

being based on objective evidence and accords with SODC's advice five years ago which also stated It was not suitable for development. She noted that allowing building on a detrimental site such as GNP5 would risk opening up arguments about other unsuitable sites. During consultations, the village wanted to protect the rural setting as a high priority. This objective would be jeopardised across the board if development were to be permitted on GNP5 notwithstanding its failure to meet the relevant criteria.

HS stated they had not been asked by the NP about a new school during consultations and SB replied that if a fully worked up proposal covering all matters and including the evidence required to assess all relevant land against the published criteria was submitted in time it could be consulted upon, but the NP cannot work in a vacuum and cannot begin the assessment process until the detailed proposal and all supporting evidence has been received.

17/7 Update from Diocese / School Governors

17/7/1 The letter from GJ was noted. HS stated that having taken advice from the Diocese and given the tight timescales they have changed the proposal. Also that although the school is full including some out of catchment children, it is now unlikely that any in-catchment applicants for this September's Reception intake would be turned away , therefore the proposal will be for a one form entry school but with potential and space to expand as necessary.

GJ stated the condition of the existing building is worse than first thought so a lot of money would be needed to bring it up to a suitable standard.

KH confirmed that the building condition review and forecast of numbers would be included in the proposal.

17/7/2 A discussion on potential numbers of students over the next few years took place. KH stated that OCC were unlikely to approve a 1.5 form entry school given current forecasts so the Governors are aiming for a building that will be suitable for that potential when it is needed. DW pointed out this was contradictory to the previous proposal. BC stated forecasts are difficult and noted the birth rate has peaked and there may be some decline so there could be a question mark as to whether the school will need to expand. To build a school with expansion potential carries some risk of either having spare places or for other schools nearby to lose pupils. She could not therefore support a proposition that a new school must have the potential for 1.5 form entry. GJ and HS confirmed their belief that the school's proposal would avoid the need to obtain approval from OCC because it does not involve an increase in pupil numbers of more than 25% at this time. BC observed however that since they do foresee that increase as likely during the period of the Plan it is something on which OCC's approval should nevertheless be sought. TR noted that GPC has expressed the view that it could not be a party to any attempt to circumvent OCC's procedures, and the present suggestion to call this a one form entry school in order to avoid seeking OCC approval whilst recognising a likely need to expand significantly over the next few years and intending to do so seems very much like circumvention.

MS arrived and took the chair from DW.

17/7/3 HS outlined the revised proposal referring to the list of subjects in GJ's letter. BC said that expansion is the trigger for the statutory process which could be avoided by a new school of one form entry now; with land / buildings for community use but would be invoked for expansion if required later. However, capital cost then becomes front loaded as the building has to be future proofed against bigger school numbers.

17/7/4 MS asked if the proposal was close to being completed and if it was predicated on GNP5 being developed even though it has been excluded from the NP's suitable and acceptable sites. KH stated it was predicated on GNP5, MS also asked if it was also predicated on the existing school land being transferred to the developer for housing development, which KH confirmed. TR pointed out the owners are both the Church and OCC and there is a strict criterion that the land must be available. SB stated the legal owner of each relevant plot must put the land forward to the NP for inclusion as a site for development. BC stated that OCC would

have to go through a process to agree to that.

MS also asked if the proposal was predicated on a reduction of the 40% Affordable Housing requirement on GNP6 which is an SODC policy that the NP supports for all of the allocated development sites in Goring. KH confirmed that the school governors are not aware of the detail but thought this could be the case. They are awaiting information from the developer on this and various other points for inclusion in the proposal.

SB reminded the Governors of the extreme urgency in order for all these criteria to be covered with robust evidence before the NP can consider a submission.

- 17/7/5** TR pointed out that the proposal will need clarity on the allocation of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), SODC agreement and also Goring Parish Council's agreement to allocate its portion to the school. KH believed that the developers are having conversations with SODC about CIL. The proposal will also address the CIL situation, in respect of which information is awaited from the developers.
- TR continued that there will need to be a financial agreement with the Developer to underpin the building of a new school. It would need to be a tight contractual commitment including change control. SB reminded of other criteria such as sustainability, traffic surveys, wildlife and that many others will need to be considered if the sites included in the proposal are to be assessed against the criteria. A form of binding contract between the owners of all land involved (current school and GNP6), the developers and other stakeholders would be needed in order to give confidence that a school would be built and can be delivered within the lifetime of the Plan. This would need to demonstrate clearly an absolute commitment that the school would be built at an early stage and regardless of what might happen with any proposed associated development.
- SB stated she would supply a list of sustainability issues to be considered, **ACTION SB** and that it would be useful for the Governors to take the published Selection Criteria Table and give an answer against all objectives and criteria.

- 17/7/6** MS summarised and noted confirmation will be required that this is a legal activity with the developer (the issue of proportionality of a gift as a means of leveraging additional development); what the CIL situation is and confirmation from SODC they would support it as they have many high priorities for infrastructure across their area; what the developer's assumption is regarding any reduction in Affordable Housing vs the SODC 40% policy and SODC's attitude to that assumption; what the agreement is regarding the transfer of the current school site and its current ownership; what housing development is proposed by the Developer on the current school site, and any implication on the currently submitted boundary on GNP6.
- CR suggested consideration of other sites in the village, TR stated other developers have made offers for a school so they should also be included for consultation / consideration. SB stated that if the proposal requires the NP to change its conclusion on the acceptability and suitability of GNP5 it must specifically address the reasons why, notwithstanding the potentially highly detrimental knock-on effect, an exception should be made for GNP5. Up to date concept drawings for all sites included in the proposal will also be needed for an assessment to be carried out.

- 17/7/7** BC stated there would need to be get-out clauses for change of use of community use areas for future expansion and suggested the NP ask to check any cost plan with OCC Property Team to provide confidence everything is covered. MS agreed that OCC input would be essential. EW suggested it include options should GNP5 not be possible to build on.
- On the issue of preventing unwelcome development around Goring, MS suggested the Governors should look at the SODC HELAA – a list of sites put forward by landowners to SODC which goes far beyond those submitted to the NP and includes large areas around Goring, including some put forward by the school's suggested developer. MS said that this is one reason why expediting the NP was so crucial to the future of Goring.

- 17/7/8** TR asked about timescales for submission of the school's fully-worked proposal and supporting evidence, as the NP is likely to be submitted to GPC by the end of May. HS stated their plans would be held up by the 2 week Easter holidays.

17/8 Next steps

17/8/1 SB stated the NP were conscious of what the impact of this discussion meant – it was a big chunk of work and asked if the NP was proposing to delay the process to wait for a proposal. MS stated that would not be possible or appropriate, but that the assessment of the school proposal could probably run in parallel as there is an urgent need to move the NP forward. There will always be other things to consider later and a new iteration of the Plan within the next 5 years is a possibility, in the course of which the school proposal could be assessed if it isn't ready in time for inclusion in the present version. It was noted that the NP would need to apply for an increased budget to reconsider later submissions. SBr asked if the school are dealing with informing parents of what is happening which was confirmed.

17/8/2 MS stated that making sure school provision is adequate in Goring is an important sustainability consideration for the NP, although it remains an OCC responsibility. The affordability of new housing in Goring for young people is also an issue of sustainability. Proposals need to be credible and with integrity so the NP and the village can support it. He thanked all for attending, particularly GJ and BC who had again helped to fully clarify the process required. He looked forward to getting a proposal through and stated that the NP had not received copies of any correspondence between the school and the developers and again asked for copies of discussions between the Governors and SODC / OCC to help speed up the process.

No date set for a further meeting.