

Walker Primary School – Consultation Report

Introduction

Enfield Council undertook public consultation about a proposal to permanently expand the capacity of the school so that it admits up to 90 pupils each year, rather than 60 pupils each year, from September 2013. This report summarises the consultation process and the responses that were received. The Council will consider the consultation responses, as well as other information, before deciding whether to continue with the proposal. If the Council does continue with the proposal, the next stage would be the publication of a Statutory Notice and Proposal for the school in accordance with The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007. This report would form part of that Statutory Proposal.

Consultation process

The proposal was part of an overall consultation process that included ten proposals to increase the number of primary school places within Enfield.

The consultation period was for five weeks, from 26 September to 31 October.

There was a single consultation document that included all schools and this was sent to a wide range of stakeholders (Annex 1 provides the list of stakeholders who were sent the document). The list of stakeholders reflects the school organisation guidance from the Department for Education (DfE), and the Council also undertook household distribution to residents adjacent to the schools who are proposed for expansion.

Two meetings were held at the school during the consultation period and were open to staff, governors, parents, and residents. These were held at different times of the day to facilitate attendance for those who wished to attend; the dates and times of the meetings were included in the consultation document. This report includes the notes of the meetings that were held at the school (Annex 2).

Individuals, groups of individuals, or organisations were able to respond to the consultation by completing the questionnaire (online or by completing the questionnaire enclosed within the consultation document), attending a meeting, or contacting the Council by letter or email.

All consultation responses were reviewed. Quantitative information was analysed to ascertain who had responded (i.e. pupils, staff, parents, residents), and qualitative comments were analysed systematically using a coding structure.

Who responded?

The following table outlines the written responses to the consultation. These include questionnaires submitted online or on paper as well as emails or letters.

Unique responses	Pupil	Staff	Governor	Parent	Local resident	Other
167	3	14	10	76	80	18

Respondents were able to tick as many of the respondent categories as applied to them; consequently, the sum of the respondent categories (from 'pupil' to 'other' in the table above) may be larger than the number of unique responses. In this instance, 16 of the parents who responded also identified themselves as local residents.

No response was received from neighbouring Councils, from any of the trade unions, from any of the faith foundations / Diocese who support schools in the borough, from local MPs, or from any other school within the borough about this proposal.

In addition, 105 people attended the first meeting and 125 attended the second meeting at the school.

Were the responses supportive of the proposal?

The following table outlines the responses from the stakeholder categories identified on the questionnaire and indicates for each group their response to the question 'how do you feel about the proposal?'

	Unique responses		Pupils		Staff		Governor		Parent		Local resident		Other	
	Responses	Percentage of responses	Responses	Percentage of responses	Responses	Percentage of responses	Responses	Percentage of responses	Responses	Percentage of responses	Responses	Percentage of responses	Responses	Percentage of responses
Strongly in favour	57	35%	0	0%	7	50%	1	11%	12	16%	34	44%	11	61%
In favour	22	14%	0	0%	0	0%	2	22%	16	21%	8	10%	2	11%
Oppose	20	12%	1	33%	2	14%	1	11%	8	11%	9	12%	2	11%
Strongly oppose	63	39%	2	67%	5	36%	5	56%	39	52%	26	34%	3	17%

The majority of parents were opposed to the proposal citing concerns about the constraints of the site and the limited external play space. Some parents suggested the Council purchase additional land to enlarge the site if the number of children were to be increased.

Local residents were divided between those who wanted expansion and those who did not. Those in favour of expansion included families who were unable to secure a place at Walker in spite of living very nearby or had younger children they hoped would secure a place at Walker in the future. Others felt the school should expand because they believed that good schools should expand to serve the needs of the local community. Those who opposed the expansion expressed concern about traffic congestion and parking issues and the constrained site. The following quotation encapsulates some of these views:

"In principle I am in favour of Walker expanding to three form entry - it is an outstanding school and is heavily oversubscribed. Opening an additional form will ensure more children in the local area can benefit from the high quality provision it offers. However I strongly oppose the expansion of the school on current plan to implement this. Walker is already crowded. The current proposals will make it even more so and outside space will be severely limited. The expansion could actually lead to a deterioration of the school. Instead of going ahead with current building plans, I would instead consider expanding upwards i.e. making Walker 2 or 3 storey – this will not reduce the outdoor space. I would also consider adding an additional assembly hall as the current hall is barely big enough to fit the current intake." (online response 59).

What themes were raised through the qualitative comments?

