

From: Patrick Leeson, Corporate Director for Education, Learning and Skills

To: Roger Gough, Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform

Subject: Proposal to expand Furley Park Primary School

Classification: Unrestricted

Past Pathway of Paper: Education Cabinet Committee – 27 September 2013

Future Pathway of Paper: Cabinet Member decision

Electoral Division: Ashford Rural South

Summary: This report sets out the results of the public consultation on the proposal to commission an enlargement of Furley Park Primary School from 2FE to 3FE for September 2014 and asks the Cabinet Member to take the decision outlined in the recommendation below.

Recommendation: The Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform is ask to allocate £40,000 for the expansion of Furley Park Primary School from the Medium Term Capital Programme. The additional funding of £1.8m for the project, as detailed below, was bid for and won as part of the Target Basic Need Fund.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Ashford district section of the 'Kent Commissioning Plan for Education Provision 2013-18', which was agreed by Cabinet on 14 October 2013 has identified a significant pressure in Reception year places. The planning area of Ashford South East is forecast to have a deficit of up to 37 Reception year places in September 2016 and 2017.
- 1.2 It is proposed to enlarge Furley Park Primary School by 30 reception year places, taking the published admission number (PAN) from 60 to 90 (One Form of Entry) for the September 2014 intake. Successive Reception Year intakes will offer 90 places each year and the school will eventually have a total capacity of 630 pupils.
- 1.3 This report sets out the results of the public consultation, which took place between 14 October and 29 November 2013. A public meeting was held on 7 November 2013.

2. Financial Implications

- 2.1 It is proposed to enlarge Furley Park Primary School by 210 places taking the PAN to 90 (3FE) for the September 2014 intake and eventually a total capacity of 630 places.
- a. Capital - The enlargement of the school requires the provision of seven additional classrooms, as well as a second large space. A feasibility study has been completed. The total cost is estimated to be in the region of £2.2m. Appropriate funding has been identified as part of the Medium Term Capital Programme, primarily from Targeted Basic Need. The costs of the project are estimates and these may increase as the project is developed. If the cost of the project is greater than 10% the Cabinet Member will be required to take a further decision to allocate the additional funding.
- b. Revenue - The school will receive increased funding through the Delegated Budget as follows:-
- (i) Pupil growth money: In the year of expansion (September 2014 to August 2015) the Reception Year PAN will be protected on 30 pupils at the rate of £2,727 per pupil. This will be the third year of Reception Year expansion at 30 pupils and therefore the final year of growth protection. Future increases to the Reception Year PAN will be funded through the Local Authority's rising roll policy.
- (ii) EFA Delegated budget: Academies are funded on the academic year September to August. The pupil count used in the calculation of the budget is taken from the October census, prior to the following academic year, therefore any increase to numbers on the October 2013 census will be reflected in the academy's academic year funding Sep 2014-Aug 2015. In acknowledgement of the lag in funding, growth funding has been provided for the period Sep 2014-Aug 2015.
- (iii) Additional Classroom funding: As part of the permanent increase to the academy's PAN of 30 pupils, funding will be allocated at £6,000 as a contribution towards the set costs of each additional classroom that needs to be opened resulting from the increase of the PAN.
- c. Human – Furley Park Primary School will appoint additional teachers and support staff as the school size increases and the need arises.

3. Bold Steps for Kent and Policy Framework

- 3.1 These proposals will help to secure our ambition “to ensure every child will go to a good school where they make good progress and can have fair access to school places” as set out in ‘Bold Steps for Kent’.
- 3.2 The ‘Kent Commissioning Plan for Education Provision, 2013-18’ has identified the demand for up to 37 Reception Year places within the planning area of Ashford South East.

4. Consultation Outcomes

- 4.1 A total of 32 written responses were received: 7 respondents supported the proposal and 25 objected.
- 4.2 A summary of the comments received is provided at Appendix 1.

4.3 A summary of the views and comments given at the public consultation meeting is attached at Appendix 2.

4.4 An Equality Impact Assessment has been completed as part of the consultation. To date no comments have been received and no changes are required to the Equality Impact Assessment.

