

## **Appendix 2: Schools Provision**

**Report to: Development Plan Panel**

**Site Allocations Plan – Implications for school places.**

**Date: 16 Dec 2014**

**Report Author: Lesley Savage, Capacity Planning and Sufficiency Lead**

### **1. Introduction**

1.1. This report provides an outline of the implications of the proposed site allocations for school places in Leeds, including reference to sites identified for new schools, in order to inform the final decision on site allocations.

### **2. Background**

2.1. The Core Strategy, and site allocations which support its delivery, are essential to the economic growth of the city, and to its aspiration to be the best city in the country. This paper outlines the work done to ensure that the school provision necessary to support it can be delivered.

2.2. The context in which this work has been completed is challenging. The city is facing a rising demand for school places due to a rise in the birth rate from a low of 7,500 in 2000/1 to an average of just over 10,000 for the last 5 years. This has necessitated the creation of over 9,000 primary school places over the past four years, through expansions of existing schools, creation of new schools, and restructuring of existing schools.

2.3. As a result the capacity of the existing school estate to respond to significant new housing is limited, particularly in certain hotspots within the city, and new sites will need to be secured initially through the site allocations process and later through detailed planning applications.

2.4. As the discussions with ward members and officers regarding site allocations have progressed, Children's Services have given their views on the potential impact in each Housing Market Characteristic Area (HMCA), and suggested sites which would be well placed to create additional school provision. In addition to considering the location relative to existing schools and the impact on them, consideration has been given to the size of particular sites, and priority has been given to locating provision in the larger sites which most directly give rise to the new demand. The recommendations for school sites should therefore be sustainable in the long term.

### **3. The process and key considerations.**

3.1. As the site uses and sizes have been refined, the analysis of the impact on school places has been adjusted. This has been a lengthy iterative process balancing housing, employment and green space allocations with other infrastructure needs including schools. The site allocations commentary reflects the school as an essential requirement of any subsequent planning application

for that site, and housing yields have been adjusted to allow for the school site area on housing allocations.

3.2. As far as possible schools have not been proposed on PAS sites. Concern has been raised that to progress a school on a PAS site ahead of housing progressing may risk of premature housing development through challenge of the status. Where a school is proposed on a PAS site consideration has been given to whether this arises purely directly from that site, or form a wider need and so be needed sooner. Where it may be needed sooner, consideration has been given to how a phased opening could reduce that risk and by initially open to meet existing demand and expanding when the housing goes forward.

3.3. School attendance patterns do not map well onto the HMCA's, and having largely concluded this iterative process it was then necessary to re-aggregate the data into meaningful school place planning areas to provide a final assessment of the adequacy of provision. Whilst this represents a position statement at December 2014, any further iteration may impact on the position described.

3.4. The report describes the context for these planning areas in terms of current pressures for places, current scope of the existing estate to meet existing demand, and the needs arising from the housing allocations. It highlights the areas of concern where no solutions for school places have been found.

3.5. Local authorities are already the providers of last resort for school places, and are dependent on working with partners to commission new provision. In addition, Free Schools are commissioned independently of the local authority. This can open up opportunities to acquire privately owned land and buildings which may not feature in this plan. Given the long term nature of the housing strategy, and the likelihood of changes to the statutory and educational context of school place planning, as well as the possibility of further changes up or down in the birth rate, it is therefore not necessarily an issue to progress with the site allocations without fully sufficient school provision being identified at this stage, however these risks are highlighted so that members can make an informed choice when approving the plans.

3.6. Establishment of new school provision is subject to a statutory process, which may or may not support the suggestions made in this report. However failure to secure sites now will almost certainly leave the authority with a significant gap in its ability to respond to the planned housing. Given the context described, it is therefore essential that the site allocations describe the provision of a school site as a requirement, but that the authority is able to confirm or decline that requirement at the time of the detailed planning application being brought forward.

3.7. It is generally inappropriate to name a specific scheme to meet the demand as this would need to be tested through the statutory process, and consultation in this site allocations process would not meet the needs of school

organisation legislation. In some villages options are clearly more limited, and consideration is given to the sustainability of more than one school. Relocation to facilitate expansion may be suggested as an obvious option to meet demand. In other cases sites immediately adjacent to existing schools offer obvious expansion options. Naming of a site, and especially a particular scheme, does not presuppose that this will be supported by the consultation and statutory process. The situation at the time the school provision needs to be brought forward will need to be appraised afresh.