The following key themes were raised in responses, including at the meetings held at the school.

Comments in favour of the proposal:

- A recognition of the need to add additional places in the area (mentioned 40 – 43 times), including a belief that expansion would help local children get access to Walker when it was their nearest school (mentioned 10 – 14 times). It was noted that the admissions 'last distance offered' to get a place had reduced to under 0.25 of a mile in recent years. (Note – a number of responses were critical of families who rented near Walker in order to get their eldest child into the school and then moved further away to benefit from the sibling admissions priority). These themes are shown in the following quotation:

“Until this year I lived in the catchment area for Walker – for the first time this year my road, which is 0.198 of a mile from Walker, fell just outside the catchment area, because of all the families deliberately renting properties within spitting distance of Walker, to ensure a place for their child. There is a chronic shortage of places at good schools in Southgate, and it has come to the point where unless a child lives no more than a five minute walk from a school, they won’t get in” (online response 187).

“I live within 0.3 miles of Walker School, yet my son was not given a place in the reception class at Walker School this year. Instead of being able to walk the 5 to 10 minute walk from our house to Walker School, I have to drive every day to a school some miles away. I don't want to have to do this for the next 7 years, when I know there are children who attend Walker who live much further away and have to be driven to school. There is no justice in a system that allows the siblings of children who live out of the catchment priority over those children who could walk to their local primary school. I hope with all my might that Walker School is expanded to include an additional Year 1 class in September 2013 so that my son can walk to his local primary school, just like I did. I would like to know how far those parents live who are campaigning against the expansion of Walker School. If they live within 0.175 miles then they may be justified in their argument. However, if they don't, then they should consider how they would feel if their child was denied a place. I'm sure they would think twice about going against the expansion proposal.” (online response 224).

A local resident said, “Because children in the immediate vicinity of Walker School are school –less! Local children do not have a local school. This is a terrible situation. Children in N14 do not have a local school because there are not enough places. Need to expand.”

- A view that the capital investment could improve the facilities of the school (mentioned 10 – 14 times, in particular in relation to the potential to replace some of the current poor condition accommodation as part of the expansion capital project).

A local resident said, “It is vital that local primary children school children have a local school to attend. At primary age, it’s not fair for children to have to travel by car or public transport to reach a school further away. It is too stressful for the child and the parents. Additionally, Walker School needs new buildings. The current buildings are no longer conducive to long term learning. The Council needs to look closely at fraudulent applications, especially for an oversubscribed school like Walker.”

- A belief that the school is well placed and able to cope effectively with expansion (mentioned 5 – 9 times).

Comments against the proposal:

- Concerns that expansion would exacerbate traffic problems, including those relating to drop-off and pick up, around the school. This included concerns about pavement widths and the impact of congregation of parents with buggies for younger siblings. The concerns included potential health and safety risks to children. (This topic was mentioned 15 – 19 times).
- Concerns that the site was not large enough to accommodate additional pupils, and / or that expansion would result in significant loss of outdoor and play space which would be to the detriment of the pupils at the school (mentioned 35 – 39 times). This was extended into a belief that the Council should buy additional land for the school if expansion was to take place (mentioned 30 – 34 times) – as shown in this quotation: *“While everyone accepts that Walker school should take on more children, this cannot be done at the expense of the quality of facilities and education that those children would receive. Therefore, I cannot support the existing proposal to expand student numbers without an increase in the outdoor space needed for them to be accommodated safely. The council needs to either acquire or*

permanently lease more land and then re-run this consultation at that point.” (online response 190).

- The school is already too big, or would become too big if it was expanded (mentioned fewer than 5 times).
- Concerns that parts of the school are already too small for the number of pupils at the school (such as dining halls, classrooms) and that these would be unable to cope if the school was expanded (mentioned 15 – 19 times).
- Concerns that the expansion would result in worse provision for students as the school struggled to maintain or improve standards (mentioned 5 – 9 times).
- There were concerns raised about several elements of the potential capital project:
 - Concern that there were significant site challenges, including a need to replace some of the existing accommodation which may result in phased works and / or design and usage challenges (mentioned 30 – 35 times).
 - Concern about the disruption that would occur during the building project (mentioned 5 – 9 times).
 - Concern that the building works would not be completed by September 2013 (mentioned 5 – 9 times).
 - A belief that there would be insufficient budget for the capital works (mentioned 5 – 9 times).