5. Views

5.1 The view of the Local Member: Having attended the recent public meeting and heard the proposal, Local Member Mr Mike Angell supports the expansion of the Academy but has serious reservations about traffic and traffic management outside the school and particularly Reed Crescent. There have been problems with car parking in the present situation and although some improvement has been made it has not entirely solved the problems. Mr Angell and other members have been in touch with the headteacher in the past and have contributed their member Highway Fund money to making limited improvement. It is essential that some major works are done. One member of the public suggested that some of the verge shrubbery should be replaced by lay-bys and Mr Angell thinks this is a sensible idea. He feels there is much work to be done with Highways and Ashford Borough Council parking.

5.2. The view of the Headteacher and Governing Body:

Headteacher: The Headteacher is in full support of the proposal.

Governing Body: Furley Park Primary School became an academy on 1 November 2013. The Governing Body was dissolved on that day and is in the process of being replaced by a Board of Trustees. The inaugural meeting of the Board of Trustees is due to take place in early December 2013. The Governing Body at the time this proposal started were supportive of the sustainable long term solution that has been proposed by KCC to enable the school to move from two form entry to three form entry. The proposal includes extra classroom provision and other spaces such as a small hall that will ensure the school's high standards are maintained.

5.3. The view of the Area Education Officer:

Furley Park Primary is a popular and inclusive school judged as 'Good' by Ofsted and is regularly oversubscribed. The school's location, adjacent to an ongoing housing development, means it is ideally placed to meet the forecast demand for primary school places. Having considered other commissioning options this enlargement is not only necessary, but the most cost-effective and sustainable solution to increase demand in the area. All other schools in the planning area were considered.

7. Education Cabinet Committee

:

7.1 The Education Cabinet Committee considered and endorsed the Kent Commissioning Plan at its meeting on 27 September 2013. The Commissioning Plan identified the need for additional places in the Ashford South East planning area of Ashford District. In addition the bid for funds to expand the schools was

considered and endorsed at the same meeting of the committee under the Targeted Basic Need Report.

6. Delegation to Officers

- 6.1 The Officer Scheme of Delegation (under Appendix 2 part 4 of the Council's Constitution) provides a clear and appropriate link between this decision and the actions needed to implement it. It is envisaged, if the proposal goes ahead, that the Director of Property & Infrastructure Support will sign contracts on behalf of the County Council.

7. Conclusions

- 7.1 Forecasts for the planning area of Ashford South East indicate an increasing demand for primary school places. This enlargement will add an additional 30 Reception Year places to the capacity per year, in line with priorities 3, 4 and 9 of 'Bold Steps for Kent and Policy Framework' and the 'Kent Commissioning Plan for Education Provision, 2013-18'.

8. Recommendation

Recommendation:

The Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform is asked to agree to the decision to:

Allocate £40,000 for the expansion of Furley Park Primary School from the Medium Term Capital Programme. The additional funding of £1.8m for the project, as detailed above, was bid for and won as part of the Target Basic Need Fund.

9. Background Documents

- 9.1 Bold Steps for Kent and Policy Framework
http://www.kent.gov.uk/your_council/priorities,_policies_and_plans/priorities_and_plans/bold_steps_for_kent.aspx
- 9.2 Kent Commissioning Plan for Education Provision 2013-18
<https://democracy.kent.gov.uk/documents/s43253/ItemD3KentEducationCommissioningPlan20132018final.pdf>
- 9.3 Education Cabinet Committee report 27 September 2013: Primary Commissioning in Ashford District.
<https://democracy.kent.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=746&MId=5033&Ver=4>
- Education Cabinet Committee report 27 September 2013 Targeted Basic Needs
<https://democracy.kent.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=746&MId=5033&Ver=4>
- 9.4 Consultation Document and Equalities Impact Assessment
<http://consultations.kent.gov.uk/consult.ti/FurleyPark/consultationHome>

10. Contact details

Report Author:

- David Adams
- Area Education Officer – South Kent

- 01233 898559
- david.adams@kent.gov.uk

Relevant Director:

- Kevin Shovelton
- Director of Education Planning and Access
- 01622 694174
- Kevin.shovelton@kent.gov.uk

Proposal to expand Furley Park Primary School, Ashford

Summary of Written Responses

Printed Consultation Documents distributed: 600
 Consultation responses received: 32