3.8. There is some uncertainty about the impact of new housing on this scale in terms of pupil yield. For many years now the council has used a pupil yield of 0.25 primary aged pupils per 100 house, and 10 secondary aged children. Adjusted by the number of year groups this equates to 3.5 children per year group in primary and 2 in secondary. These figures, particularly for primary, are not dissimilar to those used by other authorities, and have generally served Leeds well in planning school places.

3.9. Whilst the impact on primary school places from new housing is relatively immediate, the different rates at which houses sell, the life stages that families initially occupy houses, and the length of time families tend to stay in an area are among many factors that can take time to establish and influence school place demand, particularly for secondary. It is known that there is a small (typically 5%) drop off in cohort sizes between year 6 and year 7, as some pupils access provision in the independent sector or out of the Leeds area. There is considerable doubt if the difference in the pupil yield would be so large when whole new communities are being created and significant housing areas are being developed, and a concern that the yield should be adjusted accordingly. Work is underway to formally review and validate this, however in the meantime an average between the two pupil yields of 2,75 per year group has been used.

3.10. This more cautious approach should ensure the authority is not left with a strategic shortfall of provision, but proposals will only be brought forward where the demand is confirmed. This reinforces the need to ensure that the planning conditions insist on the need for a school to be factored in, but not necessarily enacted.

3.11. Appendix 1 summarises the number of houses approved, the pupil yield anticipated, and the sites identified as needing school provision including in the site use allocation by planning area. The following commentary summarises any residual concerns for primary provision by planning area.

3.12. Data is described in terms of forms of entry (FE). Schools are organised and funded around class sizes of 30 children, and a 1FE primary school has 1 class of 30 pupils in each year group, 2FE is 2 classes etc.

#### **4. Primary school place impact**

4.1. In total approximately 72 FE of additional primary provision are needed as a result of the housing plans, equivalent to 36 new 2 FE primary schools. The

site allocation process has identified options for 46.5 FE. With PAS sites included, this rises to demand of 80FE and solutions for 55.5FE.

4.2. The biggest gap in provision is in the city centre, where 10 FE of additional demand could be created, with no sites identified. There is a high degree of uncertainty about the pupil yield from city centre locations, but we do know that increasingly families are moving into flats, and into these locations. Some sites have been identified in peripheral areas in the inner HMCA, but this will not be sufficient to meet all needs. Between the two HMCAs 21FE of demand has been identified and only 11FE of primary provision. This is not to say that schools cannot be provided, as demonstrated by the recent establishment of the Ruth Gorse Academy, a secondary school due to open in 2016 on Black Bull Street, however it is to note the high degree of risk attached with this site allocation plan.

4.3. This pressure is located mainly around the northern / north eastern part of the city centre, in the Kirkstall / Burley, Hyde Park, Woodhouse areas and through to parts of the Burmantofts, Chapel Allerton, Harehills. These are all areas where school provision is already facing pressure.

4.4. The preferred size for new provision is 2FE this provides a degree of educational and financial breadth and stability, and allows options for downsizing rather than closure in times of declining birth rates. A number of areas do not present sufficient extra demand to warrant a new school but equally there may be problems meeting demand from the existing estate.

4.5. An analysis by planning area follows:

- a. **Alwoodley** – Site 2053B was agreed should contain a new 2FE primary school which should be sufficient, and ease pressure here, which is also impacting on the adjacent Roundhay / Wigton Moor planning area.
- b. **Ardley / Tingley** – Site 2127 Tingley Station was identified as a PAS site and would require a 2FE school only if and when it was developed due to its remote location. Sites 1032 and 2128 were identified as PAS sites, and may potentially require a school site any future housing allocation. This could potentially be phased to be a 1FE school in the short term to meet demand from other sites already progressing, expanding later to meet the needs arising directly from the PAS site itself if that were developed.
- c. **Armley / Wortley** – no school sites agreed but 1.4 FE of additional demand created. Mobile population creating some uncertainty. Of moderate concern as exiting estate already exhausted. Could link to Otter island development.
- d. **Beeston** - no school sites agreed but around 0.3FE of additional demand created. Mobile population creating some uncertainty. Of moderate concern as exiting estate already exhausted.

