

Education Capacity Strategy for Eynsham

Contents

Summary of recommendations	2
Recommendation 1: primary education provision	2
Recommendation 2: new or expanded secondary school.....	2
Recommendation 3: scale of additional secondary education provision	2
Recommendation 4: land requirements for expansion of secondary education provision.....	2
1. Background	3
1.1 Relevant Government guidance	3
1.2 School planning roles and responsibilities	4
1.3 Current school provision serving Eynsham.....	4
1.4 Housing and population growth to be served.....	5
2. Primary education: options	7
Option 1: One 2-form entry primary school on each site.....	7
Option 2: 1-form entry primary school on West Eynsham; 3-form entry primary school on OCGV.....	8
Option 3: 1-form entry primary school on West Eynsham; a 1-form entry and a 2-form entry primary school on OCGV.....	8
3. Secondary education: options	10
3.1 Should there be an expansion of Bartholomew School, or a separate new school?	10
Option 1: A stand-alone new secondary school within OCGV	10
Option 2: Expansion of Bartholomew School.....	10
3.2. Scale of expansion required	11
Option 1: Expand Bartholomew by approximately 600 places, in line with expected pupil generation from proposed housing	12
Option 2: Do not expand Bartholomew, or expand by less than 600 places, and push pressure out to surrounding schools.....	12
3.3 Land requirements for expansion of Bartholomew School.....	13
Option 1: expansion using Bartholomew’s current site area	13
Option 2: extending the current sports field site into adjoining land.....	13
Option 3: a new site, sufficient for 600 pupils	15

Summary of recommendations

Recommendation 1: primary education provision

A 2.22ha site within West Eynsham and a 3.01ha site within OCGV are required to provide new primary schools totalling 4 forms of entry, either as one 1-form entry and one 3-form entry, or as two 2-form entry schools.

Recommendation 2: new or expanded secondary school

Subject to Regional Schools Commissioner approval, expansion of Bartholomew School, rather than a separate new school, is strongly preferred, due to Bartholomew's status as a popular and successful school, and the risks associated with opening a small new school.

Recommendation 3: scale of additional secondary education provision

The required scale of secondary education expansion to ensure sufficiency of places and maintain parental choice would be in the order of 600 places.

Recommendation 4: land requirements for expansion of secondary education provision

A 4.88ha site is required within OCGV to allow the delivery of either a new school or school expansion solution, as approved by the Regional Schools Commissioner, and will provide flexibility for future changes to school organisation.

1. Background

1.1 Relevant Government guidance

This strategy is informed by the relevant government guidance, in particular:

- National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)
- Education provision in garden communities (April 2019)
- Securing developer contributions for education (April 2019)
- Opening and closing maintained schools (November 2018)
- Making significant changes to an open academy and closure by mutual agreement (October 2018)

The *National Planning Policy Framework* (paragraph 94) makes clear that “it is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education. They should: give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools through the preparation of plans and decisions on applications; and work with schools promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted.”

Education provision in garden communities promotes the early delivery of schools within planned garden communities. It states that “new schools are an important place-making component of garden communities where early provision is usually critical in providing core social infrastructure to help a new community thrive, improve social integration and support the creation of sustainable travel patterns and a healthy environment.” It also notes that there is “strong evidence that early provision of key infrastructure such as a new primary school will impact positively on scheme viability and generate faster sales rates and higher values.” However the government also requires local authorities to underwrite pupil-led funding as the school grows; there is, therefore, a balance to be made between early delivery of a new school and ensuring there are sufficient pupils from population growth to ensure both the new school and nearby existing schools are financially viable.

Securing developer contributions for education confirms the expectation that, “as far as possible (and often in relation to primary schools only), new settlements should be expected to meet their full education requirement. Where an onsite school is required, it should be large enough to meet the need generated by the development. While there may be exceptions justified by local circumstances, as a general rule, existing school capacity in the wider area does not need to be taken into account when calculating developer contributions for permanent onsite schools in new settlements, which should be within the statutory walking distance for the pupils living there”.