	In Favour	Opposed	Totals
Governors			
Staff			
Parents	6	23	29
Residents		1	1
Other	1	1	2
Totals	7	25	32

Pupil feedback on the proposal

Comments in favour of the proposal:

- It's a good thing as more pupils can be educated
- The bigger the better
- We will have another hall to do sports and indoor activities
- If we have more pupils we can make more friends
- More space at school with a bigger building
- More equipment
- More opportunities for pupils to engage with other year groups

Comments against the proposal:

- Pupils won't have much space on the playground
- Behaviour might change as there will be more children that can group together
- School is already big
- More traffic will be dangerous
- Will there be enough space for sports day?

All other comments:

Comments in favour of the proposal:

- Very good idea.
- I agree as long as the pupils do not suffer as a consequence, ie more pupils to a class, less efficiency.
- Children's education is important and all children need to be placed.
- Primary school places are limited. Expanding this school gives more children in the area a chance of a place.
- The school needs to expand to accommodate the expected increase in demand for places due to the expansion of housing in the area.
- I completely understand the ongoing demand for school places in the area. The issues over parking will be looked into and rectified to ensure that access etc is easier at peak school times.
- I would like to see a permanent expansion and another or larger hall. The road to the school could be reviewed and the shrubs removed to become parking bays and perhaps a walking bus could be encouraged.

Comments against the proposal:

- Parking outside the school is abominable and will only get worse leading to serious injury or death if restrictions are not put in place. (5)
- How will additional parking be accommodated if the school becomes larger? (8)
- There needs to be double yellow lines / residents permits / patrolling by traffic wardens. Parents should be allowed to drop off in the school car park.
- Widening the catchment area for Furley Park will bring parents from further afield who will drive to school, not walk.
- We do not wish to lose any more the bus services around Reed Crescent. We have lost three of the daily buses already due to increased traffic.
- There should be a new school as there will be another housing estate built soon and many more children to accommodate. (7)
- Children should not be deprived of open spaces because a school has not been planned as part of the new housing development (ie Bridgefield). (2)
- The proposed school on the Finberry development should not be a 2FE school but be a 3FE or even 4FE school.
- Ashford has increased in population in the last 5 years, largely due to the Government designating Ashford as a growth area. The promised Bridgefield School was not built. The Finberry development will have a school but despite this Furley Park is being expanded. I feel that the irresponsible behaviour of the Government, local Planning Authorities and Councils have brought about this situation.
- I have seen the impact of the intake of 90 children already and feel the school and the children's education is suffering due to this. (1)
- Currently Reception and Year One are joined together. Reception Year children are noisier than Year One which may affect their work.
- More teachers are needed; children are squashed into one classroom for certain lessons already.
- I feel that since the changes over the last couple of years standards have fallen.
- I am concerned for my child's emotional and social well-being.
- When my child started here (6 years ago) it was a lovely little school with nice children and nice parents, who mostly lived on Park Farm. Over the last two intakes of 90 children there has been an obvious decline in the type of children and parents. I have witnessed parents yelling at children and even seen a physical fight between two parents. This kind of behaviour would not have happened a few years ago. (2)
- It will take away the feeling of a nice neat community school which is well managed as it is. (3)
- The school is too large as it is. Children of primary school age should be able to develop in a smaller more personal environment. (7)
- We understand the rising birth rate means more pressure on existing schools in Ashford, but Furley Park cannot singlehandedly cope with the additional children.
- The school cannot become larger without the playground or playing field decreasing in size. (7)
- The hall cannot currently accommodate all pupils at lunchtimes. (6)
- If places are added annually I am concerned that the school will become a building site for the next four years. The building works will cause unnecessary disruption.
- We believe that the level of teacher that the school will be able to attract will reduce as the school becomes too big – if the facilities are not suitable then quality teachers will not want to join, and this will impact our children's education.

**Proposal to expand Furley Park Primary School,
Public Consultation Meeting – 7 November 2013**

Michael Northey	KCC Member and Chair
David Adams	Area Education Officer (South Kent)
Julie Hawkins	PA to the AEO (roving microphone)
Jill Clinton	School Organisation Officer and note taker
Paul Ketley	Head Teacher

Also present: Mr Leyland Ridings (in the audience), Mr Mike Angell (Local Member) and James Sanderson (Property)

Number attending: 27

David Adams outlined the proposal with the aid of the PowerPoint.

