

## Secondary School Provision in East Dulwich

### Waverley Lower School Site – Feasibility Study

#### Introduction

This Feasibility Study considers the potential use of the Waverley Lower school as the site for a new boys' school to serve East Dulwich and surrounding areas.

#### Background

The future shape of secondary school provision in the East Dulwich area has been the subject of considerable interest over the last couple of years. A group of local parents (the Eden Group) has energetically made the case for a new secondary school to serve the area. The absence of suitable sites for a new school in the area has meant that the potential role of Waverley school in meeting local needs has become central to the debate. The fact that Waverley is currently on two sites but is due to centralise on one of them (the Upper School in Homestall Road) once major building work is completed means that the future of its Lower School on Peckham Rye is of key importance.

These matters have been the subject of extensive consideration by the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Following examination of the issues, the Council decided to commission a feasibility study on the option of establishing a small boys' school on the Waverley Lower school site, with the intention that such a school would link with Waverley under recently introduced proposals for federated schools. This would involve a single Headteacher and Governing Body for the two schools. The feasibility study should include testing the will of the Council, the Governors of Waverley school, the Eden Group and residents.

This Paper does not address the full range of issues that were considered by the Council in arriving at this decision. Instead it directly addresses the feasibility of this specific option.

The six aspects to be considered are:

- 1. Site and Buildings** – is the Waverley Lower site suitable for this purpose?
- 2. Funding** – how much would it cost?
- 3. Need for School Places** – do we need such a school to meet the local demand for places?
- 4. The Education Issues** – does the proposal make sense in education terms?
- 5. Timing** – how long would it take to implement?
- 6. Acceptability** – does the proposal meet the needs of the local community and others affected by it?

## **Issue 1 – Site and Buildings**

### **The Waverley Lower Site**

Waverley Lower School is situated on Peckham Rye. It is bordered on its other sides by Friern Road and by private housing. The Lower School is about half a mile away from Waverley Upper school site on Homestall Road.

The main teaching block dates from 1896. Although in need of maintenance work, it is a sturdy building and a significant local landmark. Although the building is not listed and the site is not within a conservation area, there could be some opposition should it be proposed for demolition in order to develop a new school on the site. If demolition were to be considered, it is likely that English Heritage would be asked to assess whether the property should be listed.

A single storey annexe building, also dating from 1896, fronts onto Friern Road. It is unlikely that there would be objections on conservation grounds to the demolition of this property.

The main teaching block provides accommodation on four floors. The ground and first floors consist primarily of general classroom accommodation, hall, library and a media room: the second and third floors contain specialist accommodation for science and the arts. Mezzanine levels house offices, medical rooms and small resource areas.

The single storey annexe on Friern Road contains design and technology facilities.

The site is currently shared between Waverley school and the temporary home of the City of London Academy that opened in September 2003. Waverley School is due to vacate the site on completion of major work to its Upper School site: the Academy's occupation will cease when it moves to its permanent site at Paterson Park in Bermondsey by July 2005 at the latest.

### **State of Repair**

Because the Waverley Lower buildings are being phased out of use as the school centralises on its Upper site, there has been a lack of investment in the premises over recent years. The Council's Asset Management Plan states that necessary repairs would cost in the region of £1 million. In particular, there are numerous broken, slipped or missing tiles on the pitched roofs and brickwork re-pointing is required to all elevations. If the building is to be retained, a complete external refurbishment would be necessary. All mechanical and electrical services would require upgrading to modern standards.

### **Potential of Site**

For reasons discussed below, it will not be possible to accommodate a new school within the existing main building. Some new building will be required.

The need for good sustainable design is reflected in the Government's recent 'Building Schools for the Future' initiative. Schools must be designed to meet the needs of pupils and teachers in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. In order to achieve this, the DfES has appointed architects to develop exemplar school designs for new school

buildings that are intended to set a new benchmark standard. By having several different designs, able to be customised to individual circumstances and environments, they should be able to meet the aspirations of different schools, rural or urban, small or large and to meet different specialisms, sizes and management approaches. Schools and LEAs can use the exemplar designs to tailor their plans for individual school buildings to the needs of the local community. It is expected that these exemplar designs will be available from November 2003.

As well as these education factors, town planning requirements are likely to demand a high standard of design in view of the site's proximity to The Gardens Conservation Area.