A Walker parent said, *“There are no grounds for playing. What currently exists is very small indeed and children are injured often due to the lack of space. Increasing the number of children to 90 per year would adversely affect the school.”*

The following quotation outlines many of the points articulated regarding the building works required:

“Although the case for expansion is well made, I am concerned about the feasibility of the project given the small size of the Walker site. It will be necessary for the Council to show that the end result is a functional design for the school, and that this can be implemented with an acceptable level of disruption to the school’s operation. I say ‘acceptable’ rather than ‘minimal’ because I do not see that minimal disruption is feasible. If the project is to include, as it should, replacement of the existing cramped and worn out buildings then phasing of construction is going to be necessary. It seems very unlikely that the project will be completed by September 2013. It would be helpful if the Council could acknowledge this” (online response 006)

- A belief that the Council should be considering other schools instead of this one, which was sometimes coupled with a belief that the pressure for places is partly due to a lack of ‘good places’ which are attractive to parents, hence some respondents arguing that attention should be focused upon improving other schools so that parents were willing to send their children to them (mentioned 5 – 9 times).
- A concern either that the pupil projections may be inaccurate, or that the additional pupils would not be ‘local pupils’ and so this would affect traffic and / or the community cohesion of the school. It was sometimes commented that there had not been significant new housing in the vicinity of the school and so some respondents questioned whether there was increased local demand (mentioned 5 – 9 times).
- A belief that the Council should be building new school(s) instead of seeking to expand existing ones to provide a more sustainable solution (mentioned 10 – 14 times).

Other observations or comments:

- Comments about the consultation process (mentioned fewer than 5 times).

Annex 1: List of stakeholders

The consultation document was available online throughout the consultation period on the Enfield Council website.

The consultation document was distributed by the Council to the following stakeholders:

1. The Governing Body and Headteacher of all state-funded schools in Enfield (including primary, secondary, and special maintained schools, academies and free schools).
2. The parents of all pupils at a school proposed for expansion with copies for every student provided in book-bags, and schools encouraged to raise awareness of the consultation through newsletters and existing email / text processes for communicating with parents.
3. Residents living in the immediate vicinity of schools proposed for expansion with the consultation document delivered to each household.
4. All Early Years providers in the borough, with those providers encouraged to raise awareness of the consultation with their parents.
5. All Councillors of Enfield Council.
6. The three MPs whose constituency includes part of Enfield (Nick De Bois, David Burrowes, Andy Love).
7. Borough representatives of all Trade Unions recognised by Enfield Council (GMB, Unison, ATL, NUT, NASUWT, ASCL, NAHT, Voice, T&GWU).
8. The faith organisations who act as the foundation for state-funded faith schools in the borough: Roman Catholic Diocese of Westminster, London Diocesan Board for Schools (Church of England), the United Synagogue.
9. The Director of Children's Services of neighbouring Councils (Barnet, Haringey, Waltham Forest, Hertfordshire, and Essex).
10. Copies were available at the libraries in the vicinity of any school proposed for expansion.
11. In addition, the following were also consulted:
 - Western Enfield Residents Association
 - The Walker Cricket Trust
 - Reverend Peter Jackson, Christ Church, Southgate
 - Friends of Walker School
 - Enfield Homes Council Housing Block Representatives
 - Enfield Homes Residents Associations
 - Southgate District Civic Trust
 - Southgate Green Study Group
 - New Southgate Neighbourhood Panel

Annex 2: Notes from consultation meetings held at the school



PRIMARY SCHOOL EXPANSION PROGRAMME – NOTES OF THE CONSULTATION MEETING HELD AT WALKER SCHOOL.

15th OCTOBER AT 3.30 p.m.

The meeting was attended by 105 parents, governors, members of staff and local residents.

Dr June Keyte MBE (Chair of Governors) welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Council Officers -

Lead Officers, Andrew Fraser, Director of Schools Children's Services.
Bridget Evans, Programme Director, Primary Expansion Programme PEP).

Other Officers attending;

Neil Best, PEP Stakeholder Engagement Officer.
Angela St John, Independent School Organisation Consultant.
John West, PEP Client Project Officer.

Liz Whincop (Headteacher) explained that the school had been keen to understand the implications of an increase to 3 form entry and the related building proposals before any decision was made. As a result of recent discussions and proposals, she was very encouraged that notice had been taken of earlier concerns. She asked parents to listen carefully to the proposals and consider the alternative – i.e. to leave the existing 1970s building to deteriorate further.

The presentation on the primary expansion programme was made by Bridget Evans.