Mr Ketley (Headteacher) opened proceedings: "We feel that we will be able to cater for the needs of the school expanding. I have worked in a 3FE school before and feel able to maintain the current ethos when we expand to 3FE. SMT is already planning how to expand, by year groups etc. The advantages are that we gain more experience with the new staff coming in and another senior leader in the team."

Questions / Comments from the audience followed:-

Comment / Question	Response / Answer
<p><u>TRAFFIC</u></p> <p>How will the extra traffic be managed? Buses won't be able to get through. Emergency services won't be able to get through. Will consultation take place with the emergency services? Come down one morning to see just how bad the traffic is. The problem will get worse. Some parents will not want to come into the school but will park on one of the feeder roads. Even if you double-yellow the whole of Reed Crescent the traffic will just move to other local roads. We are responsible for our children, but due to the number of cars the safety of our children has to be someone else's responsibility because you are expanding this school. Drop off points could work in the morning when arrivals are staggered, but how will you manage that in the afternoon? It will gridlock back into Reed Crescent. I note what you say about dropping children off, but in this day and age when all</p>	<p>There are always traffic issues outside schools, whatever their size. Transport consultants will look at current and possible future issues.</p> <p>The consultants will work with the bus company to try and sort out times and routes. Consultation with emergency services will take place as part of the planning process. The Highways Authority takes all those things into account.</p> <p>Traffic consultants will be around morning and afternoon to see the traffic.</p> <p>We can talk to Ashford Council re double yellow lines, but this can create problems for local residents who then can't park outside their home or have visitors who can't park. The consultants will be looking and talking to the local council and residents.</p> <p>The plan is to drop children off on the school site. Cars would come in to the top end of the car park and children will be supervised by school staff into the building. For a lot of parents this will be fine; some parents may not want this. We expect the transport consultants to look at the existing unused drop off area to see if there</p>

Comment / Question	Response / Answer
<p>sorts of people can be around, it is not acceptable to just drop off small children and leave them.</p> <p>Dangerous parking can't be enforced. The crossing facilities need to be taken into account. You talk about education but you have to look at safety casualties as well.</p> <p>If nobody was allowed to park outside a school between 3pm and 4pm it would help. But it would need enforcement.</p> <p>We walk home and see cars drive slowly down Reed Crescent, but then put their foot down. Surprised that children haven't been run over crossing Bluebell Road. If you are expanding you need to look further than Park Farm for our children's safety.</p> <p>The school used to have a walking bus. The school thought the kids were happier, better, good for a walk, more prepared to learn. If that were to happen again then it might help.</p> <p>When the school was built the road had big grass verges and hedges and quite a big path. There could have been parking and lay-bys. That could be a solution.</p>	<p>is a way of using that to get traffic off the road.</p> <p><u>PK</u>: We did have a drop off zone but parents of younger children did not like it and some used it as a parking space which limited it for everyone, so it was closed. We have talked to planners about a fenced walkway, from where children get out of the car.</p> <p><u>DA</u>: Drop off zones are less effective at pick up times and the solution is more difficult. If you live close to the school you can have problems both morning and afternoon. Staggering start and finish times (breakfast clubs, after school clubs) can help break the flow of traffic into smaller time frames and keep it moving.</p> <p>Traffic tends to move quite slowly outside schools so ironically it is safer. If we cannot convince Highways that options around traffic management and school travel plan will work then planning will not be approved.</p> <p>We can work with Ashford Council to look at those sorts of issues. If we have something that says we can't park here between 3 - 4pm people will park outside someone's house. The traffic consultants will look at these sorts of things.</p> <p>All we can do is work with families and try and address any issues. As we work through the design process there will be plans available.</p>
<p><u>ALTERNATIVES</u></p> <p>Why this school? Park Farm and Bridgefield are complete. The additional children will come from over the railway line. Why don't you build a new school over there where it is needed?</p> <p>So you are quite happy to bring traffic over here to this estate and disrupt people living here?</p>	<p>There will be 200 more homes on the Park Farm East extension, but there is no land in there for a school and no developer contribution. We have a statutory duty to provide places for children, thus we have to expand a school.</p> <p>If you look at the map on the back of the document it includes parts of Bridgefield and a lot of Park Farm East and those children will get into this school. It will be children who live in Park Farm who won't get into this school.</p> <p>If the school had not taken 90 pupils you would have had to live within one third of a mile to get into this school. Families without a school place would have been driving their children to other communities to take them to school as it would be too far to walk. We are trying to provide local school places so as many people as possible can walk.</p>
<p>Ashford Oaks Primary School currently has an empty school across the field. It may not help this part of Ashford, but as part of the bigger picture of Ashford, why is the money not spent on refurbishing that building?</p>	<p>The old Ashford South school closed when we had falling rolls. Two primary schools were on the site. Ashford South was half empty with variable quality accommodation and went into special measures. The other was expanded to provide alternative places. If we were to use</p>