In considering the feasibility of Waverley Lower, we have looked – for illustrative purposes – at the requirements of schools at three forms of entry (450 pupils) and four forms of entry (600 pupils). The additional requirements of a sixth form have been considered for both of these options.

Guidelines for school premises are set out in DfES Building Bulletin 82 (Revised). These guidelines acknowledge that urban secondary schools rarely have space for playing fields but consider it essential that they have an adequate site area for the following in addition to the buildings themselves:

- landscaping to soften the environment;
- ball games areas for playtime and curriculum games;
- circulation space to move between buildings;
- informal and social play-areas for those pupils who do not want to play games during break times;
- access roads, service areas and car parking.

The Lower School occupies a site area of approximately 1.85 acres.

Based on the recommendations of BB82 (revised), the total site area (including buildings and external areas but excluding playing fields) for the following size of school would be required:

3 Form Entry (450 pupils) – 1.95 acres

3 form entry with 90 sixth form pupils (540) – 2.45 acres

4 form entry (600 pupils) – 2.78 acres

4 form entry with 120 sixth form pupils (720 pupils ) – 4 acres

Recent reviews of school needs in inner city areas have recognised the difficulties of achieving the minimum site areas recommended in BB82. The exemplar designs should help address this issue. It is nevertheless apparent by the shortfall between the recommended requirements and the site area available that to provide a new secondary school on the existing site will require a high quality, imaginative and sensitive design.

### **Space Standards**

Similar to the overall site requirements, BB82 (revised) also recommends minimum areas for the school buildings themselves.

These cover such spaces as:

- general and practical teaching spaces;
- halls;
- learning resources areas;
- storage;
- staff and administration;
- dining and social.

In addition, further accommodation needs to be allowed for circulation, plant, toilets, changing rooms and kitchens.

The guidelines take account of the increasing demands that need to be addressed in schools, such as:

- the inclusion of more pupils with special educational needs (SEN) and disabilities;
- the increasing use of information and communication technology (ICT);
- opening up of schools for community use;
- an increasing number of support staff (and increased non-contact time for teachers).

It should nevertheless be noted that the guidelines provide suggested **minimum** standards: most Southwark secondary schools have accommodation in excess of these. These standards do not allow for any additional uses of the school premises, such as sole-use community or adult learning facilities.

The following therefore are typical examples of the gross accommodation area required for 3fe and 4fe schools with and without sixth form on site.

A 3fe school (450 pupils) and a sixth form of 90 would require accommodation of approximately 5020m<sup>2</sup>. Without a sixth form on site, this would reduce to approximately 4224m<sup>2</sup>.

A 4fe school (600 pupils) and a sixth form of 120 would require accommodation of approximately 6220m<sup>2</sup>. Without a sixth form on site this would reduce to 5159m<sup>2</sup>.

The existing main building has a gross floor area of approximately 2500m<sup>2</sup> and, as stated previously, would need complete renovation and refurbishment should it be retained. The assumption is made that the annexe building on site would be demolished.

Considerable development of the remainder of the site would also be required to meet the minimum recommended areas for the smallest school. For a 3fe school with sixth form a further 2520m<sup>2</sup> of accommodation would be required i.e. broadly the equivalent of the existing building. A 4fe school with sixth form would require a further 3720m<sup>2</sup> of accommodation.

Both options could be accommodated on the site by retaining and refurbishing the existing main block and adding new buildings of five to six storeys.

## **Potential for Shared Facilities with Waverley School**

The amount of additional accommodation required could be reduced if facilities were to be shared with Waverley School at Homestall Road. The main potential for such shared use would be for sports provision and sixth form facilities.

All secondary schools should have access to a four court sports hall of about 600m<sup>2</sup>. Part of the major rationalisation work currently taking place at Waverley Upper school will provide an appropriately sized new sports hall by February 2004. There is no existing or planned sixth form provision at the Upper School site at present and the siting of such accommodation would require close consideration in conjunction with the school Governing Body.

Were both sports hall and sixth form to be provided at the Upper School, this would leave the respective amounts of gross accommodation required for 3fe and 4fe at the Lower School as follows:

3fe – 3624m<sup>2</sup>

4fe – 4559m<sup>2</sup>

## **Conclusions**

Provision of a small boys' school on the Waverley Lower site would be feasible, although the site standards would fall below the minimum guideline standards. By an imaginative approach to use of the site, accommodation matching DfES standards could be provided by retention and refurbishment of the existing main building and the provision of new accommodation of up to five storeys. Sharing of facilities – particularly the sixth form and sports hall – with Waverley Upper would be a distinct advantage in reducing the amount of building required on this site. This would require careful management in terms of pupil movement, safety and timetabling.

