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**Schools Forum Meeting Minutes of Wednesday 13th July 2022**

**Via Microsoft Teams**

**08.30am – 10.19am**

Approved 28 September 2022

In Attendance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Jeff Fair (JF) – Chair | Jo Barak (JB) | Richard Green (RG) |
| Sean Moriarty (SM) | Ruth Bird (RB) | Luke Bulpett (LB) |
| John Hunter (JH) | Simon Thompson (STh) | Carole Herman (CH) |
| Claire Styles (CS) | Harriet Phelps-Knights (HP-K) | Marilyn Smith (MS) |
| Nigel Hill (NH) | Emily Welton (EW) | Chanel Lassman (CL) |
| Robin Taverner (RT) | Stuart Roberts (SR) | Philomena Cozens (PC) |
| Jinnie Nichols (JN) | Lyn Wright (LW) | Ruth Sturdy (RS) |
| Sue Bardetti (SB) | Mark Farmer (MF) | Rod Lane (RL) |
| **LA Officers** |  |  |
| Yannick Stupples-Whyley (YSW) | Cllr Tony Ball (TB) | Clare Kershaw (CK) |
| Andrew Page (AP) | Val Cleare (VC) - Minutes |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1** | **Apologies for Absence and substitute notices**Jeff Fair informed that Rod Lane was not well. JF welcomed everyone to the Teams meeting. Apologies have been received from Rod Lane, Simon Wall, Debs Watson, Clare White and Pam Langmead.JF welcomed Chanel Lassman (PVI member), Robin Taverner (Primary Academy Governor) and Stuart Roberts (Secondary Academy Governor).Today is Simon Thompson’s last meeting. Simon joined Forum in December 2012. On behalf of School’s Forum, JF thanked Simon for his commitment and contribution to the Forum and wished him well for the future. STh commented he had enjoyed his 10 years on the Schools Forum. |
| **2** | **Early Years – Options for Allocating Surplus Balance – Yannick Stupples-Whyley**YSW presented on behalf of Carolyn Terry. The report was seeking for Forum approval to allocate **£1million** of the Early Years Block underspend. 4.2 showed some of the options being considered, i.e. a one-off payment to all Early Years childcare providers offering the Funded Early Education Entitlement funding. Other options were additional resource to support providers with the increasing needs of children; or a sufficiency grant to support any providers in areas where there is already a lack of sufficient childcare. Options were taken to the Early Years Sub Group in June and based on the feedback it was agreed £1million of the £1.5million we are looking to initially allocate and would be paid out on the number of hours funded in 2021/22 financial year. That comes to **£0.056** per funded hour for each child. Table 2 showed the calculation of the funding per hour. This equates to the equivalent of a payment of **£31.92** for each 15-hour funded place, and payments will be made based on the actual number of hours claimed for each funded child. Under 4.5 the proposals are being developed for the remaining **£500,000** to provide intensive interventions to support children’s school readiness that will be targeted at both Early Years providers and parents, in line with 4.2.2. These proposals are in the process of being finalised and will be brought to the September 2022 Schools Forum meeting for approval. **Questions**PC asked is that a special uplift for providers or parents and is there an additional Special Needs amount they can apply for?YSW confirmed there is separate funding for Special Needs. YSW explained there are two pots of funding within Early Years. There is SEND Funding at the moment and then they will be merged together and will advise in due course. There is intervention where some children are not quite ready for school. CK added it will be more CPD focused, and we will separate it as far as we can. SM enquired why was it decided not to go any further with the third option under 4.2.3 (sufficiency grant). The thought behind this is to address additional support in areas where there is a lack of care and providers may be closing.**Action**: YSW will ask Carolyn Terry and report back at the next Forum in September. CL said it was discussed but the general consensus with providers funding difficulties with money would prolong the inevitable and be used elsewhere.**Recommendation:**The Forum noted the report and agreed the proposal at 4.4. **Voting**: All members were in agreement. |
| **3.** | **Implementing the Direct National Funding Formula – Yannick Stupples-Whyley**The latest consultation announced on 7/6/22 and concerns the DfE’s next stage to move to the Direct Funding Formula.YSW updated the Forum on the latest DfE consultation on implementing the Direct National Funding Formula. The White Paper was going to change the legislation, but this is on hold at the moment. The consultation covers: The interaction between the Schools NFF and funding for high needs; Growth and Falling Rolls Fund; Premises Funding; Minimum Funding Guarantee. The focus is on two elements of the High Needs Funding system, i.e. the flexibility to transfer funding to Local Authorities’ High Needs budgets and proposals on the continuation of notional SEN budgets in the direct NFF. Local Authorities will continue to be able to submit applications to the Secretary of State for funding to be transferred to their High Needs budgets via an adjustment to the NFF allocations for mainstreams schools in their area. Criteria for assessing funding transfer applications will be set out at a later stage. However, the DfE expect to continue to use the criteria as set out in 5.4.It is proposed to provide Local Authorities with a short “menu” of options on how the adjustment to mainstream school NFF allocations could be made. The options envisaged are set out in 5.5. Local Authorities will need