Comment / Question	Response / Answer
	that building children here would be driven there and clog up the roads outside someone else's house. The logic is to expand a school in the community where the children live.
<p>You talked about Ashford being full. There is talk about a new primary school at John Wallis. When will that go ahead?</p> <p>Would you increase the size?</p>	<p>We want to rebuild the primary school. Its building was an old secondary school and is at the end of its useful life. We want to dispose of that land; there would have to be a capital receipt from housing to afford a rebuild of the primary school, so it would be a replacement.</p> <p>No, it would be rebuilt at 60. The expansion here is basic need. The primary academy is a modernisation project. We want to expand schools that are good and are oversubscribed and at the time of conversion the primary academy was in special measures.</p>
<p><u>ADMISSIONS</u></p> <p>We live on Park Farm and you have just said that Park Farm children may not be able to get in here.</p>	<p>DA explained the admissions criteria. Children at Bridgefield and Park Farm East will be admitted on distance criterion. This school is not for particular houses.</p>
<p><u>BUILDINGS</u></p> <p>The proposal seems to be very rushed. This is intended to happen permanently from September next year, but there are unlikely to be proper buildings in place.</p> <p>When will the building start?</p> <p>I came here tonight hoping to see how you would expand, but there are no plans. Not even a rough plan. You can't build in the playground, you can't use the field.</p> <p>If the proposal goes ahead when will the extension be finished? Will 90 children be coming in next year? Does the school have capacity to keep all classes at 30 or will class sizes increase until the extension is built?</p>	<p>We need additional capacity for 2014. The school has grown over the last couple of years and we can continue with that on a permanent basis. For September 2014 we propose adding one classroom to the school building, a permanent structure. Modularity complies with current Building Regs which are a higher standard than the rest of this building. If we go ahead we hope to replace the modularity with a single block of 6 classrooms.</p> <p>For the main building block planning will be around February / March time.</p> <p>A design team has been appointed. The current thinking is a block behind the hall; two storeys to minimise the footprint which is fine for KS2. A 6 class block plus room for a hall. No plans available at this point.</p> <p>Sep 2014 will be a 90 intake with each class having 30. The new block will be in place for Sep 2015 for the school to continue to grow over the next four years. There will be surplus rooms until they become classrooms.</p>
<p>Will there be a new hall for PE lessons and lunchtimes? My children already tell me that with the rotation of lunch they don't have enough time to eat their lunch.</p>	<p>There will be a hall in the new block.</p> <p>Lunchtimes have increased to 1 hour 20 minutes and are now staggered. Every child has at least 30 mins to eat lunch. They have to sit there for 30 mins before they are allowed out to play. If they have not finished it's because they are chatting or rushing to get out to play.</p>
<p>KS2 playground is not big enough for children to play on now. I chose this school</p>	<p>We probably have double the amount of play space of other schools. The new build will not</p>