Appendix 1 of this Discussion Paper provides an illustration of how accommodation for a four form entry school (on the basis of shared sports and PE with the main Waverley site) could be accommodated on the site.

## **Issue 2 – Funding**

### **Capital Costs**

The cost of the necessary works would be considerable. These costs allow for work to an existing building and these are always more difficult to assess than a new building because much depends on the condition of the premises and factors that are not always apparent in advance of commissioning work. As has already been noted, existing surveys of the building have revealed the need to spend about £1M in bringing it up to a reasonable condition of maintenance. For these reasons, a substantial allowance has been built into the costings for contingency. This would cover such factors as asbestos removal, new service connections, ground conditions and a design contingency.

No detailed work has been undertaken in assessing which elements of the curriculum could be provided in the existing building as opposed to new provision. The following figures should therefore be taken as indicative of the range of costs that could apply to the different options described. They are not based on detailed scheme proposals

and should therefore be taken as an indicative guide. The costs assume a start on site in 2005 and therefore include an allowance for future inflation.

All figures include professional fees:

	£
3fe, using existing building plus new build	16,816,900
Contingency Allowance	4,641,500
Total	21,458,400
3fe with sixth form, using existing building plus new build	19,924,500
Contingency Allowance	5,499,150
Total	25,423,650
4fe, using existing building plus new build	20,467,150
Contingency Allowance	5,648,950
Total	26,116,100
4fe with sixth form, using existing building plus new build	24,609,300
Contingency Allowance	6,792,150
Total	31,401,450

If a joint Sixth Form were provided at the Waverley Upper site to serve both schools, the cost has been estimated – on the same basis as the costs quoted above – in the region of £10,000,000 to £11,300,000.

No source of funding has yet been identified for this work. To the extent that the proposal meets the DfES definition of Basic Needs (i.e. accommodation required to meet the projected need for places), some funding should be available from the DfES although this is likely to amount to only a small proportion of the total costs (possibly less than 10%). DfES funding would need to be sought under the new Building Schools for the Future (BSF) initiative which is due to allocate substantial funding specifically to bring all secondary schools to a standard that meets today's needs. An alternative source of funding would apply if the new school were to be an academy where funding of the capital cost would be met by a sponsor and the DfES.

### **Revenue Costs**

The revenue budget for ongoing running costs of the new school would be based on a formula, based largely on pupil numbers. A small school therefore tends to have less flexibility, particularly in meeting fixed costs that are not related to pupil numbers. Small schools also tend to be more vulnerable if they do not attract the expected number of pupils as they must continue to meet the costs of providing a full curriculum but on the basis of a lower budget.

Most new schools recruit initially only to Year 7 with the number of pupils increasing incrementally with each successive year of admission. A new school – regardless of size – will need to meet a number of set-up costs, premises costs and staffing costs during this period of incremental growth that will not be fully reflected in a funding allocation based primarily on the number of pupils.

### **Issue 3 – Need for School Places**

#### **Provision in Southwark**

The need for school places is assessed annually in the Council's School Organisation Plan. The draft School Organisation Plan for 2003-2008 includes projections for the whole of Southwark, both for the total 11-16 roll and for Year 7 pupils (the 11+ age group transferring to secondary school). These are included as Appendix 2.

The projections forecast an increasing demand for Year 7 places at the borough's secondary schools and that by September 2006 there could be a shortage of school places for this year group. There would be need for an additional 28 places across Southwark in 2006/07, increasing to 117 by 2010/11.

An examination of the projected demand for school places more locally has been undertaken for the East Dulwich and Nunhead area. There are seven primary schools within this area. This analysis has taken the projected number of pupils in local primary schools and from this identifies the number of local pupils due to transfer to secondary school in future years i.e. the potential "market" for a new school. This does not take account of the current patterns of parental preference and recruitment that involve considerable movement of pupils to schools in Lewisham as well as schools elsewhere in Southwark, including the independent sector. Current parental preference for places is of course governed by the existing pattern of school provision in the area.