Following the presentation, the following questions and comments were made:-

Given the importance of the Conservation area I am surprised that greater reference was not given to its importance. *(Ans. Discussions already in place with the Planning Department and Conservation Officers to ensure that proposals are acceptable).*

It is noted that a traffic survey is in progress. If the catchment area is so small why do parents drive? *(Ans. A difficult question to answer, but busy lives and working parents are a key factor. Further developing the school travel plan, supporting the walking bus etc. is important).*

Population growth in London is relatively small, why so many young children? *(Ans. Rapid increase in the birth rate, in-migration etc. Projections from the GLA are good and getting better as other data such as health authority information is added).*

At an earlier meeting there was reference to school space standards, are these still being used? *(Ans. Yes, space assessment is based on the DfE BB99. Details are being discussed with the school).*

I understand the logic of keeping the 1950s building, but it has a large footprint, why not rebuild the whole building? *(Ans. Planning keen to retain this building and it would increase disruption to the school).*

Is it one building contract? *(Ans. Yes, once work starts the project will be completed.)*

The limited site and additional pupils will put increased pressure on the site and particularly on playspace. How will this be addressed? *(Ans. By minimising the building footprint, making better use of and upgrading existing areas, staggered play times. It was explained that discussions are taking place with the Walker Trust concerning the possibility of securing access to additional land for recreational activities).*

The timescale seems very aggressive, how will delivery be made risk free? *(Ans. By off-site construction, contingency in the contract and concentrating on essential delivery of classrooms for September 2013).*

Is the funding committed? *(Ans. Yes the Council has identified the necessary funding for the PEP project).*

A parent expressed concern that because the school is so popular, people secure a place at Walker and then move away, keeping the child(ren) in the school. This distorts the catchment area and prevents local children from gaining a place. *(Ans. It was explained that all fraud cases are pursued, but if a parent genuinely lives in the area (paying Council tax) it is not necessarily an offence.)*

How long will the work take? *(Ans. work on the foundations and enabling is planned to start at Easter – approx 3-4 weeks work, off site construction follows in the summer term with no work on site during exam periods. Construction and demolition to take place during the summer (6-8 weeks work).*

What happens if the school is not ready in September, perhaps there is poor weather? *(Ans. Contingency built into the planning process, priority given to those areas needed for September. Off site construction minimises problems caused by wet weather).*

Why is the Council on the back foot and why is the school historically underfunded? *(Ans. The Council has already created a large number of additional school places, but rolls have risen faster than expected throughout London. The school is funded on a formula based on pupil numbers.)*

How will the children be affected by the work and will the children still have all the facilities available? *(Ans. The majority of work will be carried out in school holiday periods and out of school hours. When the children return in September they will have more space and better facilities than previously).*

The proposals increase the roll by 50%, but there has been almost no new housing for over 10 years. Why not develop school places where there is housing growth? Why not use the Alan Pullinger building? *(Ans. Other schools are being expanded, see Garfield, the demand is local and the proposals seek to ensure that young children can attend their local school. The majority of children, 80-85% in last travel survey live locally. It was stressed that the school population growth in Enfield was a London wide issue.)*

Councillor Henry Lambrecht said that he was concerned by the term 'modular' construction and wanted to be sure that high quality provision was achieved. He was not opposed to 3 form entry, but proposals must be sympathetic to the area – a unique conservation area with a mixture of Georgian and Edwardian architecture. More work was needed to create an acceptable solution and to explore the possibility of extra space with the Walker Trustees. He noted that the devil is in the detail. *(Ans. He was assured that all these issues would be pursued as part of the planning process).*

Will the catchment area be extended? *(Ans. the school has no catchment area, admission is based on cared for children, special needs, siblings and distance to the school).*

The pavement in Waterfall Road is narrow and poorly maintained. This is an opportunity for the Council to improve local access and encourage walking. This would reduce traffic and ease the parking problem. *(Ans. It was agreed that this would be pursued. It was noted that although the school walking bus was no longer operating, this could be revived with parental support or by using*

a paid volunteer. In addition better facilities in the school could help a breakfast club be established thereby reducing congestion at the start of the school day).