Comment / Question	Response / Answer
for several reasons one being it had nice big playgrounds.	be on the playground and hopefully the modulars will go so we will have more play space. Looking at staggering playtime so the whole school is not out at once.
When you are building how will this impact on the children? How will they cope with the noise? The building will interfere with children's learning time.	Some work will take place in school holidays, some in term time. We are used to managing works at schools and try to ensure as much as possible is done in the holidays. We use contractors who are used to working on school sites and will segregate those areas off. Noisy work is done when children are not on site, but some activity will happen in school time.
We have a consultation document – distributed to parents, staff etc. How far was it delivered around Park Farm?	This meeting is about the educational aspects. There will be some pre-planning consultation activity before going to planning when we have designs and things for people to look at. Planners will consult residents, so anyone who has a view is able to input.
<p><u>STANDARDS</u></p> <p>My child is in KS1 and joined in September 2012. From what I can tell, the quality of the education of those children has gone backwards in that time (that is supported by Ofsted's Dashboard). A higher intake may add further degradation to the quality of the teaching that the children will receive. My child's social development has gone backwards in the last two years.</p> <p>Ofsted: 2010 100% achieved; 2012 95% achieved. Writing has gone from 100% in 2010 to 88% in 2012. That is worrying if it relates to factors inside your control. If it relates to factors outside your control - more children coming in from foreign, ethnic backgrounds, I can see those things will impact but it is a worrying trend. I believe before you expand it further the school should be looking to consolidate and improve. If the problem is impacted by the intake (the diversity and ethnic backgrounds) the situation is unlikely to be improved by expanding and bringing in more pupils.</p>	<p><u>PK:</u> As far as educational standards go our achievement as a primary school has been above Kent levels of attainment and, for the last 3 years, above national levels.</p> <p>Some difference in the Foundation Stage score because of the way the FS profiles have changed. A lot more FS children are coming into school not school ready; a large increase in speech and language problems, children not dry etc.</p> <p>Attainment for KS1 - for the last 5 years in reading, writing and maths we are significantly above the national levels. There are different ways of looking at data but we are happy.</p> <p>Dashboard - no consideration is made for any AEN pupils in those year groups, so AEN children are counted in the figures. In some cohorts we have 3 or 4 SSSEN pupils unlikely to achieve Level 4 and their parents are aware of this. Children with EAL are also included if they have been in the education system for at least two years.</p> <p>SEN and EAL will cause the figures to drop. We constantly monitor where every child is, we look at what the child needs next.</p>
The higher intake changes the standards in the school. Regularly see police and community wardens on the gates in the mornings to control parents.	The reason police and community wardens are around are for parking issues.
<p><u>SECONDARY SCHOOL</u></p> <p>With all these primary schools expanding what have you got planned for secondary school places?</p>	<p>A new secondary free school opened in September 2013 in Wye.</p> <p>Within Ashford Development Plans we have said we need a secondary school (6FE) in</p>

Comment / Question	Response / Answer
<p>A school in Wye won't really help us though.</p>	<p>Chilmington Green. If Cheeseman's Green goes to 5,000 plus houses we will need a secondary school there too. Currently we have surplus capacity in the secondary sector, but larger cohorts will move in over the next few years. If you ignore Wye Free School we won't need places until 2017. However, Wye Free School offers places and is taking children out of North and Towers, which will cause a ripple effect across the town.</p>
<p><u>STAFFING</u> How many teachers and teaching assistants are we going to need?</p>	<p>The headteacher will have increased staff already for the two new classrooms. The school will grow over seven years and the head will employ staff annually. Funding for more pupils will provide the salaries.</p>
<p>Will the learning mentors be increased along with support staff?</p>	<p><u>PK:</u> If we go for 3 phases I would like to have three learning mentors.</p>
<p><u>INTAKE</u> It's a big thing for a 4 year old to be one of 90. I don't see how the school can expand and not become a faceless school. I moved from SE London as I did not want my children to go to a big faceless school. You were saying the catchment area was going to change. So my children would not have got in even though I live on Park Farm? Since the 90 intake started children have been coming from much further away. You said that even expanding this school you still have a deficit in 2016 so expansion is not the answer as you need a new school. Why did our school have to expand over the last 2 years?</p>	<p><u>PK:</u> We are talking about 60s and 90s and we should be talking about 30s as every child will be in a class of 30. <u>DA:</u> An intake of 90 pushed out the catchment area to 1.9 miles and would have covered nearly the whole of Park Farm. A lot of those more distant children would have been siblings. More housing is being built across the road and as this comes on line the catchment area will decrease back in again. If we had left it at 60 with more housing coming along the circle would have decreased to less than 0.37m.</p>
<p>My son has additional needs and finds it difficult to mix with other children. I don't want to make his life any more difficult. What about during playtimes? Many more children on the playground. How will the children cope on the playground?</p>	<p><u>PK:</u> We will increase teachers and support staff for children who need support. There will be extra staff on the playground and we will arrange specific training for staff to organise playground activities for children. Currently 7 or 8 TAs at playtime plus a couple of teachers.</p>
<p>I was unaware of the 90 intake when my child was enrolled and I was disappointed to find out it was 90. If I'd known that before I probably would not have come here. There are too many children to get the attention they need. I have seen children being bullied. The teachers are brilliant but they can't keep an eye on all of them.</p>	<p><u>DA:</u> The headteacher is right about your child's school day as the majority of their time is in one class with 30 children. Other times – lunch, break, assemblies etc they can be in larger groups but there are different ways of running the school – split lunches, split playtimes etc - ways of reshaping the school day.</p>
<p>Does the breakfast and ASC expand as well?</p>	<p><u>PK:</u> Yes, breakfast club is limited by the number of staff but recruiting additional support staff can solve that. ASC is complicated as it is run by Kent Play Clubs and has a separate</p>