From this preliminary assessment it is possible to identify around 300 Year 6 pupils (divided broadly equally between boys and girls) who attend Southwark primary schools in the area and who could therefore transfer to new locally-based secondary provision in the area.

An analysis has also been carried out to ascertain to which secondary schools pupils from primary schools in a broader area of the south of the borough are transferring. This suggests that there could be a 'market' of over 300 pupils who currently go out-borough or to independent schools at age 11 available to take places at a proposed new school. It is likely however – from current recruitment patterns in Southwark – that the majority of pupils transferring out of the borough are girls who would not be served by a new boys' school.

### **Proposals in Lewisham**

These issues need to be considered in the light of current secondary school proposals in Lewisham where there is a proposal to provide a new secondary school in the north of the borough.

Lewisham has carried out a consultation exercise to ascertain the views of parents and others on the proposal for a new school. Some 141 responses were received – the majority in favour of a mixed community school. There was also a preference for the new school to be located in the north-west of Lewisham near to the Southwark border as this was perceived as the area in which parents would want a new school. A detailed feasibility study is currently under way on a site in Ladywell, approximately two miles from the East Dulwich area.

### **Conclusions**

It is apparent from all these factors that there is a need for additional secondary school provision in Southwark and that new provision in the East Dulwich area is likely to meet a local demand from those who are currently transferring from Southwark primary schools to schools outside the borough. What is less clear is the

extent of the “overlap” between this demand and the need for new places that Lewisham intends to meet by providing a new mixed school. It is also open to question whether this need would be met by a single-sex boys’ school.

An important factor here is the proposal that the new Southwark provision should be a boys’ school. A longstanding issue in Southwark is that most mixed schools have a substantial imbalance between boys and girls: in community schools, boys outnumber girls by more than two to one. The Southwark School Organisation Plan states that “such an imbalance is not desirable and it is doubtful that it truly meets parental expectations of a mixed school.” An imbalance can be expected however in circumstances where there are currently four single sex girls’ schools across Southwark and only one boys’ school.

## **Issue 4 – The Education Issues**

### **A “federated” structure**

The proposal envisages that the new boys’ school would link with Waverley school in a “federated” structure under a single headteacher and governing body.

The 2002 Education Act defines a federation as two or more maintained schools with a joint governing body. It also allows for the creation of joint governing body committees. The normal pre-conditions set by the DfES for a federation would be:

- there must be a contract drawn up between the schools involved with specified targets, timescales, activities and costs
- there must be written agreement from governing bodies
- schools must have LEA approval for federation and be committed to the federation concept and be prepared to work together to bring about improvement
- there must be clear focus on raising standards in across both schools and commitment to outcomes which will demonstrate the additional value of the federation model
- there must be a realistic timetable and evidence of sustainability

The benefits of federation are that they can increase capacity within the schools concerned to achieve higher standards, providing:

- improved teaching and learning
- a structured way for schools to collaborate, learn from each other and share best practice
- improved senior and middle management, joint appointment of staff and coherent training
- joint staffing opportunities including specialist teachers and wider career opportunities across the federation
- governance support and development
- a cost-effective and coherent curriculum. Increasing the opportunity to fulfil individual student’s needs, extending curriculum entitlement
- models of good practice to improve teaching and learning and inclusion
- cost effectiveness – economies of scale
- a basis for further partnerships, including cross-phase and with other providers (e.g. 14-19, community services etc.)
- saving on planning and administrative time
- strategic planning, for example through the sharing of complementary specialisms.



Examples of the measures that a federation can take include:

- sharing teachers and/or support staff
- sharing premises and/or equipment
- sharing specialist facilities
- moving gifted and talented children and other groups across schools
- lesson timetabling
- allowing teachers to observe and learn from each other's lessons
- 14-19 provision
- special needs provision
- tackling behaviour and exclusion
- tackling racial equality and community cohesion
- broadening curriculum entitlement
- building capacity in management and teaching and learning
- developing 'E' learning
- training teachers (ITT)
- innovative deregulation
- cross schools review
- shared accountability/ performance management
- focusing on system/ LEA-wide improvement
- working in partnership with business/ industry and higher education

The DfES has suggested that in order to be a successful federation, the likely conditions that schools should fulfil are:

- a sense of shared identity
- a sense of common purpose
- a cohesive leadership committed to a collaborative partnership
- a strong management infrastructure
- trust and openness between schools and a willingness to cooperate
- a system of review
- commitment

The regulations do not provide for a federation between an LEA maintained school, such as Waverley, and an academy (i.e. a school maintained directly by the DfES). The statutory regulations providing for the opening of a new school allow for the option of that school becoming an academy (see the section on statutory processes under Issue 5 below). Many of the principles outlined above could however be applied to an informal federation between a maintained school and an academy.