Please note that the 1970s building is actually a 1980s structure. What is the life of the new buildings? Traffic movement must be minimised. Could you please clarify the number of classes proposed? *(Ans. Yes. The buildings have a life of 60 years +).*

Why expand and what are the benefits? *(Ans. Learning and curriculum benefits linked to the building, a larger school budget and additional staff and resources.)*

Why such a fast process, why not take more time? *(Ans. Places are needed now and the refurbishment of the building is urgently needed.)*

The school is under-funded so will the percentage of budget increase? *(Ans. Yes budget will follow additional pupils with additional budget linked to enlargement project. The resources are currently under discussion with the Headteacher and school staff.)*

It is difficult to get into the After School Club as places are limited. Will more places be available? *(Ans. This will be looked into. The larger hall spaces will help the After School Club).*

Will there be a music room? *(Ans. There will be a number of specialist rooms for technology, ICT etc. The designation of non classroom spaces is under discussion as part of the design process.)*

All concerned were thanked for attending the meeting and for their interest in the primary expansion project. Everyone was asked to return the consultation forms either on line or in hard copy. This will ensure that the Council can consider all the views expressed

The meeting closed at 5.35 p.m.

PRIMARY SCHOOL EXPANSION PROGRAMME – NOTES OF THE CONSULTATION MEETING HELD AT WALKER SCHOOL.

15th OCTOBER AT 6.30 p.m.

The meeting was attended by 126 parents, governors, members of staff and local residents.

Dr June Keyte MBE (Chair of Governors) welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Council Officers -

Lead Officers, Andrew Fraser, Director of Schools Children's Services.
Bridget Evans, Programme Director, Primary Expansion Programme (PEP).
Councillor Ayfer Orhan, Enfield Council Cabinet Member for Children and Young People.

Other Officers attending;

Neil Best, PEP Stakeholder Engagement Officer.
Angela St John, Independent School Organisation Consultant.
John West, PEP Client Project Officer.

Liz Whincop (Headteacher) explained that the school had been keen to understand the implications of an increase to 3 form entry and the related building proposals before any decision was made. As a result of recent discussions and proposals, she was very encouraged that notice had been taken of earlier concerns. She asked parents to listen carefully to the proposals and consider the alternative – i.e. to leave the existing 1970's building to deteriorate further.

The presentation on the primary expansion programme was made by Bridget Evans.

Following the presentation, the following questions and comments were made:-

Where will the work be when children return to school in September 2012? *(Ans. Preparatory work will be carried out at Easter, during the summer term, off-site construction takes place. By September, new accommodation will be available. The two storey 1970's building will be retained in September until the project is completed during the autumn term 2013).*

What is being done about outdoor space and the playground. Will additional space be provided? *(Ans. It was explained that the outdoor space would be improved and re-landscaped. The design team were just starting to look at external areas as part of the design process. Discussions were in progress with the Walker Trust, the school would also be looking at staggering playtimes and making better use of all parts of the school site).*

I am not convinced of the necessity of the project, what new housing developments is it serving? *(Ans. There is local pressure for places caused by the birth rate, in-migration, housing benefits changes etc. This is part of a London wide issue. Enfield is not the only Council affected by a large increase in primary school children).*

If there are 420 applications for 60 places at Walker, clearly, if extra places are created they must be for children living in the local area. *(Ans. Agreed, the intention is to meet local needs. The Council has to abide by the National Code of Practice for Admissions. In terms of people moving into properties to secure a place at Walker everyone was asked to let the Council know if they think that there are any fraudulent actions).*

Ayfer Orhan, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People gave her assurance that if anyone knows of fraudulent admission cases, they are welcome to contact her and the matters will be fully investigated.

A number of people suggested that the law needed changing in relation to the Admissions Code of Practice, particularly in relation to people moving out of the area while retaining places at the school.

It was commented that the proposals to enlarge the school had divided the community and that this was very unfortunate. It was noted that not everyone who drives their child to school lives outside the area, there are many other reasons, e.g. dropping off a child prior to going to work.

There is a clear need for additional places at Walker. How do you allocate places for the proposed new Year 1 class. *(Ans. The Council's proposal is to open a new reception and new Year 1 class in September 2013. The same admissions criteria will be used for Year 1 as for the new reception class – looked after children & SEN, siblings in the school and distance to the school).*

Why are you not looking at other schools in the area? *(Ans. The current consultation includes additional primary places at Garfield school. Bowes has already taken an additional class).*

Is it possible that the entire new reception class in 2013 could be taken up by siblings? *(Ans. The Council will need to check the precise position on siblings, but the total 90 places will be aimed at local people.)*

Has the budget for the improvements been signed off? Secondly have you looked at the possibility of roof terraces?

(Ans. The overall budget for the Primary Expansion Programme has been agreed. There are sufficient resources to support the scheme if the decision is taken to proceed. Ongoing revenue resources to support the additional children are under discussion with the school. In addition the school is seeking resources to refurbish the 1950s building and this is under consideration. Roof terraces will be investigated, but the design would have to avoid any overlooking of nearby properties.

