning Permission has been granted for new and expanded building for Branfil School.</p>	Local Resident	<p>Comments as for 6 above.</p> <p>The Council needed the assurance, through the approval of its planning application that the project could proceed once the statutory school organisation proposal had been approved.</p>
<p><b>11.</b> We are local residents and parents of a child at Branfil School. We consider Branfil to be a good school in pleasant surroundings. We object to an increase in pupil numbers for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be an increase in traffic in and around Cedar Avenue which already gets quite heavily congested with some children travelling in from Thurrock and Grays. This not only causes annoyance to local residents and parents but increased traffic could also pose a safety issue for the children.</li> <li>• Upminster has an ageing population so the proposed expansion will see more children coming into Upminster from outside the area. If there is a need for extra school places due to an increase in Havering's birth rate then from an eco - friendly point of view, a new school or school expansion should take place in these areas of higher birth rate.</li> <li>• Building on the Junior playground will remove some of the outdoor space and the smaller playground will need to accommodate more children.</li> <li>• The additional building work will create noise and other disruption for the children. If only the damaged part of the infant block was demolished and replaced this would be a quicker project and therefore less disruptive.</li> <li>• From an aesthetic point of view, the new building is unlikely to</li> </ul>	Local Resident	<p>Traffic consultants have been commissioned to investigate the impact of expansion of the school on the local community. The Travel Plan for an expanded school that will be produced as a result of this investigation will be adopted by the school.</p> <p>Branfil School has sufficient land and capacity for expansion and the Head and Chair of Governors have been fully consulted on the building works proposed and support the project scheme.</p>

<p>blend in with the local area and will look as if it's been "crammed in".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The demand for extra school places should be met by a school with more land than Branfil or the development of a new school elsewhere in Havering.</li> </ul>		<p>Branfil has sufficient land for a three form entry school, including the detached playing field.</p>
<p><b>12.</b> An increase to the pupil intake of the school, of children from outside the local area, will increase the traffic volume and heighten the existing parking problems local residents already experience. Havering Council claims the proposed extension to Branfil School in Upminster, which will increase the number of pupils from 420 to 630, is urgently needed because of local and national birth rate projections. The council is being economical with the truth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In a Freedom of Information request, the council has had to supply the latest figures from the school census (January 2011) and the Havering Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (2010). Contrary to public statements from the council and cabinet members, the populations of Upminster, Hacton and St Andrews wards – the three wards providing most of Branfil pupils - are due to fall between 2010 and 2015. The same figures show that the increase in population is occurring in wards well away from Upminster.</li> <li>The latest Office of National Statistics figures show the expected rise in Havering's population is in wards currently undergoing residential development, i.e. Harold Wood, Brooklands, Romford and South Hornchurch.</li> <li>Havering Council's own 2012/13 school intake data for Branfil states it had 60 places available for the 2012/13 reception year. All of the 52 children in Havering who applied to Branfil as their first choice were accepted. An additional seven applied from Thurrock and one pupil from Barking &amp;</li> </ul>	<p>Local Resident</p>	<p>Traffic consultants have been commissioned to investigate the impact of expansion of the school on the local community. The Travel Plan for an expanded school, that will be produced as a result of this investigation, will be adopted by the school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The JSNA refers to the population as a whole while the Council's Pupil forecasts refer to the pupil population which determines the number of places needed in schools in future years. Births <i>within</i> the Upminster &amp; Cranham area rose by 15.6% in the five year period 2006/07- 2010/11 and this is projected to lead to a deficit of pupil places equating to one form of entry (30 per year group) in Year Reception by Sept 2013 in the area; and potentially a further one form of entry deficit by 2016/17.</li> <li>The main determinant of the projected rise in pupil numbers in Upminster is the substantial increase in births and not an increase in housing developments.</li> <li>Branfil is over subscribed by 118 first preferences for 2012/13.</li> </ul>

Dagenham. So Havering is not short of places. Indeed, there are currently 62 pupils at Branfil from outside of Havering. On this basis, the school expansion is not needed for local Upminster children. I am all for improving schools, particularly Branfil which has some very dilapidated buildings that need replacing, but school extensions should be in the wards that need them the most.

- Branfil School is in a very quiet residential area and may become one of the largest in the borough simply so the council can get additional funding from central government to re-build dilapidated classrooms and replenish dwindling local authority coffers. As a result, local residents will have an increased volume of traffic and street parking in the roads surrounding the school. The narrow side streets in the area surrounding the school were not built for high volumes of traffic. If the school enlargement goes ahead, these streets will now need to handle an additional 210 parental cars and an additional 30+ staff cars. The staff car parking provision in the application is not sufficient for the anticipated increase in staff numbers. The roads impacted by the proposal are not just Cedar Avenue, Acacia Gardens and South View Drive - i.e. the roads mentioned in the traffic study - but also Gaynes Park Road which is already very busy during the school run in the morning and afternoon, and gets clogged with parked cars, so much so that it can be difficult to safely get out of my drive. Visibility down the street is poor when cars are parked by the roadside during school drop off/pick up and this will only get worse. Consequently I am concerned with the increased risk of a child being injured or even killed by a car. In addition, I am not happy with the prospect of the increased noise elevated traffic levels will bring to Gaynes Park Road. Like many other people in Upminster, we chose to live in this area because it is a quiet residential area. We want to keep it that way.