The model described above more accurately describes a federation between two existing schools rather than between an existing and a new school. A key issue in a federation between Waverley and a new boys' school will be the extent that the advantages of joint working described above can be achieved while still retaining the integrity of separate girls and boys' provision.

### **Curriculum Issues**

In terms of being able to provide curriculum breadth/diversity particularly at 14-19 (and associated economies of scale) schools of 3fe and 4fe would not normally be

considered to be the optimum size. Schools of 8fe/10fe would probably now be considered to be more appropriate for new build secondary schools.

National developments at 14-19 will require schools to broaden choice by providing a diverse range of high-quality qualifications, matched to individual pupil needs. Vocational courses in particular will be expected to be a strong element in this, as will accelerated entry into advanced level courses. Small schools will find it more difficult to provide such choice because of the number of specialist staff and facilities that are likely to be required. It is not normally economic to fund very small teaching groups. At post-16, providing courses across the ability range from entry level to Advance Level is more straightforward for schools with larger sixth-forms.

Although curriculum provision at KS3 is perhaps not as problematic for small schools as 14-19, the same arguments can apply, for example in providing additional modern foreign language choices. Flexibility in setting by ability can be more restricted with small cohorts of pupils.

Collaboration between providers – such as through federation - can be used successfully to overcome the disadvantages of small size although joint arrangements across two sites can present logistical and organisational difficulties. This will normally involve the movement of pupils and staff between sites with the potential disruption that this can cause. Collaboration between schools, schools and local colleges, and schools and work-based providers is being actively sought in 14-19 education. Locally The Southwark Guarantee is actively promoting this strand.

The critical issue for single sex schools is the impact that collaboration would have on standards, ethos and philosophy of single sex education. Another salient issue would be the views of parents of the single sex schools and the response of staff.

There are perceived advantages of small schools that should also be considered. For example, the tracking of pupil performance can be more straightforward and staff will probably know a much higher percentage of pupils than in a large school.

### **Types of Collaboration**

The main types of collaboration that could be considered are:

- shared use of each school's facilities
- a degree of mixed gender classing
- single sex teaching on both sites
- leadership and management
- shared teaching staff
- collaboration on out of hours learning/extra-curricular activities

### **Shared use of each school's facilities**

The degree of shared use would to some extent relate to need and equity. For example, as outlined in Issue 1, it is probable that the Sports Hall at the girls' School would need to be used by the boys.

The impact of pupil and staff movement between the two schools raises issues of safety, cost and constraints on timetabling.

### **A Degree of Mixed Gender Classing**

- Sixth Form – this type of collaboration is quite common between boys and girls schools.
- Key Stage 4 – this is less common than sixth form collaboration but could apply to some specialist subjects.
- Key Stage 3 – this is seen less often as it has greater effect on the ethos of single sex education.

### **Single Sex Teaching on both sites**

Research suggests that the effect of single-sex teaching is difficult to separate from other factors. Interestingly Ofsted has recently reported on research into both school size and the effect of single-sex education. The findings for secondary schools were not conclusive.

### **Leadership and Management Structures**

Although the federation model proposed envisages a shared governing body and headteacher, many forms of collaboration would still be feasible if there were to be separate governing bodies and heads.

### **Shared Teaching Staff**

The degree to which staff could be shared could vary considerably. It might be particularly beneficial in specialist subjects in the 14-19 curriculum.

### **Issue 5 - Timing**

Should the Council's Executive decide to proceed with the proposal described in this document, a statutory process would be required in connection with the proposal for a new school.

The Education Act 2002 introduced changes to the school organisation arrangements with a view to promoting greater diversity and choice. A special procedure for new school competitions, to be decided by the Secretary of State, now applies where an LEA decides that an additional secondary school is needed.