Opening and closing maintained schools sets out the processes through which new schools can be opened. In the circumstances discussed here, the usual route would be the “free school presumption”, whereby section 6A of EIA 2006 places the LA

under a duty to seek proposals to establish an academy (free school). The LA is responsible for providing the site for the new school and meeting all associated capital and pre-/post-opening revenue costs. All new free school presumption proposals require the Regional Schools Commissioner's approval (on behalf of the Secretary of State) as it is the Secretary of State who will enter into a funding agreement with the academy trust/sponsor.

Making significant changes to an open academy and closure by mutual agreement sets out the processes through which existing academies, such as those within the Eynsham Partnership Academy Trust, can make changes such as expansion, moving sites, or moving onto split sites. The Trust needs to submit a business case to the Regional Schools Commissioner, who is the decision-maker on behalf of the Secretary of State.

1.2 School planning roles and responsibilities

The county council has statutory duties to ensure sufficient school and early education/childcare places.

The government guidance *Education provision in garden communities* requires local planning authorities (WODC) and the local authority with education responsibilities (OCC) to work together with developers to proactively plan for new school provision.

The government guidance *Securing developer contributions for education* makes clear that the DfE expects local authorities to seek developer contributions towards school places that are created to meet the need arising from housing development. This includes the assumption that both land and funding for construction will be provided for new schools planned within housing developments.

The current Eynsham schools are academies, independent of the county council. Accountability for the academies lies with the Eynsham Partnership Academy Trust (EPA), which also includes surrounding village primary schools. Any significant changes (including expansion) need to be approved by the Regional Schools Commissioner.

Any new school (under current legislation) would be expected to be an academy. The county council would specify the need for the new school and then run a competition inviting potential academy sponsors to run the school. The final choice of sponsor would be a decision for the Regional Schools Commissioner. The aim of any such process would be to ensure the new academy is run by a trust that can ensure sustainably high-quality education, which meets the needs of the local community.

1.3 Current school provision serving Eynsham

Eynsham is currently served by the following schools:

- **Primary education:** Eynsham Community Primary School: admission number 60; capacity 420; number on roll (Sept 2019) 330. The school has an Ofsted rating of “Good”.
- **Secondary and sixth form education:** Bartholomew School: admission number 210; capacity 1300; number on roll (Sept 2019) 1270. The school has an Ofsted rating of “Outstanding”.
- **Special Education provision:** Springfields School in Witney: capacity of 103 funded places; number on roll (Sept 2019) 112. The school has an Ofsted rating of “Good”.
- **Early education & childcare:** nursery class at Eynsham Community Primary School; Eynsham Pre-School; Oxford Nursery Eynsham; and private childminders. Further childcare provision is delivered by a range of out-of-school clubs.

1.4 Housing and population growth to be served

The Local Plan allocates around 1,000 homes to the West Eynsham Strategic Development Area (including 77 units at Eynsham Nursery and 160 units at Thornbury Road already permitted and underway) and around 2,200 homes to the Oxfordshire Cotswold Garden Village.

Infrastructure planning work undertaken in support of planned growth at Eynsham identifies that as of 1st April 2018, a further 787 homes are likely to come forward in the Bartholomew School catchment area, including 125 from three Local Plan allocations at Long Hanborough and Stanton Harcourt, 488 from existing planning permissions and 174 from anticipated ‘windfall’ development.