to submit applications informed by the provision High Needs allocations that are published in July each year. Consultation with schools will still be required. The DfE will issue guidance to Local Authorities on how they can calculate their schools’ notional SEN budget for 2023-24. YSW added he imagined the DfE will narrow the number of factors which can be used. Subject to the green paper consultation, the DfE will consult on the detailed calculation of an indicative budget for SEND support within the direct NFF, as part of the wider consideration of the funding changes that the green paper reforms will require. The DfE will also consider and consult on whether a different financial threshold or alternative approach would be more appropriate, consistent with the responsibilities that will sit with mainstream schools under the new national standards. The DfE expects all schools and academy trusts to work collaboratively with local authorities, dioceses and other schools in the area, to ensure that there is a co-ordinated approach to place planning and delivery. Local authorities currently have discretion as to whether or not to operate a growth and/or falling rolls fund. If they do, it must be used only as set out in 6.4. Local Authorities would continue to be required to submit their local growth criteria for scrutiny by the ESFA. The DfE will also publish data on the growth criteria which local authorities were adopting in order to increase transparency of the approaches taken. These proposals could be implemented in 2024-25, in the second transitional year of the introduction of the direct NFF. Once this is in operation, growth and falling rolls funding would remain as part of Local Authorities’ funding allocations, alongside other elements of DSG, such as Early Year and High Needs, with proposals on changes to the allocation methodology included in 6.8. Significant growth would be defined as increases in the number of pupils as mirrored under 6.18. Not all growth in schools is to meet demographic need. Growth can also occur where a school becomes more popular with parents and children locally. We currently make funding available for academies with significant forecast growth to reflect their increased costs. Academies that are entitled to this funding provide us with an estimate for their number of pupils in the coming year, which we provide funding for subject to an adjustment process based on the actual, in-year autumn census. Agreements are made on a case-by-case application basis at academy trust level.With regards to premises funding, this is based on historic spend which is funded in the next year. The only exception is PFI where they do add increase based on RPI to allow for contract increases. Split sites funding will be counted where they are separated by a public road or railway as a clear marker of separateness. The sites must primarily be used for the education of 5-16 year olds and must share the same URN. There must be a building on site, but this will exclude playing fields. This will be known as Basic Eligibility. The split site funding will be a lump sum payment with the maximum allocation set at 60% of the lump sum. The basic eligibility element will be set at 20% of the lump sum value and distance eligibility will be 40% of the lump sum value. The other area we are looking at is exceptional premises factors. Essex has three one for amalgamating infant and junior schools, one for recouping the cost of buying out the Tendring contract and one for joint use arrangements for secondary schools. The proposal is to automatically allocate additional funding through the lump sum. Joint use agreements are where schools share the use of a facility in order to deliver their curriculum due to inadequate facilities. This will be retained within the NFF, however, in a bid to reduce the number of qualifying schools the funding spent on joint use agreements must account for 2.5% of the total budget, which is an increase from the current 1%. No new schools will qualify for an exceptional premises factor and existing schools will only be eligible if they meet the new 2.5% of total budget requirement. In terms of the third factor, there is no information on this and will request a response.With regards to Minimum Funding Local Authorities set a minimum funding Guarantee under the current funding arrangements, where the NFF uses as funding floor. In the move to a direct NFF, the funding floor and MFG will be merged into one single protection mechanism and will continue to be called MFG. Under the current funding arrangements, MFG and the Funding Floor protect pupil-led and school-led funding as school-led factors can increase or decrease quite significantly year-on-year. In the direct NFF there will no longer be differences in school-led factors, so it is proposed to only protect pupil-led funding. In terms of the funding cycle the Local Authorities will no longer operate a funding formulae. The DfE will still need to gather some data and the DSG allocation for the Schools Block will no longer be published. The proposal is to continue to publish the NFF in July each year. As this will apply directly to schools, they will have earlier knowledge of the final formulae which will apply to them. There are two options:* Continuing to publish notional allocations showing what each school’s funding would look like the following year if their pupil numbers and pupil characteristics remain unchanged, and / or
* Publishing a calculator tool which allows schools to plug in their own pupil numbers and pupil characteristics to see what their funding will be.