- Traffic consultants have been commissioned to investigate the impact of expansion of the school on the local community. The Travel Plan for an expanded school, that will be produced as a result of this investigation, will be adopted by the school.

<p><b>13.</b> I chose Branfil Primary school for my children not because it was the nearest school to me as I was also considering Upminster Infants school, but primarily due the fact that it was a small school which gave it an advantage over other schools in the area. At present the teachers know all the pupils, the Head also knows all the pupils and parents, this is vital when problems need to be addressed. The head knows who his pupils are rather than a name on a list. It also leads to a friendly atmosphere and a sense of cohesion and community. The increase of 210 pupils will have a negative impact on this community and I believe on the quality of the teaching and I can see Branfil's performance falling as a result which would be a dreadful shame.</p> <p>The argument is that Havering needs more school places, this may well be but it should be targeted at the areas that are in the greatest need. This is not Upminster. We have the highest proportion of elderly in the borough and that is unlikely to change as it is becoming increasingly harder for young couples to get on the housing ladder at all let alone in an affluent area such as Upminster. As Branfil already has some pupils from outside the area mainly being Aveley and South Ockendon this would indicate that under the admission guidelines there are certainly enough places for Upminster children other wise they would have had priority distance wise than those living further away.</p> <p>The council is also ignoring the environmental impact of this proposal. The government wants everyone to reduce their carbon footprint and green issues are very high profile, how then can it be environmentally friendly to make pupils travel longer distances none of which will be on foot. The parents of these children if they have a car will be forced to drive to school which at that time of the day is a long, fuel consuming journey. Then where will they park? Of course most will want to park as near as possible to the school which means either Cedar Avenue itself or the surrounding roads. Currently Cedar Avenue is heavily congested at school times with double parking, blocking of drives and general inconsideration very much the norm. Surrounding roads are affected at the</p>	<p>Local Resident &amp; Parent</p>	<p>Branfil is a successful school, judged by OfSTED to be good, and the Head and Chair of Governors who fully support the proposal, believe an enlarged school will be able to sustain these high standards.</p> <p>Births <i>within</i> the Upminster &amp; Cranham area rose by 15.6% in the five year period 2006/07- 2010/11 and this is projected to lead to a deficit of pupil places equating to one form of entry (30 per year group) in Year Reception by Sept 2013 in the area; and potentially a further one form of entry deficit by 2016/17. The main determinant of the projected rise in pupil numbers in Upminster is the substantial increase in births and not an increase in housing developments.</p> <p>The Council was very aware of the need to address the impact of the expansion on the local environment and commissioned Traffic and Transportation specialists Robert West to carry out traffic surveys, attend local resident and parent consultations and to support the school in producing a new Travel Plan for the enlarged school. This Plan promotes safer routes to school, discourages car journeys, and identifies the steps that will be taken to achieve these aims.</p>
---	------------------------------------	--

moment too, it is already a dangerous situation. If an ambulance or fire engine needed to gain access to the school at these times it would fail thereby putting children's lives at risk that is not acceptable. If you add another 210 cars into the mix I shudder to think what the outcome will be. I live in Lime Avenue which at present has some school traffic parking in it but generally is much less than Cedar, 8 weeks ago 2 ambulances needed to attend to my neighbour in an emergency at school start time, if this had happened with the proposed volume of traffic and parking they wouldn't have stood a chance.

The council were happy to ignore Branfil's failing building needs for many years and it has now only acted due to parent pressure in the past year over the state of the classrooms. These parents who acted on their children's interests have been cheated. All we wanted were suitable classrooms for our children to be taught in, mainly the rebuilding of the KS1 site, I don't think anyone who campaigned for this to happen would think it would lead to a larger school and most do not want this to happen. Unfortunately due to some clever propaganda by both the council and the school, a lot of parents think that the funding will only become available for new classrooms if the school becomes 3 form entry. Why was the public notice giving details of the proposal and how to object posted on the school gate at a date when the council knew no parents would see it as the school is closed for the summer holiday and the deadline for objections to the proposal ends before the school re-opens. Forgive me for being cynical but the planning of that publication date couldn't have worked out better for the council. Luckily those residents with children at the school may have seen it and I for one have passed on the information to anyone I know.

Branfil is not the right school for expanding. I believe it will destroy the very thing that made most parents choose it in the first place. Branfil is in the middle of a quiet residential area with no direct public transport links. The school spaces are not needed in

The Council carried out a full public consultation between 11 June and 13 July which included consultation meetings on 3 and 5 July. During this period it was made clear that the Representation period would take place during the summer from 3-31 August and consultees were alerted of the need for their representations to be made within this period and a large number of representations have been received.