Precise housing mixes for the strategic sites are still to be agreed, and there may be some changes in housing numbers; therefore uncertainty remains as to the exact pupil generation to expect. Multiple scenarios (10 so far) have been tested for OCGV, giving pupil generation ranges for 2200 dwellings of:

- 546-627 primary pupils
- 101-119 nursery pupils
- 380-438 secondary pupils
- 60-69 sixth form pupils
- 11.1-12.7 special school pupils

Assuming a similar generation rate for the West Eynsham SDA, that would be expected to generate:

- 248-285 primary pupils
- 46-54 nursery pupils
- 173-199 secondary pupils
- 27-31 sixth form pupils
- 5.0-5.8 special school pupils

In total, making a similar calculation for the further 787 homes expected in the secondary school catchment, this suggests that school planning needs to allow for:

- 794-912 additional primary pupils in Eynsham (c 4 forms of entry)
- 147-173 additional nursery pupils in Eynsham
- 615-708 additional secondary pupils within Bartholomew's catchment area (c4 forms of entry)
- 97-112 sixth form pupils within Bartholomew's catchment area
- 18.0-20.5 additional special school pupils living in Eynsham and surrounding area (nearest special school: Springfields School in Witney)

Given the uncertainty over housing mixes and numbers, it is necessary to protect the ability to meet the needs of higher pupil generation if necessary.

It is also important to maintain some level of spare capacity, to allow for fluctuations in population, and where appropriate, protect the potential for further growth in the longer term.

The timing and triggers for any expansions and new schools will need to be agreed as part of the s106 negotiations. Based on the latest pupil projections, it is not currently expected that the existing Eynsham Primary School will run out of Reception places before 2025, and therefore this should be target date for the first new primary school to open to ensure overall sufficiency of school places. (However, given government guidance that new settlements, especially garden villages, should be expected to be self-sufficient for primary school provision as early as feasible, it may be that an earlier opening is sought, and/or that new schools need to be delivered in both developments sooner than an overall forecast would indicate).

As the secondary school is already at capacity, any additional population growth without school expansion will mean that:

- i. Secondary pupils moving into Eynsham already of school age will be unable to secure a place at the school, and will have to travel to an alternative school;
- ii. For each round of admissions into Year 7, increased local population will displace applications from further away to other schools, increasing pressures on their capacities.

It would therefore be supportive of the new and existing populations if the secondary school capacity could increase early in the development. However, it is accepted that there will be practical constraints in doing so, which will depend on the eventual solution to secondary school capacity.

2. Primary education: options

The existing Eynsham primary school was expanded from 1.5fe to 2fe in 2013. As this was in advance of housing completions, the school still has c90 spare places, which will contribute towards meeting the needs of the planned development, but spare capacity is not sufficient to remove the need for new schools.

In isolation, the West Eynsham SDA would be expected to generate more pupils than a 1-form entry school could accommodate, but somewhat less than a 1.5-form entry. Two parcels of this development (Eynsham Nursery and Thornbury Road) have extant s106 agreements which contribute funding towards the previous expansion of Eynsham Primary School, and the pupil generation from these sites is, as a result, able to be absorbed by the existing (expanded) school. The remaining primary education needs would be met through a new 1-form entry school, and the remaining West Eynsham development will be required to fund this scale of additional capacity.

In isolation, OCGV would be expected to generate pupils broadly equivalent to 3 forms of entry (or a little less) and the development will be required to fund this scale of additional capacity.

To ensure efficient and effective delivery of primary education, it is important to plan primary school provision across the whole of Eynsham and the OCGV. Primary schools work more efficiently in multiples of whole forms of entry, and the preferred size of new schools in Oxfordshire is 2 forms of entry. A few schools in Oxfordshire have grown, or are growing, to 3 forms of entry, but this remains unusual, especially in rural areas.

The additional capacity will need to be provided through new schools. The existing primary school's site is not large enough to expand further, and it is not well located with respect to the housing locations. Regardless of these barriers, expansion of the existing school would not be of sufficient size to meet the scale of housing growth planned. Early housing growth, however, will be accommodated by the spare capacity currently available at the existing school due to its previous expansion.

Once the current/future spare capacity at the existing school has been utilised (which is not currently expected to be before 2025 as explained previously) the remaining need is therefore expected to be:

- 1 form of entry generated and funded by West Eynsham SDA; and
- 3 forms of entry generated and funded by OCGV.

This could be delivered in a number of ways.

Option 1: One 2-form entry primary school on each site

Site area requirements:

West Eynsham 2.22ha

OCGV: 3.01ha (to protect ability to expand, as below)

Total: 5.23ha across both sites.