De-delegation will continue under the Direct NFF and any transfers. Currently we would make the original application for joint use. It will be the responsibility for academies rather than Local Authorities to apply for it.Split sites factor changes are expected to be made in 2024/25. The move towards the direct NFF constitutes a major structural change to the school funding system. It is expected the direct NFF will be implemented within the next 5 years by 2027/28 funding year at the latest. Primary schools will fully transition to being funded at NFF values in 2023/24 when the lump sum moves to the same value as NFF. Essex will be classified as mirroring NFF in 2023/24. Essex currently has 3 primary schools and 4 secondary schools eligible for split site funding. The total funding allocated for the split sites factor in 2022/23 is £922,000. Annex A showed the impact on the 7 split site schools of the proposed change to fund up to a maximum of 60% of the lump sum value, assuming the change was implemented in 202/23. It can be seen 3 schools are favoured by the proposal but 4 are disadvantaged. Two schools are significantly disadvantaged. The decrease in funding will be protected by MFG. Annex A also showed only one secondary school currently qualifying for Joint Use funding under the 1% requirement, even though there are 6 schools with joint use facilities. Currently the cost of joint use facilities is 2% of the total budget, so under the proposed 2.5% the school would not qualify. The decrease in funding will be protected by MFG.**Recommendations:**Forum noted the consultationIt was agreed that the Forum submits a response to the consultation.It was agreed that the Finance Review Group formulates and submits a response on the behalf of the Forum. |
| **4.** | **Early Years Funding Formulae Consultation – Yannick Stupples-Whyley**YSW updated the Forum on the DfE consultation to review the Early Years Funding Formulae for 2023/24. There has been no change in universal base rates since the formula was introduced in 2017. The additional needs factor accounts for 10.5% of funding and is made up of three proxy measures described 4.9. It is proposed to use the DLA from February 2021 and FSM and EAL data from January 2022. With regards to Area Cost Adjustment (ACA), the ACA takes account of the relative difference in costs in different areas of the country. It accounts for variations in both staff and premises costs. The ACA is made up of general labour market measure to reflect staff costs (weighted 80%); nursery rates cost adjustment to reflect premises costs (weighted 10%).The remaining 10% of costs are assumed not to vary from authority to authority.It is also proposed to amend the rateable value measure used from the current mean average rateable value for all settings within a Local Authority to an average per square metre by taking account of the floor area of each setting. The current nursery rates cost adjustment is calculated using private nursery sector data only. It is proposed to also include an infant primary rate cost adjustment to allow the formula to better recognise the overall cost of childcare across an Authority. From 2023/24 it is proposed to move the funding that school-based nurseries and maintained nursery schools have been receiving through the Teacher’s Pay and Pension Grants into the overall quantum of three and four year old funding. The proposal is to return to using the formula for 2023/24 which means that the base rate will be updated.It is proposed to introduce year-on-year protections in both formulae to mitigate the impact of the reforms. It is proposed to set this at +1% to ensure every Authority sees an increase in their hourly rate in 2023/24. To ensure the year-n-year protection is affordable within the funding available it is proposed to introduce a gains cap on the gains a Local Authority can receive. It is proposed to limit Local Authority gains to 4.5% for three and four year old funding and 8.6% for two year old funding. With regards to Reform of the Maintained Nursery School Supplement, to facilitate this reform an additional **£10million** will be invested into the maintained nursery school supplement from 2023/24. It is proposed to introduce a minimum funding floor at £3.80 and also it is proposed to cap gains at £10 per hour. Consultation submission date is 16th September 2022.**Recommendations:**The Forum noted the consultation.The Forum agreed we submit a response to the consultation.It was agreed the Finance Review Group formulates and submits a response on the behalf of Forum, in consultation with the Early Years Sub-Group. |