The LEA should first carry out formal consultation on its proposal with all those likely to be concerned, for example local parents, other schools and adjoining LEAs. It must then publish a statutory notice proposing the opening of a new school and inviting interested parties to bring forward proposals for the new school. These could include the diocesan authorities, any other person or organisation that has previously expressed an interest in setting up a secondary school to serve pupils in the area, and any other body or organisation that is likely to be interested in the proposals. Responses to this could include proposals for a new foundation or voluntary school or an academy.

When the deadline for receiving the proposals has passed, the LEA then publishes a further notice, giving details of all the proposals received and any it wishes to make itself, and inviting comments on the various proposals. The responses are then reported to the School Organisation Committee. This Committee gives its views on the proposals and then forwards these views to the Secretary of State who will make the decision on the type of school to be provided.

Time scales for most of these new statutory processes are set in the detailed regulations and these are shown in Appendix 3. The statutory requirements are complex and largely untested. It is likely it will take a period of some 12 months to obtain final statutory approval to a new school.

Once statutory approval has been given to the proposal, it is then necessary to obtain funding, undertake the detailed design work on the scheme and procure a contractor to carry out the work. For predominantly new-build projects, the expectation is that this would be delivered through the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) although if refurbishment of the existing Lower School block forms a major part of the scheme, a traditional form of procurement would be more likely.

It is possible that a new school could be opened in September 2006 but in view of the complexities of both the statutory procedures and the development phase, a September 2007 opening may be more feasible.

## **Issue 6 – Acceptability**

During October, the following consultation was carried out:

2.10.03 – meeting with Eden Group

7.10.03 - meeting with parents of pupils attending local primary schools.

16.10.03 – consideration by Waverley Governing Body

16.10.03 – discussion at Dulwich Community Council

22.10.03 – joint meeting with Waverley Governors and Eden Group

27.10.03 – discussion at Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council

The general response in most of these discussions was supportive of the proposal. Most significantly, the Waverley Governors and the Eden Group produced a joint paper in support of the proposal for federated boys' and girls' schools. This is attached as Appendix 4. The joint document covers many of the issues included in this feasibility study, including a single headteacher and governing body; some joint staffing arrangements; need for major investment at the Lower School site; some joint teaching at KS4; and use of the Waverley Sports hall for both schools. It also makes the case for use of Peckham Rye for sports; a wide range of after school activities; shared admissions criteria; and names for the two schools that reflect their linked identities. The paper also suggests that Academy status should be explored for the schools.

The meeting for local parents was organised by the Eden Group and was attended by approximately 35 parents with children attending four local primary schools (one of which is in Lewisham). The meeting received a presentation on the Issues 1 to 5 of this Feasibility study and a presentation by Waverley Governors on the lines of the joint paper. Some queries were raised on the adequacy of the Lower School site to accommodate a boys' school. Some parents expressed a preference in principle for a wholly mixed school but took the view that the federated single-sex model offered the most realistic option available for early implementation. A vote taken at the end of the meeting showed a very substantial majority in favour of working on the federated model with Waverley, with none voting against. A major concern of the

meeting was to achieve implementation earlier than 2006 or 2007 as quoted under Issue 5 of this feasibility study.

A wider range of points was raised at the two Community Councils. Points raised included:

- the logistical problems of managing a two-site federated arrangement
- the risks involved in opening a small boys' school in terms of securing parental support and education achievement
- the high cost of the proposals
- the need for wider consultation, particularly of parents at primary schools
- the need for Waverley School to improve in order for it to become a natural first choice for local parents
- the lack of alternative options for parents and others to consider.

Many of these are valid points and will need to be addressed if this proposal proceeds. It is nevertheless apparent from the response of the Waverley Governors, the Eden Group and those parents so far consulted that there is support for the federation model among those most directly affected. Before any statutory proposal is published however, it would be necessary to undertake a wider ranging consultation, particularly across local primary schools and among Waverley parents, to be satisfied that the proposal will secure the support of those affected.

## **Conclusions**

This feasibility study has addressed the issues of:

- site and buildings
- funding
- need for school places
- the education issues
- timing
- acceptability

in relation to the option for a boys' school at the Waverley Lower site, in federation with Waverley School.

The study has concluded on each of the issues that the proposal is feasible – although further work would be needed in most of these areas in order to address fully the many issues involved. The level of funding required constitutes a major challenge and a further round of more extensive consultation would be needed prior to publication of statutory proposals. The feasibility has however demonstrated that a firm basis of support exists among those parties who have so far been most directly involved in the process – the Waverley Governing body and the Eden Group.