Will you remember to consult people living in Mayfield Avenue, not just at the front of the school? *(Ans. Yes, this will also form part of the planning process).*

Will there be a working group set up, similar to the one set up at Wilbury School to develop the plans? *(Ans. Yes a working group involving staff and governors has already been set up).*

Councillor Henry Lamprecht, Ward Councillor for Southgate Green noted that Walker was a victim of its own success, in that everyone wanted their children to go to Walker. He wanted to give his support to the provision of much needed additional places at the school, but was very keen that the Council worked with the Conservation Group and local residents to overcome concerns and deliver the scheme successfully. He had some concerns about the appearance of modular construction. He wanted the project group to work with the whole community. The Council should also investigate the issue of local flats being occupied on a short term basis and explore the issue of a site extension.

(Ans. The Council is seeking to try and expand the footprint of the site and will consult the whole community).

What will happen to the spare capacity in the school that will be available in 2013?

(Ans. The school will be able to use these classrooms for other activities or to mothball them to save running costs. The accommodation is being provided as part of one contract as that is more cost effective. Additional capacity will also be available at other schools. Liz Whincop noted that the school would not be willing to take additional pupils other than reception and Year 1 in 2013. To take additional pupils in other year groups would create instability in the school and be impossible to manage. It was noted that only if there were very exceptional circumstances would the authority consider opening new classes in other year groups.)

The Government talks about creating sustainable neighbourhoods. What percentage of the children come from within an easy walking distance? *(Ans. The majority of children, 80-85% in last travel survey live locally).*

The school has a good reputation, hence people move into the area to secure a good education for their families. This is understandable. It is reflected in local property prices, hence the whole community gains.

The catchment area for Walker is very small, this needs to grow. All schools have a responsibility to try and provide local places for children.

The building appears to have asbestos. Will this be removed as part of the building process? *(Ans. There are statutory regulations concerning asbestos management and removal. Great care will be taken to ensure that there is no risk to staff or parents and that any work with asbestos is done in accordance with all the health and safety precautions.)*

"Talks with the Walker Cricket Trust?" What does this mean? If the school enlargement proceeds with no additional space the site will be very tight.

(Ans. The Council is exploring whether additional green space can be provided to benefit the increased roll. Discussions are also likely to take place with the Church Authorities).

The catchment area is smaller than suggested. Families who live very close cannot get into the school.

Why is the consultation process so short?

(Ans. Informal consultation ends on 31st October. Formal consultation will then be carried out. In addition there will be consultation through the planning process).

Councillor Henry Lamprecht commented that in his view it was essential that the Council obtained more land for Walker. There was also a need for the traffic issues to be resolved.

When will the Planning submission be made? *(Ans. It is proposed that the planning application will be submitted during November, with a decision expected in February 2013).*

A number of people asked why the Council did not CPO land.

(Ans. It was not thought that CPO powers were appropriate, but Andrew Fraser invited people to suggest how the site could be successfully enlarged).

I have had a child on the waiting list for a long time why has it taken so long to put forward proposals for additional places? *(Ans. Councillor Orhan explained that the Administration had given very high priority to additional school places since 2010. A large number of additional places had already been created. However population changes, housing benefit changes and other issues, outside the Council's control had influenced the need for places, pushing up demand. The demand for additional school places was a London wide issue. Walker seemed an ideal candidate for enlargement, a popular school and a building in need of refurbishment. The Council was listening to all the concerns expressed during the consultation process).*

Space at Walker is tight, but places are needed. Has the Council looked at Southgate Town Hall, Broomfield House or other sites. As Garfield is not full why enlarge it? *(Ans. Neither of these sites is considered to be suitable. Southgate Town Hall has no playspace, is in poor condition and is at a busy road junction. Broomfield House is derelict. The expansion of Garfield is linked to the development of the Ladderswood Estate).*

It was noted that if the Walker brothers were alive today, they would want to help the school.

If the enlargement of the school did not proceed, would money still be available to address the poor condition of the 1970s building? *(Ans. No, at present there is no Government money for funding condition work, all present all available funding has to be used to provide additional school places. Further funding is required for condition funding before any commitment could be given).*

All concerned were thanked for attending the meeting and for their interest in the primary expansion project. Everyone was asked to return the consultation forms either on line or in hard copy. This will ensure that the Council can consider all the views expressed

The meeting closed at 8.20 p.m.