Comment / Question	Response / Answer
	<p>registration for Ofsted as to the number of pupils they can have based on floor area. With another hall we can look at other provision. Or we could look at after school clubs; we currently have about 15 of these; with another 7 teachers we can increase that.</p>
<p>I am a working parent and rely heavily on after school clubs. However, no provision has been made to increase the provision at the ASC for the additional 60 children over the last two years. From September I will have to send my son somewhere else.</p> <p>Can the ASC not use the hall and a classroom – they do that sometimes? What is the solution for working parents?</p>	<p>ASC is restricted by floor space per child. It is well used and another hall may mean we can increase that capacity.</p> <p>Ofsted regs say the classroom used would have to be identified, the same every day, which would be unfair on that teacher.</p> <p>No solution at the moment but when we have more space we will liaise with Kent Play Clubs.</p> <p>With another hall we can make other changes. Kent Play Clubs use this hall 5 nights a week. We can't use it for an indoor sport club.</p>
<p>If the expansion does not go ahead are we looking at 36/37 children in a class? That will put added pressures onto the teaching staff.</p>	<p>There are no Year R places left in Ashford which means schools with 31 or 32 in KS1 classes. Children need to be in school and we can't produce a class overnight. A school might squeeze on another class, or half a class, but then need to recruit staff. There is no quick fix. We want to make sure we have the right provision in the right places at the right time.</p> <p>90 children have turned up since March in Ashford town - equivalent to the intake at this school. We hope to have Cheeseman's Green on line by 2017, but will have to manage the time in between, which could be by sending children significant distances. At the moment, if you move into Ashford the nearest school place is Bethersden. We are in a challenging position and I am talking to other schools about taking additional children.</p>
<p>Why have builders been allowed to build all these houses without provision for schools being put in place? You say there will be another school in 2017 but there have been hundreds of houses built in this area without provision for education and we now have to have this discussion for our school here because it has not been thought of.</p> <p>But it's no good waiting until the houses are built before thinking about the schools.</p>	<p>Ashford Council is the planning authority for housing. Many years ago Ashford decided that it would be a major growth area and there was a master planning process. Within that, we have been saying we need new primary and secondary schools. Ashford Council is good at getting developer contributions, but if there were no new houses you would still have the change to the population. Ashford Council can only secure contributions from a developer from new housing.</p> <p>Planning consent comes in for a number of houses. We look at the number of places we have at that time and forecasts for the next five years. If a developer comes along when we have capacity we cannot ask for money. If he</p>

Comment / Question	Response / Answer
	does not build for a few years we might by then need capacity but cannot go back and ask for money if we then need it. We can't do anything at Cheeseman's and Chilmington until a certain number of houses are built so until then we need to make capacity available within existing stock.
Was a school never considered for Bridgefield?	There is no school site within the existing development and no plan to put one there.