

## Notes

### Infrastructure Planning Task Group

---

**Time and date**

10.00am on Thursday 18<sup>th</sup> December 2014

**Place**

Byworth Room, Farnham Town Council, South Street, Farnham

---

### **Farnham Neighbourhood and Surrey County Council Education**

**Attendees:**

Kathy Beresford, Surrey County Council (KB)

Cllr Carole Cockburn, Lead Member IPG, Farnham Town Council (CC)

Cllr Roger Steel, Task Group Member, Farnham Town Council (RS)

Cllr Paddy Blagden, Task Group Member, Farnham Town Council (PB)

Introductions were made and CC gave KB an update on the progress of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan (FNP) and explained that the meeting was to inform the team on how to plan for future development, specifically in relation to the associated need for school places with new development.

KB explained that SCC had a statutory duty to provide school places and described the process of analysing and ranking school applications. She explained that Surrey children were ranked higher than Hampshire children and would get first places available in Surrey school. She also explained that parental choice for school is considered but that there are sometimes compromises as it was challenging to meet everyone's first preferences.

KB explained that when allocating children to schools, it is not usual for a child to have to travel to the other side of the town for a school place. She also advised that 22-23% of Surrey children attended independent schools and that Hampshire had a catchment area that ended at the Surrey border, which meant that although some Hampshire children could apply for Surrey schools, children from Surrey could not apply to Hampshire schools.

RS asked what was being planned for expanding schools, without taking account of the new development planned.

KB explained that SCC factored in current permissions, based on projections of children coming to school age and that there was not a current need to expand any of the schools. She explained that new projections were due in January 2015 which would be used to inform future plans.

CC asked if there would ever be a need for a new secondary school in Farnham. KB said that there was scope within the existing provision to expand.

KB explained that SCC regularly liaised with WBC and developers on new permissions and planned new development. She also said that CIL and Section 106 contributions are made towards education provision but said that WBC were currently using PIC structure.

KB said that market research was done on how many children come with new development and that there was a formula that is used. This assumed 25 primary and 18 secondary age pupils to every 100 new dwellings. She explained that as the LA SCC could not open new maintained schools and that new schools would need to be free/academy schools. It was noted that SCC can only think about opening a new maintained school if a tender for a free/academy was unsuccessful.

CC asked if KB thought that with the possible changes in government, that the push for free/academy schools would change. KB said that she felt it may not, as it had come a long way and predated the existing government.

KB said that the timing of a new school was considered to be very important and that until planning permission was granted, a new school could not be built.

It was noted that RS asked if the SCC education had the power to stop development if the schools could not accommodate the new pupils. KS said that impact of development can only be mitigated if the demands made by SCC education were satisfied. It was noted that SCC education starts planning as soon as a number of large-medium scale developments are planned/permitted. KB said that there were some ideas to expand the existing provision.

CC asked if there was a point that SCC education could say that new development cannot be permitted without new provision and if SCC had to identify new provision. KB said that they could be quite specific about needs, such as area and size of new provision, but that more specific details could not be discussed until the developers were involved.

It was agreed that following receipt of the new projections in January 2015 KB would provide some further feedback on the numbers of new dwellings planned in the FNP.

The meeting closed at 11.45am.