| **5.** | **Any other business, feedback from schools through Associations and from Schools Forum representatives on other Bodies.****ASHE**This was STh’s last meeting and was very pleased to hand over the baton to Carole Herman and agreed CH would provide some feedback. STh said thank you to everyone on the Forum with whom he has worked over 10 years where very important decisions on how funding has been decided.CH responded we are still waiting for the STRB report on the Teacher’s Pay Award. Most schools are putting 3% in the budget to cover that. Recruitment issues – many schools have had difficulty in recruitment of support staff along with teaching assistants which will be on-going. It was noted recruitment to teacher training is considerably down. Energy costs for schools is an issue and will really affect school budgets particularly as move to the autumn term. ASHE discussed agreed data sharing protocol for examination results this summer. Also discussing in-register provision for young people who are struggling in mainstream and discussions in Local Authority across Essex. Looking closely at how to support young people. The onus is on schools to check on safeguarding in any registration is high. Inspections’ focus is on reading. With the task force and the Year of Reading, this focus will continue and there are a number of initiatives already started in that area. Covid is still affecting schools, attendance on staff in schools. Also some schools are struggling with respect to Omicron variant and staff getting into work. **EPHA**HPK reported about Covid and managing parental expectations. Recruitment issues for primary schools are a challenge with quality teachers which is not available and lack of support staff applying for those jobs. Because it is a lower paid job, the prospective applicants do not want to apply for the jobs. We are not getting a pool of applicants. EPHA has set up a small group sharing good practice and Jinnie Nicholls is Chair of that group. This has been primarily to provide support, guidance and advice on fund raising.As a primary voice on the Task Force, the Year of Reading has had a positive impact on primary schools. We are currently looking at reading age assessment to be used across all schools and identify a programme which will work for everyone. The Task Force is putting in financial support for a wellbeing programme for small schools, a support programme for small schools’ short-term project, leadership support. It is about building capacity within the system we are able to offer. Thank you to Clare Kershaw and her team for support and information give at this year’s White Paper, strategy and the SEND update. **ESSET**EW informed that recruitment of support staff is challenging and recognition that some of the roles in special schools are more challenging because of behaviours and low pay. Energy is a huge problem which schools are concerned about and how it will increase beyond forecast. Covid is still an issue and also managing parental expectations. It is also spreading amongst staff as well. We have implemented a new banding matrix in phase one. We have established an Assistant Head and Deputy Head Group for future proofing in the sector and this is going well. It is good for networking. Information on the Task Force. ESSET is looking to jointly have the Essex Year of Reading looking at how young people with special needs have good stories around sensory. It is hoped to eventually roll-out across the county.**PRUs**JB reported on new funding model in September feedback – KS3 numbers are on the increase and also KS3’s with EHCP’s. JB echoed about recruitment and struggling with posts for support staff. Also Covid with a significant number of staff off and this is on the rise. JB was excited with the new build project and move into the next one in September. PC agreed with the new arrangements in September for new funding and the Local Authority using AWPU as agreed through the Schools Forum. Concern regarding numbers – 17 young people permanently excluded. There are a number of young people sitting with us who are not moving on. It is difficult to get children to be moved on and will have to look at this with headteachers. We took a team view at Heybridge. If children are permanently excluded, they will get 1:1 tuition of the Local Authority but PRU’s cannot solve on our own. PC agreed everything about recruitment. PC has appointed two new headteachers, Jo Cookson and a new headteacher starting in September coming over from Eastleigh College and very pleased to have him. **Early Years – Nurseries**Nothing to report. **ESGA**RB stated we are still here to support all governors. Everyone has the same problems, i.e. recruitment, retention and the cost of living. We are still planning our conference for October.**Unions****Unison**MS noted issues raised about recruitment for support staff and Covid impact. People are living with Covid and not asking for help. JF was aware about teaching staff and also the recruitment and impact all round. Also very aware of the increase in Covid.**Church Rep** There was no representation and no report. **High Needs Sub-Group** - Highlighted AOB communication of new funding round and going into two schools initially.RB asked for an amendment – the attendance should read RB, not RH.**Action**: YSW to amend.**Finance Review Group** – the FRG had met and is a main item on the agenda.**Early Years Sub-Group** – Early Years had met and information is on the agenda.PC added looking at the Green Paper we need to think how PRU’s can offer outreach support so that unregistered providers is not the only place they can come to.CK appreciated the increase in responsibilities of using unregistered providers. We need to note this. Ofsted is not against this as long as all the safeguard checks are in place. It is about framework roll-out in September.  |