- e. **Belle Isle** - no school sites agreed but 0.5FE additional demand created. Mobile population creating some uncertainty. Of less concern as options may exist in existing estate.
- f. **Boston Spa** – site 3391 to include 2 x 2FE primary schools. Sufficient secondary provision in area for local children, but would need to address demand from inner east.
- g. **Bramhope / Pool** – site 1080 / 3367A in Bramhope and 1369 and 1095B (PAS) in Pool were agreed should include a primary school site each for potential solutions which create an additional 0.5FE places in each for demand from sites within the villages. The PAS site would only be needed if the PAS were developed.
- h. **Bramley** – no sites agreed for school use, and 0.6FE of additional demand created. Of less concern as options may exist in existing estate once other changes have settled.
- i. **Burmantofts** – site 2145 Dolly Lane agreed to be reserved for educational use. At this stage it has notionally been outlined as a through school with 2FE primary and 4FE secondary capacity. This would meet demand arising from the allocations, however the site has been subject to other interest including Free School bids and the optimum type of educational use has yet to be properly established.
- j. **Calverley** – no sites for school use agreed, and 0.2FE additional demand created. Existing estate already facing some pressure, but solutions in adjacent areas of Horsforth and Farsley are likely to resolve pressure.
- k. **Chapel Allerton** – 264 Roundhay Road CS offices agreed for a 2FE school, subject to AMB agreement – there is known current interest in the site. Although only 0.3FE of additional demand created directly in this area it is close to parts of other planning areas ie city centre / Woodhouse /Burantofts and Harehills, and in all these areas the existing school estate is already exhausted. The site is strategically well placed to meet demand arising from a number of sites allocated for housing.
- l. **Cookridge / Adel** – 2130 Church Lane agreed for a 2FE school. In total housing will generate almost 3FE of additional demand created, and there may be options for expansion in the existing estate to meet the remaining shortfall. Moderate risk.
- m. **EPOS Villages South** - 2134 PAS to the east of Scholes agreed to contain a school solution to create an additional 0.5FE to partially meet 1FE of additional demand from that site. Only needed if the PAS site is developed.
- n. **EPOS Villages West** – no school sites agreed 0.3FE of demand identified. Moderate risk.

- o. **Farnley** – no sites identified, 1.5FE of additional demand. Options believed to exist in the existing estate. Low risk.
- p. **Farsley** – 1114/1110 PAS agreed should contain a 2FE primary school. Would be sufficient to meet 0.5FE of demand from site itself and also strategically well located to meet demand from sites within walking distance at Clariant/Riverside, and would redistribute pupils from Rodley, all of which is currently feeding into pressures in Horsforth and Calverley. Only develop school if PAS site progresses.
- q. **Garforth** – agreed site 1232B to contain 1 x 2FE primary and 1 x through school with 2FE primary and 4FE secondary. Would be sufficient to meet the additional demand of in excess of 3FE and also address Micklefield.
- r. **Gildersome / Drighlington** – agreed site 3064 adjacent to Birchfield could provide for expansion by 1FE to partially meet 1.4FE of demand. Shortage is of moderate risk.
- s. **Guiseley / Yeadon / Rawdon** – a 2FE school from somewhere within sites 2163A, 1180A, 1311A has been agreed in principle. All are in a good general location but have access issues which may compromise housing or school use in reality. High risk as other options limited after extensive recent consultation.
- t. **Harehills** – no sites agreed with an additional 0.7FE of demand. Whilst in part this could be addressed by Roundhay Road, this is still a high risk as there are no known options in the existing estate at this time.
- u. **Holbeck** – no sites have been identified, 10.8FE of demand created. Very high risk.
- v. **Horsforth** – site 4240 has been agreed should contain a through school with 2FE primary and 4FE secondary. Part of site 1202 adjacent to Newlaithes also needed, but this was not put forward for housing.
- w. **Hunslet** – no sites identified, but 1.2FE of demand generated. Of moderate concern, some potential may exist in current estate.
- x. **Hyde Park / Headingley** – no sites identified, and 1.2FE of demand generated. Option of the use of West Park being considered through AMB, otherwise of concern as existing estate largely exhausted.
- y. **Kippax** – no sites identified, but 0.2FE of demand generated. Not of concern, scope in existing estate to accommodate.
- z. **Kirkstall / Burley / Hawksworth Wood** – a site within the Otter island complex 3390 / 3393 / 3408 / 198 was agreed should include a 2FE primary. Masterplan approach needed to confirm precise scope – this site has little access to existing schools but is only around 1FE of demand. Site 626 to include a 2FE primary, 1FE of demand arising directly but second FE would

be LA funded to meet remaining demand. Current discussions with developer. In total 3.3FE of additional demand created and solutions do not map particularly well to demand. Of some concern due to similar pressures in adjacent Woodhouse and Hyde Park / Headingley planning areas.

- aa. **Lower Aire Valley** – site 1149A, Allerton Bywater PAS if and when progressed would need to provide a 1FE primary school. It is adjacent to Brigshaw High School which may have some development potential on site to meet secondary need.
- bb. **Manston , and Swarcliffe / Whinmoor** – ELE site 797 to include provision for 3 x 2FE primary and 1 x 8FE secondary in addition to Northern quadrant site already agreed should be sufficient to meet local demand.
- cc. **Meanwood** – no sites identified but 0.4FE of additional demand created. Of moderate risk due to limited options in existing estate and current BN pressures.
- dd. **Morley** – site 1220A East of Churwell identified for 2FE school to meet 2.3FE of demand needed. Moderate risk, options for expansion largely exhausted.
- ee. **Osmandthorpe / Temple Newsam** – 2FE of additional demand. Free School already progressing on part of site 259B as a through school with 2FE primary and 4FE secondary which should address the demand arising from this housing. Also site 1295A Skelton Lake in AAVP agreed to contain a similar through school. These would be sufficient to meet demand.
- ff. **Otley** – site 745 was identified for a 2FE primary school, which may involve relocation and expansion of an existing school and so is only counted as 1FE net increase. Shortage of approx. 0.5FE compared to additional demand is of low concern as other options believed to exist within existing estate and some housing already underway is already accounted for in current projections.
- gg. **Pusley** – site 3464 was identified to include a school expansion option of 1FE. Total additional demand of 2.2 FE. An area of some concern as while some options for expansion may exist in the existing estate the area is currently facing pressure and this may not be sufficient.
- hh. **Richmond Hill** – site 1146 great clothes was identified for a potential 1FE net expansion of existing provision. Site 2080 within the AAVP which includes the former Copperfields site has been agreed to include a new 2FE primary school, however the precise location is important and must not be directly on the old school site.
- ii. **Robin Hood / Rothwell / Woodlesford** – site 4222A/B/C Fleet Lane agreed for a new 2FE primary provision. Site 3081 was not supported for housing, but was suggested for a school instead. This has been included in

the allocations and analysis, but is not clear if it would be progressed and would depend on changes in surrounding areas at that time.

- jj. **Seacroft** – site 4090 East Leeds Family Learning Centre was reserved entirety for school use for a 2FE primary, to meet the additional demand plus potentially also other educational priorities. This has been supported through the brownfield land disposal/development process. Site 2154 - Seacroft Hospital, requirement for a 6FE-8FE secondary school.
- kk. **Staningley** – no sites agreed for school provision with 0.2FE of additional demand. Of less concern as options thought to exist in current estate
- ll. **Wetherby** – no sites agreed for school use as options exist within the current estate to meet the 0.8FE of demand arising. Low concern.
- mm. **Woodhouse** – no sites agreed for school use, and 1.3FE of demand expected. Of some concern due to existing estate being exhausted and adjacency of a number of areas with insufficient solutions identified.

## 5. Secondary school place impact

5.1. In total approximately 46 FE of additional secondary provision are needed as a result of the housing plans, equivalent to 6 new secondary schools of around 8 forms of entry each. The site allocation process has identified options for 36 FE. With PAS sites included demand rises to 52 FE, but no further sites were agreed.

5.2. There is considerable current uncertainty about the capacity of secondary schools to meet anticipated demand. Changes to sixth form funding mean that any sixth form of less than around 250 pupils is not financially sustainable. As sixth forms are established collaboratively and increasingly in off site provision, there will be additional space available for statutory school age children. Translating the number of places made available by this is not straightforward as the delivery of the curriculum is not based on simple classes of 30 as in primary, and requires use of specialist facilities. Admission numbers are often therefore not rigid multiples of 30, although the language of FE is still used as an approximation.

5.3. As described in 3.6 above, a cautious approach has been taken when projecting the pupil yield for secondary school places. This uncertainty around both the projection of demand for secondary places and how it might be met should be borne in mind when considering the implications for planning school provision.

5.4. New provision agreed within this process in East Leeds Extension, AAVP, Horsforth and Garforth should address the demand arising from this site allocations plan for areas where the existing estate would otherwise be insufficient to cope. Site 2154 - Seacroft Hospital, requirement for a 6FE-8FE secondary school.



5.5. There is estimated to be over 16FE of demand arising in the inner and city centre HMCAs, with only the potential for 4FE of provision at Dolly Lane agreed through this process. Within this area the inner East and inner North East of the city already face considerable pressure for places, and work will be starting in the spring term on consultation events to address this, however it will add to the difficulty in meeting demand arising from this housing. The local authority has already started a piece of work to look at the funding of site acquisition and demand arising from this housing plan will need to be considered as part of that plan.

## **6. Conclusion and recommendation**

6.1. Housing growth is an essential requirement for the economic and social development of the city, and as we strive to be the best city for children, school place planning is a critical part of the infrastructure planning that runs alongside this. There are a number of sites which have been identified as requiring school provision to be included in any future use, and the plans panel are asked to:

6.2. Support the sites identified for school provision

6.3. Note the risks associated with housing plans in areas where insufficient school provision has been identified at this stage

6.4. Formally record this requirement in the site allocation plan as a requirement of any planning application for housing, which the local authority will confirm (or withdraw) at the point a planning application is put forward.

6.5. Note that the precise location of a school within a site will be determined at the point of the planning application/formulating detailed site requirements in drawing up the Publication Draft Plan.

6.6. Note that support of use of any council owned sites will need to be confirmed through AMB.

Appendix 1 of Appendix 2 on next page:

HMCA area	Primary Planning area	Current baseline position for primary school places	PAS sites				Non-PAS sites					Sites refs	Comments and outstanding issues.	
			Housing Capacity	Number of primary FE demand generated	Number of secondary FE demand generated	Primary school FE sites identified	Secondary school FE sites identified	Housing Capacity	Number of primary FE demand generated	Number of secondary FE demand generated	Primary school FE sites identified			Secondary school FE sites identified
City Centre							8,374	10.0	7.7				no sites identified	
Inner							9,192	10.9	8.4	11.00	8.00		2145 Dolly Lane, 264 Roundhay Road, 3390/3393/3408/198 otter island, 259 former whitebridge sch, 1146 great clothes, 4090 East Leeds Family Learning Centre,	
Aire Valley (Inner)							1,928	2.3	1.8	2.00			2080 copperfields	
Aireborough			304	0.4	0.3		2,175	2.6	2.0	2.00			Options within Guiseley sites 2163A, 1180A, 1311A	
outer NW			461	0.5	0.4	0.5	1,761	2.1	1.6	3.50			2130 Church Lane Adel, 745 East of Otley	
North						1.0	6,165	7.3	5.7	6.00	4.00		2053B Alwoodley Lane, 4240 Horsforth, 1202 Horsforth, 626 Kirkstall Forge,	
Outer North East			1,339	1.6	1.2	0.5	4,737	5.6	4.3	4.00			3391/ 4167 new settlement	
East							7,397	8.8	6.8	6.00	16.00		797 ELE and 2154 Seacroft hospital	
Aire Valley (east)							2,404	2.9	2.2	2.00	4.00		2195A Skelton :Lake	
Outer SE			1,508	1.8	1.4	1.0	3,766	4.5	3.5	4.00	4.00		1232 East of Garforth	
Outer South			214	0.3	0.2	2.0	2,435	2.9	2.2	2.00			4222 Fleet Lane. 3081 Robin Hood also suggested but not clear if this is a good fit, so excluded from figures	
Outer SW			1,695	2.0	1.6	2.0	6,203	7.4	5.7	3.00			1220A East of Churwell, 3064 next to Birchfield	
Outer West			693	0.8	0.6	2.0	4,106	4.9	3.8	1.00			3464 adjacent to Tyersal	
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>			<b>6,214</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>60,643</b>	<b>72.2</b>	<b>55.6</b>	<b>46.50</b>	<b>36.00</b>			
	Alwoodley	1FE short					333	0.4	0.3	2.00			2053B Alwoodley Lane	
	Ardley / Tingley	1FE short	1,311	1.6	1.2	2.0	1,563	1.9	1.4				2127 Tingley Station PAS	1032/2128 PAS recommended by members - school needed
	Armley / Wortley	0.5FE amber					1,143	1.4	1.0					
	Beeston	0.5FE short					235	0.3	0.2					
	Belle Isle	0.5FE short					402	0.5	0.4					
	Boston Spa	Green - OK	248	0.3	0.2		3,180	3.8	2.9	4.00			3391/4167 Hedley Hall / Spen Common	
	Bramhope / Pool	Green - OK	461	0.5	0.4	0.5	449	0.5	0.4	0.50			1369 PAS in Pool, 1080 / 3367A in Bramhope	
	Bramley	1FE amber					497	0.6	0.5					
	Burmantofts	1.5FE short					1,590	1.9	1.5	2.00	4.00		2145 Dolly Lane	
	Calverley	0.5FE short					159	0.2	0.1					
	Chapel Allerton	1FE short					237	0.3	0.2	2.00			264 Roundhay Road	
	Cookridge / Adel	Green - OK					2,380	2.8	2.2	2.00			2130 Church Lane	376 Silk Mill Way / Ison Drive discussed but not progressed
	EPOS Villages South	Green - OK	902	1.1	0.8	0.5	1,129	1.3	1.0				2134 East of Scholes PAS.	
	EPOS Villages West	Green - OK	97	0.1	0.1		192	0.2	0.2					
	Farmley	Green - OK	436	0.5	0.4		857	1.0	0.8					
	Farsley	Green - OK	447	0.5	0.4	2.0	385	0.5	0.4				1114/1110 Kirklees Knoll	
	Garforth	Green - OK	472	0.6	0.4		2,689	3.2	2.5	4.00	4.00		1232 east of Garforth	
	Gildersome / Drighlington	Green - OK					1,167	1.4	1.1	1.00			3064 adj to Birchfield	
	Guiseley / Yeadon / Rawdon	Green - OK	304	0.4	0.3		2,832	3.4	2.6	2.00			2163A or 1180A or 1311A	
	Harehills	1FE short					573	0.7	0.5					
	Holbeck	amber - monitor					9,073	10.8	8.3					
	Horsforth	1FE short				1.0	1,132	1.3	1.0	2.00	4.00		4240 off A65 off Horsforth roundabout and 1202 Victoria Ave	
	Hunslet	amber - monitor					984	1.2	0.9					Includes 1FE primary from Aire Valley sites. Schools solutions progressed outside of this process. None in this area
	Hyde Park / Headingley	1FE amber					1,026	1.2	0.9					
	Kippax	Green - OK	166	0.2	0.2		170	0.2	0.2					
	Kirkstall / Burley / Hawskworth	1.5FE short					2,741	3.3	2.5	4.00			3390/3393/3408/198 otter island / kirkstall road, 626 Kirkstall Forge	
	Lower Aire Valley	Amber - monitor	974	1.2	0.9	1.0	721	0.9	0.7				1149 Adj to Brigshaw PAS	
	Manston	1FE amber					877	1.0	0.8	4.00	8.00		797 ELE, 2154 Seacroft hospital	
	Meanwood	0.5FE short					311	0.4	0.3					
	Middleton	1.5FE short					602	0.7	0.6					
	Morley	0.5FE short	77	0.1	0.1		1,953	2.3	1.8	2.00			1220A East of Churwell	
	Osmondthorpe / Templenewsam Area	0.5FE Amber					3,941	4.7	3.6	4.00	8.00		259 former Whitebridge school	Includes Aire Valley sites School solutions progressed outside of this process but include 1295A Skelton Lake for a 2FE Primary/4FE secondary through school
	Otley	Green - OK					1,248	1.5	1.1	1.00			745 East of Otley	
	Pudsey	1FE short	117	0.1	0.1		1,844	2.2	1.7	1.00			3464 adj to Tyersal	
	Richmond Hill	Green - OK					1,957	2.3	1.8	3.00			1146 Great Clothes	Includes over 2FE primary from Aire Valley sites. Schools solutions progressed outside of this process but include part of site 2080 which contains the former copperfields site for a 2FE primary
	Rothwell / Robin Hood / Woodlesford	Green - OK	110	0.1	0.1	2.0	2,269	2.7	2.1	2.00			4222 Fleet lane	3081 Robin Hood also suggested but not clear if this is a good fit, so excluded from figures
	Roundhay / Wigton	1.5FE short					148	0.2	0.1					
	Seacroft	1.5FE short					1,146	1.4	1.1	2.00			4090 East Leeds Family learning Centre	
	Stanningley	1FE short					193	0.2	0.2					
	Swardcliffe / Whinmoor	Green - OK					4,575	5.4	4.2	2.00	8.00		797 ELE	
	Wetherby	Green - OK	92	0.1	0.1		650	0.8	0.6					
	Woodhouse	Green - OK					1,090	1.3	1.0					
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>			<b>6,214</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>60,643</b>	<b>72.2</b>	<b>55.6</b>	<b>46.50</b>	<b>36.00</b>			