## APPENDIX 2

	<i>Year</i>	<i>Total and projected 11-16 Roll</i>	<i>Capacity (MOE/NC)</i>	<i>Surplus Places</i>	<i>Surplus %</i>
<b>Actual January</b>					
	1994	8947	11026	2079	18.9
	1995	9152	11026	1874	17.0
	1996	9163	11000	1837	16.7
	1997	9157	10617	1460	13.8
	1998	9334	10628	1294	12.2
	1999	9572	10622	1277	12.0
	2000	9780	10022	588	5.9
	2001	10221	10922	1148 *	10.5
	2002	10299	10922	864 *	7.9
	2003	10574	11331	757 *	6.9
<b>Projection January</b>					
	2004	10951	11170	219 **	2.0
	2005	11264	11350	86 **	0.8
	2006	11415	11590	175 **	1.5
	2007	11618	11830	212 **	1.8
	2008	11802	12070	268	2.2
	2009	11921	12070	149	1.2
	2010	12038	12070	32	0.3
	2011	12059	12070	11	0.1
<i>Actual Borough Rolls up to January 2003</i>					
<i>Projections based on January 2003 Rolls</i>					
* as reported in the Surplus Place Return this figure includes a considerable number of nominal surplus places because The Charter School has an MOE capacity of 900, but only recruited to Year 7 in September 2000 .					
**Based on the new Net Capacity assessment for 11-16 places Includes additional places at the City of London and Peckham Academies - the capacity from 2003/04 to 2006/07 reflects the impact of the phased opening of the new Academies					

	<i>Year</i>	<i>Year 7 Roll</i>	<i>Published Admission Number</i>	<i>Surplus Places</i>	<i>Surplus %</i>	
<b>Actual January</b>						
	1994	1945	2225	280	12.6	
	1995	1930	2225	295	13.3	
	1996	1798	2195	397	18.1	
	1997	1863	2195	332	15.1	
	1998	1990	2126	136	6.4	
	1999	2007	2126	119	5.6	
	2000	2042	2096	54	2.6	*
	2001	2177	2186	9	0.4	**
	2002	2212	2264	52	2.3	***
	2003	2201	2256	55	2.1	****
<b>Projection January</b>						
	2004	2353	2426	73	3.0	*****
	2005	2413	2414	1	0.0	*****
	2006	2402	2414	12	0.5	
	2007	2442	2414	-28	-1.2	
	2008	2449	2414	-35	-1.4	
	2009	2491	2414	-77	-3.2	
	2010	2554	2414	-140	-5.8	
	2011	2531	2414	-117	-4.8	
* includes temporary increases at Geoffrey Chaucer, Warwick Park and Waverley.						
** includes The Charter at admission number of 180						
*** includes temporary increases at Aylwin, Geoffrey Chaucer and Warwick Park						
**** includes temporary increases at Aylwin, SSSO, Sacred Heart and St Michaels						
***** includes additional places at the City of London and Peckham Academies						
***** reflects new Net Capacity admission numbers						

## APPENDIX 3

### POTENTIAL TIMETABLE FOR STATUTORY PROCEDURES

#### 2003/04

**December** - Consideration of Feasibility Study by Executive

**December** - If decision is to proceed, start of consultation with all interested parties  
*No statutory timescale but normally 2/3 months*

**March** - Consideration by Executive of outcome of consultation

**March** - If decision to proceed, publication of notice for new school, inviting expressions of interest  
*Two months statutory period for responses to LEA*

#### 2004/04

**May** - End of period for proposals to be submitted

**June** - Report to Executive on proposals submitted. Decision on whether Council wishes to make its own proposal.

**June/  
July** - Publication of notice giving details of proposals received, Council's own proposal (if applicable) and inviting comments  
*Six weeks statutory period for responses to LEA*

**September** – End of period for comments to be submitted  
*One week statutory period for LEA to submit all proposals and comments received to SOC*

**September/  
October** - Submission to School Organisation Committee  
*Six weeks statutory period for SOC to consider the proposals and send their recommendations to the Secretary of State*

**October/  
November** - Submission to Secretary of State  
*Target of six weeks for Secretary of State to make decision*

**December** - Decision by Secretary of State