| **6.** | **Minutes of 18th May 2022**Minutes were accepted as a true and accurate record of the discussion. |
| **7.** | **Minutes Action Log – Yannick Stupples-Whyley**Action: To bring proposals for allocating £1.5million of the surplus balance to the July/September meeting.YSW reported we have agreed £1million today and the remaining £½ million will discuss at next meeting. In progress. |
| **8.** | **School Balances Update – Yannick Stupples-Whyley**YSW reported on the level of school balances for maintained schools and academies.The combined balances for maintained schools and academies are **£166.0** **million**, which is an increase of **£23.5 million** compared to last year. Table 1 showed the total balances on 31st March 2022 for maintained schools and 31st August 2021 for academies. Table 2 showed a breakdown of the movement in balances for maintained schools between 2020/21 and 2021/22. Balances for maintained schools have increased by **£5.7 million**, which coincides with the **£35.9 million** increase in the Schools Block for 2021/22, excluding the transfer of teachers’ pay grant and teachers’ pension employers contribution grant. Table 3 showed a breakdown in the movement of academy / free school balances between the 2019/20 and 2020/21 academic years. Balances for academies have increased by **£17.9 million**, which reflect the **£53.1 million** increase in funding for 202/21.Table 4 showed for maintained schools the number of schools in surplus or deficit. For the schools in surplus the number of schools above the DfE thresholds is also shown. There are 3 maintained primary schools with deficit balances (£31,3000) at 31st March 2022, which is a decrease of 1 school from the previous year. Of the 235 maintained schools with a surplus balance, 159 schools (67.7%) have balances in excess of the recommended DfE guidelines. Table 5 showed the same information as Table 4 for academies. There are 17 schools with deficit balances (£2.8 million) on 31st August 2021, which is a decrease of 26 schools from the previous year. Of the 247 schools with a surplus balance, 198 schools (79.2%) have balance in excess of the recommended DfE guidelines. Whilst academies are registered as charities, they have a guaranteed regular income and therefore do not need to hold large balances.Chart 1 showed the movement of school balances over the last 5 years. Since 2017/18, school balances have increased by **£42.0 million**, which is a 33.9% increase. Chart 2 showed how maintained schools plan to use their carry forward balances in 2022/23 and beyond.Detailed Analysis. As reported in 4.1 academy balances now include Trust balances for central services. Table 6 showed Trust central services balances between 2016/17 and 2020/21. Trust central services balances significantly increased in 2017/18 when the DfE permitted budgets to be pooled.Table 7 showed balances for primary schools within the DfE’s rurality.Balances have decreased overall for schools in rural hamlets and isolatedDwellings and rural villages but have increased for the other 3classifications. Table 8 showed the same analysis for secondary schools.The analysis showed there are 6 schools with less than 600 pupils of which2 qualified for sparsity funding in 2021/22. Whilst there continues to be acorrelation between rural location and balances in primary schools, nocorrelation can be determined for secondary schools due to MATs poolingbalances. The Forum will recall that at the May 2022 meeting it wasapproved that the Finance Review Group undertake reviewing why someschools are holding balances of 30% or more. This review will commencein September and an update will be brought to the November meeting.Table 9 showed primary schools with the highest balance as a percentageof budget. Table 11 showed secondary schools, Table 13 special schoolsand Table 15 PRU’s.