

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

To: Education Cabinet Committee – 14 January 2014

Subject: Decision number 14/00003: Proposal to relocate and
expand Tunstall CE Primary School

Classification: Unrestricted

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

Future Pathway of Paper: Cabinet Member decision

Electoral Division: Swale Central

Local Members: Mr Roger Truelove and Mr Lee Burgess

Summary: This report sets out the results of the public consultation on the proposals to relocate and enlarge Tunstall CE Primary from 1FE (30) to 2FE (60) from September 2015.

Recommendation(s):

The Education Cabinet Committee is asked to consider and endorse or make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform on the decision to:

- (i) Issue a public notice to relocate and expand **Tunstall CE Primary School**, by 210 places from 1FE (30) to 2FE (60).

And, subject to no objections being received to the public notice

- (ii) Relocate and Expand the school
- (iii) Allocate £4,818,000 from the Education. Learning and Skills Capital Budget.
- (iv) AUTHORISE the Director of Property and Infrastructure Support in consultation with the Director of Law and Governance to enter into any necessary contracts/ agreements on behalf of the County Council
- (v) AUTHORISE the Director of Property and Infrastructure Support to be the nominated Authority Representative within the relevant agreements and to enter into variations as envisaged under the contracts

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Swale district section of the Kent Commissioning Plan for Education Provision 2013-18 has identified a significant pressure in Reception year

places. The district of Swale is forecast to have a deficit of up to 87 Reception year places in September 2016 and 2017.

- 1.2 Tunstall CE Primary School is located on a small restricted site. There are significant issues with parking and access and full compliance with DDA guidelines is not possible. The current school accommodation consists of the original Victorian building, two timber demountable classrooms and three mobiles. A key issue has been the renewal of planning for the three temporary mobiles, without which the school could not continue to operate as a one form entry school.

It is proposed to relocate and rebuild the school on a site owned by KCC located approximately 500 metres to the north east of the existing school. It is also proposed to enlarge Tunstall CE Primary School by 30 reception year places, taking the published admissions number (PAN) from 30 to 60 (Two Forms of Entry) for the September 2015 intake. Successive Reception Year intake will offer 60 places each year and the school will eventually have a total capacity of 420 pupils. The rebuilding of the school will provide the children and staff with buildings and facilities fit for 21st century education and expansion will provide much needed places within the Sittingbourne South planning area.

- 1.3 On 27 September 2013 Education Cabinet Committee recommended to the Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform that a consultation takes place on the proposal to relocate and expand Tunstall CE Primary School.
- 1.4 This report sets out the results of the public consultation, which took place between 30 September and 15 November 2013. A public meeting was held on 22 October 2013.

2. Financial Implications

- 2.1 It is proposed to relocate and rebuild Tunstall CE Primary School, enlarging the school by 210 places taking the PAN to 60 (2FE) for the September 2015 intake and eventually a total capacity of 420 places.

a. Capital – The total cost is estimated to be in the region of £4,818,000. Appropriate funding has been identified as part of the Medium Term Capital Programme, which includes funding from the Targeted Basic Need allocation from the DfE made in August 2013. 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 – For a period of three academic years from September 2015, the school will receive protection for an additional 30 Reception Year pupils at the rate of £2,727 per pupil. For each additional classroom, resulting from the expansion of the school, the sum of £6,000 will be allocated towards the classroom set up costs.

c. Human – Tunstall CE Primary School will appoint additional teachers, 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 317 Reception Year places within the planning area of South Sittingbourne.

4. Consultation Outcomes

- 4.1 A total of 264 written responses were received: 116 respondents supporting the proposals; 128 objecting to the proposals; 15 supporting the proposal to relocate the school but not the proposed expansion; 2 respondents supporting the proposal to relocate the school but undecided about the proposal to expand the school and 3 respondents undecided.
- 4.2 A summary of the comments received at the time of writing 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.

5. Views

- 5.1 The view of the Local Members:

Having attended the recent public meeting and heard the School’s proposals, Local Member Roger Truelove is in favour of relocation on educational grounds because the current site is not fit for purpose. He also accepts the case for expanding to two forms of entry to meet need in the Sittingbourne area. On the planning consultation, Mr Truelove will be interested to see whether parking arrangements are adequate and what plans are in place to encourage children and parents to walk to the school.

Having attended the recent public meeting, Local Member Lee Burgess provided the following response. He declared his interest in the proposal as he is Chairman of Tunstall Parish Council and lives in a property opposite the current school site

“Tunstall school is located in a small hamlet south of Sittingbourne, has its origins in the 1800s and a large part of the school is in a listed building which has grown over the years to meet demands of local residents and more recently for people all across Sittingbourne. The playground is now dominated by mobile classrooms that are cold in winter and hot in the summer. Each expansion has very rarely looked at long term problems like parking for staff or the increase in traffic from parents. This has led to at times a very hostile relationship between the Parish Council, village hall, residents and the school, a relationship that has not got much better with regards to the current plans and a consultation that has been less than transparent and helpful. The current site is not an ideal one for the ambitions and catchment area of the current school but other options can be looked at.

The consultation has not been as wide ranging or transparent as I would have hoped, the Parish Council and local residents have not been engaged as much as they should have been. If the Parish Council had not stepped up to the mark then very few people would have known about the whole project, and though KCC and the diocese may have done all that the law requires they have still fallen short in proper community engagement. The constant lack of information, misinformation and the constant running of the rumour mill has led to an atmosphere of distrust between residents, the Parish Council, and the school/authority.

The new school will be on very good agricultural land that has drainage issues as does the surrounding area. It will also erode the strategic greening gap between the village and southern Sittingbourne and, in my view, will help pave the way for future development in the rural area. The road is struggling to take current levels of traffic and will not cope with the massive increase in cars; it is a country road that has traffic calming on a bus route. The new proposal though welcomed in principal is not a very good idea on the intended site. All that will happen is the problems we currently experience with the old site will be magnified by the increase in numbers and just moved further down the road. As a Church of England school children living close to the school but outside the Ecclesiastical Parish come 9th on the admission criteria and Children with affiliations to other Anglican Churches within the Deanery of Sittingbourne come 5th, Children with other Church affiliation at churches in membership with 'Churches together in Sittingbourne come 6th. There is no reason why this new build needs to be in the civic parish of Tunstall at all. It has been for some time serving an ever growing number of children from outside of the civic parish with future development to the north of Sittingbourne and with the schools good reputation this will only increase. The local people were only offered one site for this new school and an inappropriate one at that. This current plan is being rushed forward and has left a lot of people in the dark. I know much of what I have written is more to do with planning than the education needs but they are so closely linked. Poor planning will lead to a detrimental outcome in terms of education. I do not want to see Tunstall lose its small and unique village school; neither do I think it would close due to the expansion/relocation not going ahead or being delayed. The mobiles will keep getting planning permission and people will still want to send their kids to the school as well as other extra capacity in the borough being brought into effect before the new site would even be open, so the education case does not mean we should push ahead regardless. I would be happy to invite all members of the Committee to have a site visit at the proposed new site so that rather than looking at misleading maps and pictures they can get a better idea of the situation."

5.2. The view of the School

Headteacher and Governing Body:

The Headteacher and the Governing Body are wholly supportive of the sustainable long term solution that has been proposed by KCC and the Diocese to relocate and expand the school. The proposed site is within the ecclesiastical parish, maintaining its links with the church, whilst providing the expansion to two form entry. This proposal will provide the school with buildings and facilities fit for 21st century education and will allow them to

build upon its reputation of providing 'good' education as confirmed by Ofsted.

Pupils:

As part of a writing exercise, Year 6 children had the opportunity to give their views; 24 supported the proposals to relocate and enlarge the school; 5 objected to the proposals to relocate and enlarge the school.

- There will be more room for us to play
- We will have better facilities to learn in the new school
- Our old mobiles get flooded in heavy rain and sweaty when it's lunchtime.
- We would have a larger hall with proper space to do PE.
- We would have more friends and more friends mean a happy school.
- I object to the new school because there would be lots of traffic disruption.
- Four year old children will find it much more daunting in a larger school.
Many children like Tunstall School because it's a small school.

5.3 The view of the Diocese of Canterbury:

The Diocese of Canterbury jointly proposes the re-siting and expansion of the school. It will serve the continuing and sustained demand for places in the school, while also making the school more cost-effective. The Church has provided a School for the ecclesiastical parish and local communities here since 1887, and fully supports the proposal.

It is the Diocesan Board of Education's view that this 'Good' school with a strong and popular ethos is worthy of expansion, and can make a valuable contribution to supporting parent choice and adding to the number of available Voluntary Aided primary places in the area.

5.4. The view of the Area Education Officer:

The Area Education Officer for East Kent fully supports this proposal and, having considered other commissioning options and the need to address the urgent situation with regard to the school on its current site, is of the belief that rebuilding Tunstall CE Primary School as a two form entry school is not only necessary, but the most cost-effective and sustainable solution to the increased demand in the area. All other schools in the planning area were considered.

Tunstall CE Primary School is a popular and inclusive school judged as 'Good' by Ofsted and is regularly oversubscribed. The school's location in South Sittingbourne means it is ideally placed to meet the forecast demand for primary school places in this locality.

6. Proposal

6.1 Tunstall CE Primary School is a Voluntary Aided Church of England school and the proposal is being brought forward by KCC and the Diocese of Canterbury with the support of the governing body of the school.

6.2 The proposed relocation and expansion of Tunstall CE Primary School is subject to KCC statutory decision making process and planning.

6.3 An Equality Impact Assessment has been completed as part of the consultation. Comments have been received from local residents saying

that the proposals impact unfavourably on them, but the Equality Impact Assessment is an assessment of the impact of the project on the client group, which in this case is the children, and the families whose children currently attend the school and whose children will attend in the future. No comments to the assumptions made in the Equality Impact Assessment have been received from the client group.

7. Delegation to Officers

- 7.1 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. For information it is envisaged, if the proposal goes ahead, that the Director of Property & Infrastructure Support will sign contracts on behalf of the County Council.

8. Conclusions

- 8.1 Forecasts for the planning area of South Sittingbourne indicate an increasing demand for primary school places. The rebuilding of Tunstall CE Primary School 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 'Commissioning Plan for Education – Kent' (2013 – 2018).

9. Recommendation(s)

Recommendation(s): The Education Cabinet Committee is asked to consider and endorse or make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform on the decision to:

- (i) Issue a public notice to relocate and expand Tunstall CE Primary School, by 210 places from 1FE (30) to 2FE (60).

And, subject to no objections being received to the public notice

- (ii) Relocate and expand the school
- (iii) Allocate £4,818,000 from Education, Learning and Skills Capital Budget.
- (iv) AUTHORISE the Director of Property and Infrastructure Support in consultation with the Director of Law and Governance to enter into any necessary contracts/ agreements on behalf of the County Council
- (v) AUTHORISE the Director of Property and Infrastructure Support to be the nominated Authority Representative within the relevant agreements and to enter into variations as envisaged under the contracts

10. Background Documents

10.1 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

10.2 Kent Commissioning Plan for Education Provision 2013-2018

<https://democracy.kent.gov.uk/documents/s43253/ItemD3KentEducationCommissioningPlan20132018final.pdf>

10.3 Consultation Document and Equalities Impact Assessment

<http://consultations.kent.gov.uk/consult.ti/TunstallSchool/consultationHome>

11. Contact details

Report Author

- Marisa White, Area Education Officer –East Kent
- 01227 284407
- marisa.white@kent.gov.uk

Relevant Director:

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

**The proposed expansion of Tunstall CE Primary School to increase the PAN
from 30 to 60 places**

Summary of written responses

Consultation documents (hard copies) distributed: 400

Responses received: 264

Category	Agree	Disagree	Agree with relocation but disagree with expansion	Agree with relocation but undecided about expansion	Undecided	Total
Parent	56	8	7	1	0	72
Other Interested Party	41	119	8	1	3	171
Governor	5	0	0	0	0	5
Member of Staff	14	0	0	0	0	14
Total	116	128	15	2	3	264

In support of the proposal

- There is no opportunity on the current site for real development or educational 'growth'.
- Two form entry has long been regarded as the optimum size for a primary school.
- As a contribution to the wider community of Sittingbourne, we could look forward to offering the popular and proven Tunstall Christian Ethos of quality education to many more local families.
- The children would benefit enormously from learning in proper sized classrooms instead of the mobiles they are currently housed in.
- It is disheartening when told by Ofsted inspectors that it is our buildings and not our teaching that is holding the school back.
- I am aware that a new school with a two form entry may well result in increased traffic flow past my house before and after the school day, but as this will occur for short periods on less than 200 days per year, it seems a very small price to pay to facilitate freedom of choice for parents who wish their children to be educated within a Christian environment, currently only available to a small percentage of those applying for a place at the school.
- The school needs to relocate in order to replace the grossly inadequate and substandard accommodation with modern educational facilities.
- We live in the 21st century and our schools need to be 21st century ready – we need this new school as soon as possible to give the children the facilities they deserve.
- Tunstall CE Primary is an excellent school operating in very difficult conditions. A new school with purpose built areas, playing field and car park would benefit all concerned.
- An increase in school places would be welcomed by many families in the area.
- This proposal will benefit pupils, parents and residents of Tunstall.
- The current school has no proper library, no room for study groups, hardly any playground, no proper music or sports facilities, in short it is not fit for purpose.

- As a local resident who would have the new school opposite my house, I would welcome it, whereas many of the local residents seem to oppose everything the school tries to do including improving facilities on its current site.
- I feel this would benefit the residents of Tunstall village to provide a school of this type in a setting sympathetic to the area. My family is completely in favour of this proposal and feel it to be in the best interests of all concerned.
- I believe that the proposals will contribute to maintaining a healthy and sustainable future for the Tunstall church, which in turn could contribute a thriving sense of community in and around Tunstall.
- As the population is increasing it makes sense to have a bigger school and you couldn't get a better location, still in the Parish of Tunstall and in walking distance of the church.

Against the proposal

- Not only will there be congestion on the roads, but also on pavements; and there is no space to provide pavements in parts of Tunstall Road.
- New schools should be built within new housing developments to minimize road congestion.
- The school should not be built on agricultural land when there are brown field sites available in Sittingbourne
- The land on which you propose to build the new school is an area which absorbs a lot of the local rainfall. The excess runs off onto Tunstall Road, from there onto Cranbrook Drive and Chegworth Gardens causing flooding problems.
- I cannot see that there is any safe and easy entrance point to the proposed site at any point along the Tunstall Road.
- The pond is deep and dangerous and would need to be much more secure to make it safer for children in the area.
- The identified site is wholly inappropriate for such use and presently has no support in the Swale local plan. Alternative proposals should be considered. Many of the school intake travel by car or walk to the existing school from some distance away. So alternative sites within the built up area can reasonably be reviewed and then brought forward at an appropriate time having undertaken the necessary consultation to establish that the development proposed would be acceptable, in principle, with the local planning authority.
- The proposed location would cause serious traffic congestion, light pollution, noise and devalue properties in the area and will also be inadequate for future expansion.
- There would be no need for a new school if only the local children attended the present school.
- It would increase the traffic on the roads which increase the emissions which the government are trying to reduce.
- We don't want or need a new school in Tunstall. The development is on the north side of Sittingbourne.
- Not only will you de-value our house prices you will also ruin the village way of life, the quality of life we have in Tunstall is a quiet retirement setting.
- Just because KCC happen to already own the proposed site for the new school is not a good enough reason to build a new school on it.
- At a time when growing populations demand more food it would seem wrong to use grade one agricultural land for building.
- This would be a massive scar on one of the few pieces of genuine scenic beauty in this area, something which the town of Sittingbourne sadly lacks.
- There is no real need locally for this many school places in Tunstall, just demand.
- We feel it would become a bottle neck at certain times of the day as the Kent Science Park also creates traffic.

- There may well be a need for primary places elsewhere in Sittingbourne but that is where a school should be built so that the children can walk to school as per the KCC health and wellbeing strategy.
- We do not need a town size school, large in this case is not good, and the school is successful because it is small and a centre to the village community.
- We moved here because it is a beautiful place to live and we want to keep our semi-rural life style. Our views will be blighted by a new modern school building.
- The impact of the success and expansion at the Kent Science Park must also be put into the equation.
- The school cannot be left in its present situation and should either be returned to its previous, pseudo-village school capacity or if this is deemed no longer operationally viable in education terms, closed and appropriate provision made for the pupils in their own localities.

The Tunstall Parish Council carried out their own consultation in parallel to the KCC consultation, which informed their response to KCC. The Parish Council does not agree with the proposals to relocate or expand the school as the majority of Parishioners responding to their separate consultation did not agree with the proposals. The Parish Council provided copies of the responses they received to their consultation, both for and against the proposals.

In support of relocation but not expansion.

- I fully understand the proposal to relocate the school but if additional school places are required to support new developments then new schools should be built close to these estates.
- A larger school would attract more traffic and more pollution.
- We would prefer to keep a one form entry school in Tunstall rather than doubling its size, otherwise this rural village will lose its identity, and just get swallowed up into Sittingbourne.

**Proposal to relocate and expand Tunstall CE Primary School
Public Consultation Meeting – 22 October 2013**

Panel	Mr Leyland Ridings	Chair of Education Cabinet Committee
	Mrs Marisa White	Area Education Officer (East Kent)
	Revd. Simon Foulkes	Diocese of Canterbury

In Attendance

	Mrs Jane Wiles	Area Schools Officer
	Mrs Ann Davies	Public Meeting Recorder
	Mrs Kate Hutchings	Head Teacher
	Mrs Doreen Hunter	Head of Governors

The meeting was chaired by Mr Leyland Ridings and was attended by approximately 180 people including parents, governors, staff and other interested parties. The meeting was also attended by Local Members, Mr Roger Truelove and Mr Lee Burgess.

A short presentation outlining the proposal for relocation and expansion was given by Marisa White. Marisa White explained that this is the consultation for the education case and that a separate planning consultation would take place, running in parallel with this consultation, starting within the next few weeks.

The Reverend Simon Foulkes informed the meeting that the Diocese was committed to the school and very proud of it. He thanked staff for all their work. The school is judged as a 'Good' school and educational standards are key to this project, as all children are entitled to a good education.

Kate Hutchings, Headteacher spoke about the good education provided by the school, but the constant difficulties the school faced because of the accommodation and site. The school is excited about the proposal and hope it goes ahead to provide the facilities to continue the good education.

The main points, views and comments are listed below:

Issues Raised	Responses from Marisa White and Simon Foulkes
If this proposal goes ahead, KCC will have to build houses to fund this project	Marisa White, explained how the proposal would be funded from basic need funding provided by the government and capital funding which includes disposal of KCC surplus accommodation. There are no plans to sell part of the site for housing to contribute to this project.
KCC should not be building a school here in Tunstall where it is not needed. In the past there was the opportunity for sites for schools which KCC did not take up. Now you are going to build a school on farmland where it is not needed. The	Tunstall is a good school and to remain good and to become outstanding they cannot stand still. Tunstall is one of many schools we are expanding. There are sometimes options for school sites when housing developments are

<p>school should stay as it is.</p>	<p>proposed. The triggers for these options are such as when house 400 is occupied we can have the site with a two year window to build school. At the time of the development in Sittingbourne, there was a population dip and no pressure on school places; therefore we could not draw down funding from the government to build schools.</p>
<p>I think you are going to rip apart this village by doing this. Has rebuilding on the current site been considered?</p>	<p>The existing site has mobiles requiring temporary planning permission. We looked at the options at the time of renewal and it is not possible or viable to provide what is needed on the existing site.</p>
<p>How will the children get from the school to the church if it moves?</p>	<p>It is a key requirement for the children to be able to walk to the church and this remains the case.</p>
<p>Concerns were raised about flooding on Cranbrook Drive as the original storm drains do not have the capacity to take the water away and when it rains the road floods. The pond is there to absorb the rain water. Is removal of the pond part of the project? Building on that site will only exacerbate the problem. KCC drainage teams have been unable to provide a solution to the flooding problem.</p>	<p>There is no intention to remove the pond. As part of the feasibility work and the planning process, surveys will be undertaken with regard to drainage but we cannot predict what the outcome will be at this stage. Your comments will be taken into consideration.</p>
<p>The new housing developments in Sittingbourne were built out and now this situation has caught up with KCC because they have not planned adequately. This town has not been planned properly. No one thinks 10 years down the line. When the village hall was built why was the school not expanded at that time?</p>	<p>The practical problem is that the site now occupied by the school is not all owned by the school, part of it is rented and there is no further land to build on.</p>
<p>There are no pavements where you are planning to put the school</p>	<p>There will be surveys and plans to provide pavements as part of the planning process and consultation.</p>
<p>The Diocese must have an idea of how the village will look with the new school. Do you feel this will have an adverse impact on Tunstall Village? The traffic is horrendous and the village cannot take double the traffic coming from all points in Sittingbourne.</p>	<p>There are processes going on in parallel. The impacts have to be balanced and worked through with the community to prepare for the future.</p>
<p>I would like to think that having a good quality local school in my village would enhance the value of my property and</p>	<p>Tunstall can only operate as a one form entry school because of the mobiles. If planning permission is not renewed, the</p>

<p>everyone should consider what the risk would be if this proposal does not go ahead. This is about sustaining good quality education for the future in this village.</p>	<p>school will not have enough accommodation to deliver education to the children already in the school and as a consequence would have to reduce the number of places available to 15 per year group. Small schools can become vulnerable because of the new funding formula from central government, which provides challenges to smaller schools.</p>
<p>The school buildings were purchased and given to the parish by the children of The Reverend George Bridges-Law, Rector of Tunstall. There are approximately 40 children from the parish who attend the school and the rest get shipped in from all over Sittingbourne.</p> <p>Please provide Tunstall Parish Council with paperwork to show who owns the school, because if it belongs to the Parish it does not belong to the Church.</p> <p>Are you proposing to use the entire 10 acre field for the school, or just part of it and sell the rest for housing?</p>	<p>There is a trust for the school which exists by virtue of the original gift and various education acts have been passed since that date. Paperwork can be provided to the Parish Council. The Diocesan Board of Education is now the Trustee of the school site, but not the whole site.</p> <p>The proposed school site will also have sports areas, play areas and parking. Our proposals will be scrutinised by Highways.</p> <p>There are no plans to sell off part of the 10 acre field and allow housing. No plans currently but cannot guarantee what decisions will be made in the future.</p>
<p>There is crazy parking around all the schools in the area by parents. There will be dozen of cars trying to park creating a hazard. What are you prepared to do about this?</p> <p>Children come to this school from all parts of Sittingbourne including Medway.</p>	<p>We are at the early stages of the process and are required to undertake a full traffic survey, to provide parking and a safe exit and entrance. We know parking is a major issue with most schools and we need to see whether we can address these issues. We cannot predict what Highways will require and whether we can provide those requirements.</p> <p>Parents have the right to identify their preferred school and a Church school, with a particular ethos will be a preference for parents from a wider area. Patterns do change as school popularity changes and we work hard to ensure that parents secure one of their preferred school. If there are more applications than places at a school, then the oversubscription criteria has to be applied, which includes distance.</p> <p>We should be in a position to publish the plans for this proposal before Christmas, and be in a position to consult on the plans in about four of five weeks.</p>

Will the school become voluntary controlled if the LA is contributing to the proposal?	The school will remain a voluntary aided school. The LA works closely with the Diocese to jointly fund projects as the LA has the responsibility to provide school places where they are needed.
Will you be building this one big school and shut all the other small schools?	We need all the places in all the schools we have currently and there is no intention to close any school. Small schools do face financial challenges but there are ways of schools working together for economies of scale.

Comments
It is the children we should be thinking about, as their future education is at the heart of this proposal. The school buildings are inadequate, making the space in the school very difficult for teaching the children. We want to have new buildings and facilities so that our children can be provided with a school fit for 21 st century education. A good education should be afforded to as many children as possible.
It is educationally beneficial for the children to be taught in a school with two classes per year group. The children deserve to benefit from a new expanded school with better facilities and accommodation.
Tunstall will no longer be a village but will submerge into Sittingbourne. The value of properties will decrease and the traffic will be appalling.
The school serves the ecclesiastical parish not just the village of Tunstall. A mile or two away from Tunstall is still within the ecclesiastical parish.
If KCC did not own this site, this proposal would not be coming forward.
Currently there are 210 children attending the school with only 52 parking spaces at the village hall, this causes traffic chaos and this will not get any better on the proposed site.
I do not want to see the school move but this is a once in a lifetime opportunity and any proposal that provides children with a better education and raise standards must be welcomed.
This will affect the value of my house and my lifestyle. We will be in our garden and hear children. The treeline is not opposite my house, as they have all blown down in the wind. We already find it impossible to get out of our drive in the morning and I am also sure that any traffic impact assessment will prove that this proposal is not feasible.
I am concerned that this proposal is to build on grade 2 productive farmland and land built on is lost forever as food production. Whilst there may be need for more school places, this is the wrong place. Bigger is not better and primary education should be delivered on a small scale. Tunstall is a good school but to what extent will this continue. The school should look at what the impact will be in relation to children on the SEN register, from the travelling community, eligible for free school meals and children who have English as a second language.
We should embrace the plans and work together to address these issues. Houses in an area with a good school can increase in value.
Swale Borough has indicated that they will not renew planning for the mobiles. This will mean that 90 children will not be able to attend the school in the future. If the school is moved it will be more accessible for children to walk to school. Over half of the places available are taken by children who have siblings at the school. Doubling the size of the school will give more children who live in the

locality the opportunity for a place at the school.

Small schools and small communities continue to provide a better education, and if the size increases, it will provide more places for SEN and how will this impact on those children currently attending the school.

The new school would allow a larger breakfast club and maybe an after school club, reducing the numbers arriving at the school at the same time.
The current economic climate does not allow us the luxury of small schools that cost more to run.

It is important to recognise there are two processes. Educationalists have to consult on whether it is a good proposal educationally. The planning process will decide whether the proposal is feasible and viable.
The current site is untenable and unsustainable going forward to the future.
Conflict between the school and the community has been going on for many years.

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL – PROPOSED RECORD OF DECISION

DECISION TO BE TAKEN BY:

Roger Gough,
Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform

DECISION NO:

14/00003

For publication

Subject: Proposal to relocate and expand Tunstall CE Primary School

Decision:

As Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform I agree to:

- (i) Issue a public notice to relocate Tunstall CE Primary School and expand the school by 210 places from 1FE to 2FE.

And, subject to no objections being received to the public notice

- (ii) Relocate and expand the school
- (iii) Allocate £4,818,000 from the Education, Learning and Skills Capital Budget.
- (iv) AUTHORISE the Director of Property and Infrastructure Support in consultation with the Director of Law and Governance to enter into any necessary contracts/ agreements on behalf of the County Council
- (v) AUTHORISE the Director of Property and Infrastructure Support to be the nominated Authority Representative within the relevant agreements and to enter into variations as envisaged under the contracts

Should objections, not already considered by the cabinet member when taking this decision, be received during the notice period a separate decision will be required in order to continue the proposal and expand the school to allow for proper consideration of the points raised.

Reason(s) for decision:

The Swale section of the Kent Commissioning Plan for Education Provision 2013-18 has identified a need for up to 24 additional Reception Year places within the planning area of South Sittingbourne.

The expansion of Tunstall CE Primary School will help to address these pressures and adheres to the principles of our Commissioning Plan as it increases capacity at a good and popular school. In reaching this decision I have taken into account:

- the views expressed by those attending the public consultation meeting on 22 October, and those put in writing in response to the consultation;
- the views of the District and Parish Councils, the local County Councillors; The Diocese of Canterbury; Governing Body of the school, the Staff and Pupils;
- the Equalities Impact Assessment and comments received regarding this; and
- the views of the Education Cabinet Committee which are set out below

Financial Implications:

It is proposed to enlarge Tunstall CE Primary School by 210 places taking the PAN to 60 (2FE) for the September 2015 intake and eventually a total capacity of 420 places.

- a. Capital – The school will be rebuilt as a 2FE school on a site owned by KCC located approximately 500 metres to the north east of the existing school. A feasibility study has been completed. The total cost is estimated to be in the region of £4,818,000. 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 on a 'per pupil' basis.
- c. Human – Tunstall CE Primary School will appoint additional teachers, as the school size increases and the need arises.

Cabinet Committee recommendations and other consultation:

27 September 2012

The Committee endorsed the Kent Commissioning Plan, which identified a need for additional places in the planning area of Swale District.

date

To be added after Committee meeting

Any alternatives considered:

The Commissioning Plan for Education Provision 2013-18 explored all options and the expansion of this school was deemed the suitable option.

Any interest declared when the decision was taken and any dispensation granted by the Proper Officer:

.....

Signed

.....

Date