Pros:

- Efficient sizes of schools.

Cons:

- Limited potential to expand capacity further, should pupil generation exceed current expectations (mitigated by the OCGV site area being sufficient for 3fe).
- Some OCGV residents are very likely to need to travel to Eynsham for primary school.

Option 2: 1-form entry primary school on West Eynsham; 3-form entry primary school on OCGV

Site area requirements:

West Eynsham: 2.22ha (to protect ability to expand, as below)

OCGV: 3.01ha

Total: 5.23ha across both sites.

Pros:

- School capacity well matched to expected location of population, reducing the need to travel.
- West Eynsham primary school would have potential to expand capacity further, should pupil generation exceed current expectations.

Cons:

- 1-form entry schools are challenging to launch, due to low pupil numbers in the first few years.
- Limited potential to expand OCGV capacity further, should pupil generation exceed current expectations (mitigated by potential for growth in West Eynsham).
- Reducing West Eynsham Primary School to 1fe (at least in the short term) would reduce economies of scale.

Option 3: 1-form entry primary school on West Eynsham; a 1-form entry and a 2-form entry primary school on OCGV

Site area requirements:

West Eynsham: 2.22ha (to protect ability to expand, as below)

OCGV: 2 * 2.22ha (to protect ability to expand, as below)

Total: 6.66ha across both sites.

Pros:

- School capacity well matched to expected location of population, reducing the need to travel.
- OCGV school travel would be dispersed across 2 sites.
- Schools on both sites would have potential to expand capacity further, should pupil generation exceed current expectations.

Cons:

- Reducing 2 schools to 1fe would reduce economies of scale.

- 1-form entry schools are challenging to launch, due to low pupil numbers in the first few years.
- Greater risk than one or more schools becomes unsustainable should the pupil population subside in the longer term.
- Increased construction costs due to building 3 new schools.
- Increased land requirement.

Recommendation 1: primary education provision

Requiring a 2.22ha site within West Eynsham and a 3.01ha site within OCGV facilitates the delivery of either Option 1 or Option 2. The choice between these options can then be decided once timescales are clearer.

For any new schools, under current legislation the county council would be expected to seek an academy sponsor to run the school. To support this process, the county council would draft, consult on, and finalise an education specification setting out the type of school and education required. This will not be done until there is a clearer timescale for the developments, and thus the new school(s).

3. Secondary education: options

3.1 Should there be an expansion of Bartholomew School, or a separate new school?

Whereas additional primary education capacity for Eynsham will need to be through the establishment of new schools, for secondary education it could either be through a standalone new secondary school within OCGV or through expansion of the existing Bartholomew School (including potentially onto a split site, as addressed below).

Option 1: A stand-alone new secondary school within OCGV

The minimum scale of new secondary school which would be approved is 600-places.

Pros:

- Increased choice and diversity in local school provision. (Section 2 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 inserts sub-section 3A into S14 of the Education Act 1996, placing a duty on local education authorities to exercise their functions under this section with a view to securing diversity in the provision of schools, and increasing opportunities for parental choice.)
- Residents of OCGV would not need to cross the A40 to secondary school.

Cons:

- Requires approval by the Regional Schools Commissioner, which may not be granted should there be concern that a new school would undermine the viability of existing schools, or that the new school itself may not be viable.
- The new school would not be large enough to support a sixth form, nor provide the same range of educational provision that a larger school could.
- Given the timelag before a new school would be viable, temporary classrooms may be needed at Bartholomew School.
- The initial financial viability of the new school will be challenging, as to start with it would only have a small number of pupils but need to support a full staff.
- The ongoing financial sustainability of a 600-place secondary school is likely to be challenging.
- Due to these challenges, there may be a shortage of academy sponsors interested in running the school.

Option 2: Expansion of Bartholomew School

Government policy supports the expansion of Good and Outstanding schools.

Pros:

- Bartholomew is a popular and successful school, with a proven track record and an Ofsted rating of "Outstanding".
- Reduced risk, especially regarding financial stability and sustainability, compared to opening a new school.

- Expansion of places likely to be possible faster than the opening of a new school, as the school can grow gradually in line with population.
- Provides investment into an existing school, enabling it to increase its range of facilities and services.

Cons:

- Expansion is subject to approval by the Regional Schools Commissioner, which would be expected as long as the school maintains a Good or Outstanding Ofsted rating, but which may be more challenging if it requires movement onto a split site (see below).

Recommendation 2: new or expanded secondary school

Subject to Regional Schools Commissioner approval, Option 2 (expansion of Bartholomew School) is strongly preferred, due to its status as a popular and successful school, and the risks associated with opening a small new school.

3.2. Scale of expansion required

The combined growth in secondary and sixth form education from housing growth within Bartholomew's catchment is estimated at 712-820 pupils. This is equivalent to approximately 4 forms of entry (including sixth form).

Bartholomew School has already been expanded from 6 forms of entry to 7 forms of entry, partly funded by s106 funding from the two already permitted parcels of West Eynsham (Eynsham Nursery and Thornbury Road). Therefore, the additional scale of expansion required is 3 forms of entry, equivalent to 600 additional pupils.

(As the previous expansion occurred prior to the housing completions, in the intervening period the additional capacity has been filled from non-catchment pupils. As the local population grows, future non-catchment applicants would be displaced by catchment applicants, ensuring Bartholomew School has sufficient capacity to serve its catchment.)

Expanding the school by less than Eynsham's population growth would mean that parents' choice of school would be severely reduced, and represent a negative impact on existing Oxfordshire residents. (Section 2 of the *Education and Inspections Act 2006* inserts sub-section 3A into S14 of the *Education Act 1996*, placing a duty on local education authorities to exercise their functions under this section with a view to securing diversity in the provision of schools, and increasing opportunities for parental choice.)

Insufficient expansion of Bartholomew School would also result in additional capacity being required at schools in surrounding areas to accommodate the displaced pupils, as those areas are also experiencing significant growth. Dependence on additional school capacity being created at other schools could be a barrier to Eynsham's housing growth, and complicate the planning of sufficient school capacity.

The options for scale of expansion of secondary school provision are therefore:

Option 1: Expand Bartholomew by approximately 600 places, in line with expected pupil generation from proposed housing

Pros:

- Expansion of a popular and successful school, in line with government expectations.
- Ensure all Eynsham catchment pupils would be able to secure a place at the school.
- The needs of population growth are fully met without reducing parental choice for existing populations.
- No additional pressure is placed on surrounding schools.

Cons:

- Significant investment, and additional site area, required for Bartholomew School, as set out below.

Option 2: Do not expand Bartholomew, or expand by fewer than 600 places, and push pressure out to surrounding schools

Pros:

- Less, or no, building work required at Bartholomew; less, or no, additional land required.

Cons:

- Parental choice would be severely weakened, particularly harmful where younger siblings are not able to attend the same school as older siblings.
- Not all Eynsham catchment pupils would be able to secure a place at the school – the effective catchment area would shrink.
- No investment in Eynsham secondary education facilities – developers' contributions would be required to expand other schools.
- Surrounding schools would require significant expansion, on top of that required to meet their local population growth. It may not be possible to expand schools sufficiently. Developers' contributions would be required to expand these schools.
- Dependence on the expansion of other schools increases uncertainties and may be a barrier to Eynsham's growth.

Recommendation 3: scale of additional secondary education provision

Assuming the expansion of Bartholomew school is approved, the required scale of expansion to ensure sufficiency of places and maintain parental choice would be in the order of 600 places.

3.3 Land requirements for expansion of Bartholomew School

Based on the recommendations above, either Bartholomew School will expand by approximately 600 places, to a total size of 1,900 pupils, or (if not approved by the Regional Schools Commissioner) a separate new 600-place school will be required.

Option 1: expansion using Bartholomew's current site area

Bartholomew School currently operates across a split site, with a detached playing field of 35,717m² supplementing its main site of 58,258m², giving a total site area of 93,975m². This combined area is in line with the government's Building Bulletin 103 area recommendations for a 1,300 place school, i.e. the school's current size. However, one consequence of having a detached playing field is that at breaktimes only the main site is available to pupils, and it therefore is under-sized at these times.

The Building Bulletin 103 area recommendation for a 1,900 place school is 130,700m², and the minimum standard requires a site area of 104,000m². The current site area is therefore insufficient to meet even the minimum standards for the scale of expansion required.

Pros:

- No land is required from the development(s).
- School operations (other than sports) are contained to a single site.

Cons:

- Insufficient land area to meet BB103 minimum school site area standards.
- Site already feels cramped in places, and this would be significantly worsened by a near-50% increase in pupil numbers.
- Very unlikely to be approved by the government due to the loss of school playing field required.
- This option cannot be relied on ahead of the RSC's approval, as it would not support the fall-back position of a separate new school.

Option 2: extending the current sports field site into adjoining land

Under this option, either the playing field would be moved to the adjoining land so that additional building can be provided on the existing playing field, or the new buildings would be constructed on the acquired land. Under s.77 of the School Standards and Framework Act as amended by the Education Act, 2011, the Secretary of State's consent is required for a change of use of playing field land, including for the purposes of building school accommodation. Therefore, if the buildings are to be constructed on existing playing field, replacement playing field will be required as compensation, as well as to ensure sufficient playing field for the larger school.

The additional land needed to meet Building Bulletin recommendations for a 1,900 place school would be 36,725m².

Bartholomew's main site is surrounded on all sides by development and cannot be expanded. Bartholomew's playing field site is surrounded to the north and east by development and to the south by permitted development. The only option for expanding the site is to the west, but this would still be difficult to achieve as this is bounded by woodland and includes a ditch and a flood zone. It is therefore unlikely that a continuous site could be provided. A detached parcel of land may need to be larger than the additional land that would be required for a continuous site extension to be of any practical use.

If suitable land could be added to the school site, this does not, however, answer the building footprint need. In order to avoid further overcrowding on the current main site, the necessary additional accommodation would need to be built on the current playing field site or on the acquired land. This, and the physical constraints of the acquired land, would compromise the pitch layouts necessary to deliver the sports curriculum, which in turn may increase the additional land requirement.

It would not be practical for younger pupils to travel between the two sites between lessons. Safeguarding would be compromised by pupils having to go outside the site, cross the road, walk down the road and onto the other site. Teaching time would be lost, and staff would have to supervise the movement. This is not acceptable to the academy trust. Therefore, any building on the sports field or acquired site would need to be a sixth form block, so that younger pupils would not need to move between sites. To avoid placing additional pressure on core facilities such as the school's canteen, the sixth form would need to be self-contained, with its own canteen etc, and the full range of curriculum facilities such as science labs. It may be acceptable for the sixth form to share the existing school's sports facilities, which would reduce the additional land required, if developer contributions funded improvements to the sports field (e.g. multi-use games area and improvements to the pitches) to enable them to be used more intensively.

This scale of additional accommodation, together with maintaining and enhancing sports provision, may require more land from the West Eynsham development than would be implied by a simple BB103 area calculation.

Pros:

- Bartholomew School does not need a third separate site.
- The school's sites are closer together than would be the case if a site were to be provided on OCGV.
- Less land area is required than for a completely separate site.

Cons:

- Immediately adjoining land is woodland or flood zone, so the land provided would need to be beyond that, compromising its usefulness.
- A larger amount of additional land would be required to provide a manageable solution for the academy.
- The constraints affecting the West Eynsham site are such that it may not be possible to accommodate expansion of the existing playing field site, together with the provision of a new primary school, the required number of dwellings and all other supporting infrastructure.
- The school's buildings and operations would need to be split across both sites.

- This option cannot be relied on ahead of the RSC's approval, as it would not support the fall-back position of a separate new school.

Option 3: a new site, sufficient for 600 pupils

This option treats either a separate new school or an expansion of Bartholomew in the same way, i.e. as a 600-place new site.

Government BB103 standards for a 600-place school are for a site area of 48,800m². Based on a 2-storey solution with single storey hall, it would require a GIA of 5.204m² and a building footprint of 2,820 m².

Such a separate site could in theory either be within the West Eynsham development or the OCGV development.

West Eynsham pros:

- Would not split the school across both sides of the A40.
- Proximity to the main site may allow some sharing of sports pitches, which could reduce the additional land area required – there would need to be additional investment into the sports pitches to enable more intensive use.

West Eynsham cons:

- As a smaller development it is not considered to be possible to identify a suitable land area (in addition to the primary school site and other infrastructure which will be required.)
- Connectivity between the school's sites – both pedestrian/cycle and vehicular - would need to be considered carefully. In particular, if the detached site is a sixth form centre, it should be accepted that some sixth formers will drive to school and on-site parking would be necessary to avoid them parking within the surrounding area.
- Any reduction in land requirement through sharing of sports pitches could not be confirmed prior to Regional Schools Commissioner approval for the separate site to be an expansion of Bartholomew, and therefore the full 4.88ha would need to be protected until that time.

OCGV pros:

- Provides some secondary education provision – and associated community use facilities - within the garden village, increasing its self-sufficiency and providing links between the two communities.
- Provides greater opportunities for linkages with the business development on OCGV.

OCGV cons:

- Requires movement of staff, and in some cases pupils, across the A40.
- Connectivity between the school's sites – both pedestrian/cycle and vehicular - would need to be considered carefully. In particular, if the detached site is a sixth form centre, it should be accepted that some sixth formers will drive to school and on-site parking would be necessary to avoid them parking within the surrounding area.

The preference of the Eynsham Partnership Academy Trust for practical purposes would be for a site within West Eynsham, close to the existing school playing fields. However, it is unlikely that sufficient, suitable land can be made available. Emerging work undertaken in relation to the constraints and opportunities of the West Eynsham site suggests it would be extremely challenging to make provision for both secondary and primary education on-site, whilst taking account of constraints such as flood risk and delivering the required level of housing growth and other supporting infrastructure. On this basis, the additional secondary school site is required within the Garden Village.

The additional secondary school site would ideally be located close to one of the new primary school sites, to enable sharing of resources and joint activities, but as at this stage it cannot be confirmed whether the Eynsham Partnership Academy Trust would be operating the primary school, less weight should be given to this aspiration.

Assuming this becomes a split site Bartholomew School, the school and the Eynsham Partnership Academy Trust would need to decide how to split operations across the two sites. Ideas explored include:

1. A separate sixth form centre, removing the c250 sixth formers currently on the main site. This would leave approximately 1,500 Year 7-11 pupils on the main site.
2. A separate upper school covering Years 11-13. This would leave approximately 1,200 Year 7-10 pupils on the main site.
3. A separate lower school covering Years 7-8. This would leave approximately 1,300 Year 9-13 pupils on the main site.

The decision on how to split operations across the sites should be taken by the academy trust, based on educational grounds, alongside ensuring sufficiency of school places, and may evolve over time. At this stage, it would be supportive of future education serving Eynsham to keep open options as far as possible.

Pros:

- This is the only option which can be relied upon ahead of the RSC's approval for Bartholomew to expand, as it would also support the fall-back position of a separate new school.
- No loss of playing field, which will facilitate government approval.
- An opportunity to significantly enhance local provision both for the school, and for community use.
- Provides flexibility and future proofing for the school to adapt in the longer term.

Cons:

- The school would now have three sites, with the school's buildings and operations split across two of them.

Recommendation 4: land requirements for expansion of Bartholomew School

A 4.88ha site is required within OCGV to allow the delivery of either a new school or school expansion solution, as approved by the Regional Schools Commissioner, and will provide flexibility for future changes to school organisation.