**Questions**SM asked YSW to confirm that the figures appearing in this report wherethose schools are academies, do not include central services in those. YSW confirmed no, it does not include central services.SM said the figures are potentially higher.YSW responded, potentially yes.SM enquired, given the fact some schools in the top 10 are academies,what powers has the Local Authority got to ask about the use of thosebalances?YSW replied we have not got that information relating to this.YSW indicated under special schools 5.1.3 Castledon school is happy tosay balances are a lot lower. Funding for a particular project has been usedand that will go down next time.CK suggested putting this into a more sophisticated debate than justheadline figures. It is really difficult to say to Cllr Ball that schools are infinancial difficulty. Looking at these figures shouts out that we are unable tocontrol this down. We understand the position going forward and hope withSchools Forum support has oversight of all the budget and funding. **£166 million** we have sitting in DSG.PC indicated what you see in the Heybridge budget as not changed. Muchof the money is held for refurbishment.MF stated a lot of information is available from the end of year academyTrusts reports. There is information on designated funds. Anything sitting inreserves they have to stipulate what it is being intended to be used for. Cllr Ball re-emphasised what CK had said about how schools are struggling.What is needed from Schools Forum is a clear narrative for all schools inEssex why the balances are in place and what they are being used for. CllrBall asked for a narrative to go to our finance people as to why thesebalances are seemingly so high. **Recommendations:**The Forum noted the report.The Forum noted that the Finance Review Group will use the updatedbalances data in conducting their review of schools with balances in excessof 30% of their funding. |
| **9.** | **Schools Budget and Education Functions Quarter 1 Budget Update – Yannick Stupples-Whyley**YSW updated the Forum on the outturn position for the year ended31st March 2023 for both the Schools Budget and Education Functions.The forecast outturn for 2022/23 at Quarter 1 (May 2022) was set out in Annex A. The total forecast DSG grant allocation for 2022/23 after academy recoupment is **£554.5 million**. There has only been one academy conversion since. At Quarter 1 (May 2022) the Schools Budget is forecast to underspend by **£9.2 million**. There is a top-up funding for maintained schools, academies and free schools are forecasting a **£2.2 million** overspend due to an additional 296 EHCPs.SEN Services is forecasting an underspend of **£12.4 million**. The Forum will recall the Authority is holding a High Needs Contingent budget due to the increased funding for 2022/23. This is earmarked for funding the continued increase demand and price for Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) and early intervention projects. At quarter 1 this is showing an underspend of **£13.6 million**. This is offset by a **£1 million** overspend on Individual Pupil Resourcing Agreements due to increased medical needs (£163,000 overspend), an increase in volume (£258,000 overspend) and inclusion framework projects (£588,000 overspend).Other alternative provision services are forecasting a £200,000 overspend due to an increase of 21 pupils above the budget pupil forecast. Support for inclusion is forecasting a £213,000 underspend due to staffing vacancies. Therapies and other health related services is forecasting an overspend of £142,000 due to an increase in the number of therapy hours than forecasted.Table 2 showed a number of risks and opportunities that are not included in the outturn forecast. YSW stated there is insufficient certainty to quantify the risks and opportunities at this early stage of the financial year. Table 3 showed the forecast DSG position on 31st March 2023.Education Functions. At the meeting of 6th October 2021 the Schools Forum approved the Authority’s proposals for services provided to all schools and this was shown in Table 4 with a total of **£3.08 million**.The Secretary of State approved further de-delegation for School Improvement following the 50% reduction to the School Improvement, Monitoring and Brokering Grant for 2022/23. Table 5 showed the total funding de-delegated from maintained schools in 2022/23.Table 6 showed the forecast outturn at Quarter 1 (May 2022) which is an underspend of **£113,000** due to vacant posts.JF was concerned about 4.10 Table 2 of the deletion of the banding of 2 special schools from January 2023 which would be a disappointment rather than an opportunity. **Recommendation:**The Forum noted the forecast outturn position for 2022/23. |
| **10.** | **Forward Plan – Yannick Stupples-Whyley**YSW read this out and confirmed the dates of future meetings.YSW mentioned with regards to the November meeting there would be an update on the 2023/24 decision to potentially change the Minimum Funding Guarantee – working with Finance Review Group on this.**Recommendations:**The Forum noted the dates of future meetings.That additional items as proposed by Schools Forum are included in the Forward Plan. |
| **11.** | **Chair’s Closing Comments** (Rod Lane)JF thanked everyone for attending and for their contributions. JF looked forward to the next meeting.**Date of next meeting – Wednesday, 28th September 2022 at 8.30 a.m.** **In person meeting – Hamptons Sports and Leisure, Tydemans, Beehive Lane, Great Baddow, Chelmsford CM2 9FH** |