In common with most London Boroughs, Havering is experiencing a major growth in birth rate that has led to the need for additional primary places in all localities, including Upminster. The Council has a statutory duty to provide sufficient school places and every effort is made to listen to the comments and representations made by the school and local residents to ensure the school remains successful and the impact on the local environment is minimised.

To meet the shortage of places in this planning area for Sept 2013 consideration was given to all primary phase schools in this planning area and Branfil was proposed because it was popular and successful, judged by OfSTED as Good, it was central rather than periphery to the growth



Upminster, they should be made available where the most need is.		area, and the Headteacher and Governing Body fully support expansion.
<b>14.</b> We support the proposal to expand Branfil Primary School from two to three form entry as set out in the statutory notice.	Various  Online petition supported by 61 individuals	Signatories included the Chair of Governors and Headteacher.
<p><b>15.</b> I am very concerned that there is no capacity in this location to cope with such an enlargement. Access to the school is mostly in Cedar Avenue which is not wide enough to take the school traffic at present. Any increase will be unacceptable.</p> <p>Regular control of the traffic will be needed even at the present pupil numbers let alone an increase. The particular rudeness of parents already attending the school with regard to the lack of consideration shown to local residents should be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Cars arriving (at the school) as early as 7.30am....would pose a nuisance with noise and disturbance...</p>	Local Resident	Every effort will be taken to minimise the impact of the expansion on local residents. Traffic consultants have been commissioned to investigate the impact of expansion of the school on the local community. The Travel Plan for an expanded school, which will be produced as a result of this investigation, will be adopted by the school.
<p><b>16.</b> I do not feel that adequate research has been carried out into the impact on traffic conditions and the environmental impact of increased vehicle traffic. The traffic conditions at school opening and closing times are currently too much and possibly dangerous. Cedar Avenue is blocked every day and if an emergency vehicle needs to access Cedar (Avenue) it is impossible and any</p>	Local Resident	Traffic consultants have been commissioned to investigate the impact of expansion of the school on the local community. The Travel Plan for an expanded school, which will be produced as a result of this investigation, will be adopted by the school.

proposed expansion will exacerbate this problem. Cedar Avenue itself is a narrow road and only takes two vehicles to park opposite each other for the road to be blocked. This is unacceptable, Emergency services should have good and free access to the school, I doubt this is the case at present and if the pupil numbers are increased then unencumbered access for emergency services needs to be essential.

Pupils from outside the borough should not be taken in (to Branfil Primary School), if there is a lack of space for Havering Children then it can be addressed by stopping children attending schools who do not live in the borough.

...birth rates...are not increasing in Upminster, Upminster has one of the oldest generations in Havering. The Councils own documentation shows that only 1 pupil per year is coming from new developments in Upminster, that is because Upminster has no residential development opportunities that will generate more families.

The councils own documentation shows that population increases will be in Harold Wood, Romford and South Hornchurch and so any school developments should be local to these areas so that they can serve the local community.

Branfil is not served by public transport. The nearest bus stop is some 15 - 20 minutes walk. This will mean an unacceptable increase in vehicle transport and the resulting emissions that will bring. School expansion should be on roads that are served directly by public transport.

One major concern is the lack of Playing fields at Branfil. The playing field is a 5 minute walk away from the school and means pupils crossing a busy road. The playing fields are not accessible

Emergency Services were consulted during the planning stage of the project and approval to the plans was given.

The Council, as admissions authority for Branfil Primary School, is legally bound to offer places at schools according to national guidelines and requirements. It would not be possible to refuse to offer a school place on demand simply because a child lived in a different local authority from that in which the school is located.

Births *within* the Upminster & Cranham area rose by 15.6% in the five year period 2006/07- 2010/11 and this is projected to lead to a deficit of pupil places equating to one form of entry (30 per year group) in Year Reception by Sept 2013 in the area; and potentially a further one form of entry deficit by 2016/17. The main determinant of the projected rise in pupil numbers in Upminster is the substantial increase in births and not an increase in housing developments.

Yes there is increased demand for additional places in these areas and the Council already has proposals in place for dealing with this.

It would not be practicable to limit the provision of additional school places to those schools located on roads served directly by public transport.

Branfil School has sufficient land and capacity for this proposed expansion

<p>by pupils at break times and so no large soft play area is available. The playing field at the moment is not that big and with the proposed increase in pupil numbers I question if it will be big enough. Has a risk assessment been carried out on the fact that pupils will need to be walked on foot from the school to the playing field each time for field sports and activities?</p> <p>I object to this proposal, it is not required in Upminster and a more suitable location should be sought.</p>		<p>No alternative options for dealing with the need for additional places were identified during the consultation stage relating to this proposal.</p>
<p><b>17</b> Gaynes Park Road is a very busy road. This year I have had early hospital appointments, and have not been able to pull out into the road because of cars and traffic jam. This proposal to enlarge Branfil is going to make this situation much worse.</p>	<p>Local Resident</p>	<p>Emergency Services were consulted during the planning stage of the project and approval to the plan was given.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank