

Appendix a

Section 19 Notice on the possible expansion of Pupil Places at St. Peter's Church of England Primary School in Mansfield.

Reasons for Objection to the proposal

1. Consultation.

1. The proposed 50% expansion of pupil places at St. Peter's Church of England Primary School in Mansfield will necessitate the physical capacity the school to be increased by 105 pupils to accommodate these additional places the County Council are legally required to publicise a full statutory public consultation as the increase is 25% more than the existing school capacity and hence a statutory notice under section 19 (1) of (EIA) 2006 is required ensuring the whole community who might be affected by the proposed increase are afforded the opportunity to comment and object in structured and auditable manner this has not been done.
2. The County Council being cognisant of the fact that this School is the only Christian faith based school in the area with no defined catchment area have not used all available and appropriate means to effectively and inclusively consult with the local people of the Mansfield area and other interested parties so that they could give their views. The county council are apparently unable to advise on who they were consulting with and neither were they able to advise on the proposed number of interested parties from whom they were seeking views for a school that has no particular catchment area and one which is faith based, the "Community" is a large church to reach a wholly inadequate attempt has been made to seek there views in there haste to foster an inappropriate solution to a perceived problem which is not proven at this particular school.
3. There is no guarantee that all existing parents and the community at large have been consulted with as the documentation and consultation has not been managed in a controlled manner with a complete audit trail that the County Council officers can verify and there warrants a formal notice to be issued under section 19 (1) of the (EIA) 2006.
4. The methodology for the formal consultation is fundamentally flawed as there is considerable confusion in the leaflet regarding who has a right to express a view, it is unclear as to

anonymity, there is no formal definition of the “wider community” or “interested parties” (A faith based school has a wide and varied number of individuals who may seek to express a view) and the proposed method of collection of views by the County council has the potential to be flawed in that it seeks views by several different uncontrolled methods both verbally and in writing and Cabinet and committee members should be formally made aware of this as part of this consultation process.

5. The alleged “meeting” held on the 10th October 2012 at which there were Two Number yet to be determined draft design proposals put forward by the design team which the architect manually amended during the session, had no formal structure to it nor did it in anyway have any formal way of garnering views from interested parties who by virtue of late notification or no notification by the County Council may have been absent and completely unaware about the principle of providing extra places at St. Peter’s Church of England Primary School in Mansfield.
6. At the Drop in session held on the 10th October 2012 the representatives of the school governors, the teaching staff and the county council were either unable or unwilling to answer all questions raised by interested parties and in fact gave many contradicting statements about the proposal.
7. From the onset of this proposal the views of the parents and interested parties at large were not properly sought by the governors or the diocese prior to ratifying the decision to move forward.
8. The governors have procrastinated in there response to reasonable and legally bound requests for information to allow an informed view to be made about this proposal by interested parties and the community at large.

2. Rationale Behind the Recommendation

1. It Is wholly inappropriate to include this school into any geographical / regional or area data on the basis that it has no defined catchment area furthermore the County Councils own projected demand figures prove that in its current form with a net capacity of 210 pupils the following **SURPLUSES** exist.

2012/2013 there is a surplus of places of 17

2013/2014 there is a surplus of places of 12

2014/2015 there is a surplus of places of 11

2015/2016 there is a surplus of places of 9

2016/2017 there is a surplus of places of 7

Therefore the projection methodology to assess the demand by the county councils own research proves there is no proven demand at this school.

2. The County Council and the Diocese are at odds as to the certainty of the location of the proposal which for correctness is N 053°07.454' W 001°09.855 the school is conveniently referred to as either East or South Mansfield to support an unproven case.
3. This solution does not solve the predicted problem of a shortfall of 100 plus place in the area from 2014 onwards and proves the need for a new school to be created by 2017 which better future proofs this part of the community.
4. This proposal is potentially unlawful under the provisions of the School Premises Regulations 2012.

3. Implications for parents and future parents of the school.

1. This proposal will result in a loss of inclusion by the creation of a separate annex building.
2. This proposal will result in the loss of a whole school community for example it will no longer be possible to gather all together in the existing hall for worship assembly performances etc which under this proposal sees no expansion.
3. The integration of year groups in Key stage 2 will lead to the creation of elitism.

4. Financial implications.

1. The proposals do not represent value for money for the whole lifecycle cost of the new asset.
2. The EMPA frameworks are not the most economically advantage procurement route in this current economic climate tender price indexes have dramatically lowered since the creation of the frameworks.
3. The professional services contracts have not been competitively market tested.
4. Modular buildings have a significantly higher cost in use profile over the lifetime of the building and are not future proof spaces and the principle weathering elements namely the roof and windows only have a 20 year life cycle.

5. Equalities Implications.

1. The culture and ethos of the school will be fundamentally changed by the introduction of more pupils who do not necessarily come from a faith based background giving rise to the potential risk of unlawful discrimination within the pupil and parent population.

6. Human Resource Implications.

1. The governors are not willing to make lasting and binding commitments that the appropriate levels of teaching staff will be utilised in order to preserve a ratio of at least one fully qualified member of teaching staff to every 30 pupils for all years groups and therefore the county can not guarantee that funding from the increase to the school budget triggered by an increase number of pupils will be utilised appropriately for the education of the children.
2. The Governors when asked the question what is the proposed increase in staff numbers and at what grade the response is:

“any newly created positions would be advertised at the correct grades pertinent to the post at the time of advertising”

3. On the question What is the proposed ratio of full time teaching staff to pupils per class year the Governors response is:

“Current government guidelines are 1 teacher per 30 pupils in Key Stage 1. The structure of staffing in school is very adult rich with at least 1 teacher being supported by a Teaching Assistant every morning. A full time Care Assistant is employed in Reception, Year 1 and Year 2. **What the staffing structure will specifically be in the future cannot be guaranteed,** however it is **hoped** that the ‘adult rich’ culture currently enjoyed by pupils at the school can be continued.”

7. Crime & disorder issues.

1. Increased class sizes will increase the likelihood and probability of the risk of increasing disorder in the school environment.
2. The increased number of pupils will give rise to a significant increase in the likelihood for crime particularly vehicular related in the surrounding neighbourhood.

8. Human Rights Implications.

1. The admissions policy seeks to ensure that those pupils from a faith based family receive priority over geographical location of pupils with no prescribed catchment area and there being significant evidence that there is no increased demand for faith based pupils the cultural balance will fundamentally change within the school and will fundamentally impede upon the human rights of the Christian faith based pupils.

9. Safeguarding of children Implications.

1. The two number designs displayed at the drop in session pose a number of safeguarding issues and owing to the absence of one firm proposal prevents further comment.

10. Impacts for Sustainability and the Environment.

1. This proposal results in Loss of valuable playing field and outside play facilities, the latest ofsted report has highlighted areas for improvement include the need to provide "outdoor activities that match those taking place indoors so that children's learning is promoted equally well in both areas" and furthermore Section 10 of the School Premises Regulations 2012 states:

"Suitable outdoor space must be provided in order to enable:

A) Physical education to be provided to pupils in accordance with the school curriculum; and

B) Pupils to play outside."

When the proposals are set against the minimum design standards they are significantly deficient in provision of "suitable" open space.

2. The proposed development will lead to the loss of all or part of a playing field, and would prejudice its use, and should not be permitted because it would permanently reduce the opportunities for participation in sporting activities. Government planning policy and the policies of Sport England have recognised the importance of such activities to the social and economic well-being of the country and Sport England have already expressed their concerns to the county council about the

proposal with The main area of concern being the desire to provide new hard play area as a replacement for the loss created by the proposal to construct the additional classrooms on part of the existing hard court/play area.