

Chris Banks
Banks Solutions
64 Lavinia Way
East Preston
West Sussex
BN16 1EF

c/o Warlingham Community Library
Shelton Avenue
Warlingham
Surrey
CR6 9NF

10 January 2020

Dear Mr Banks, Programme Officer, TDC Local Plan,

INSPECTOR LED CONSULTATION – TED23 EDUCATION NOTE, WARLINGHAM

Warlingham Parish Council has considered Tandridge District Council's document reference TED23 (Primary School Provision in Warlingham – November 2019) and has the following comments.

1. The proposal to move Warlingham Village Primary School (WVPS) is purely aspirational. TDC's Note for the Inspector (reference TED23) is an attempt to retrofit a rationale to support it. However, their case is flawed in many ways.
2. The data in the Appendix suggests that the 400 planned new homes in Warlingham are likely to generate in excess of 100 primary aged pupils. This seems high, but even if true, represents roughly 50% of a single form of entry.
3. The analysis completely overlooks the fact that capacity already exists at Hamsey Green Primary School for an additional form of entry. This would accommodate all the projected requirements for additional school places in Warlingham with some margin to meet further needs should these arise. It makes much more sense to obtain this extra capacity by expanding Hamsey Green on its current site, than the expensive and unnecessarily disruptive proposal to relocate WVPS. This is the true pragmatic solution to the need for extra provision.
4. Furthermore, the proposed site for the new school is only 400 metres from Hamsey Green Primary. Creating a new school so close to an existing one is not good planning and would poorly serve the widely spread community of Warlingham, Chelsham and Farleigh.
5. We challenge many of the points made under section 2, Need Arising. In particular:
 - 5.1 We have in the past been assured by Surrey County Council (SCC) that one form entry schools are sustainable, especially as part of Academy chains, which WVPS is. If all 1FE schools were to close, this would create the need for much more travelling and adversely impact the sustainability of the communities in which they are situated.

- 5.2 OFSTED ratings, which change frequently, should not be a basis for decisions on long-term provision
- 5.3 The London Borough of Croydon is not banking on getting places in Surrey. Croydon and SCC forecast on the basis of their own populations and do not predict cross border use.
- 5.4 The example of Waverley has no relevance to the situation of WVPS. Each case is unique and the circumstances are particular to the locality. The Cranleigh School is an existing Good, split site school formed by merger, with SEN facilities and an Outstanding private Nursery on site. The infant school was single form entry whilst the Junior school had two forms of entry, taking children from Ewhurst C of E infants. The buildings were in poor condition and required extensive investment in any event. In rebuilding the school, it becomes 2FE Infants and 3FE Junior, meeting stated local demand on a single site adjacent to the Local Secondary School. This is not directly comparable to the WVPS proposal.
- 5.5 Godalming School was proposed for closure despite being adjacent to planned future housing development. The school has very different characteristics to the current WVPS and was placed in Special Measures in 2017. It was a C of E Voluntary Aided school and had a PAN of 30 but had been significantly under recruiting. SCC was providing significant additional funding, but still rescinded plans for closure. The school instead converted to an Academy in 2019 (as WVPS did in 2012) changing its name to St Mark and All Saints C of E Primary. It remains significantly under populated.
6. We have issues with much of the data in the Appendix used to build the case. This data is for the whole of Tandridge and is not specific to Warlingham. The substantial projected deficits in school places following the building of additional houses are for the whole of Tandridge, including the proposed Garden Village.
7. Also, the baseline projections quoted are different from the EDGE (2019 version) analysis which Surrey County Council circulated to schools locally. These show a much higher projected surplus in Tandridge over the next 10 years.

	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29
<i>Planned Capacity</i>	6660	6690	6720	6720	6690	6690	6690	6690	6690	6690
<i>Benchmark demand forecast</i>	6274	6298	6306	6279	6249	6266	6276	6274	6263	6272
<i>Benchmark requirements surplus</i>	386	392	414	441	441	424	414	416	427	418

8. In conclusion, we do not see any evidence to justify the relocation of WVPS and strongly urge that this proposal is removed from the Plan.

Furthermore, as the relocation of the school into HSG15 was used as a reason for removing land from the Green Belt, we would like to see the site put to a community use – specifically for an indoor sports facility – and not for more housing.

Yours sincerely

Simon Bold, Clerk
For and on behalf of Warlingham Parish Council

*Note:
submitted by email to: bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com*