

Date of issue: 11<sup>th</sup> June, 2010

<b>MEETING:</b>	<b>CABINET</b>																
	<table> <tr> <td><b>Councillor Anderson</b></td> <td><b>Leader of the Council - Finance &amp; Strategy</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Councillor S Chaudhry</b></td> <td><b>Community &amp; Leisure</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Councillor A S Dhaliwal</b></td> <td><b>Performance &amp; Accountability</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Councillor Matloob</b></td> <td><b>Opportunity &amp; Skills</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Councillor Pantelic</b></td> <td><b>Education and Children</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Councillor Parmar</b></td> <td><b>Environment &amp; Open Spaces</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Councillor Small</b></td> <td><b>Health &amp; Wellbeing</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Councillor Swindlehurst</b></td> <td><b>Neighbourhoods &amp; Renewal</b></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Councillor Anderson</b>	<b>Leader of the Council - Finance &amp; Strategy</b>	<b>Councillor S Chaudhry</b>	<b>Community &amp; Leisure</b>	<b>Councillor A S Dhaliwal</b>	<b>Performance &amp; Accountability</b>	<b>Councillor Matloob</b>	<b>Opportunity &amp; Skills</b>	<b>Councillor Pantelic</b>	<b>Education and Children</b>	<b>Councillor Parmar</b>	<b>Environment &amp; Open Spaces</b>	<b>Councillor Small</b>	<b>Health &amp; Wellbeing</b>	<b>Councillor Swindlehurst</b>	<b>Neighbourhoods &amp; Renewal</b>
<b>Councillor Anderson</b>	<b>Leader of the Council - Finance &amp; Strategy</b>																
<b>Councillor S Chaudhry</b>	<b>Community &amp; Leisure</b>																
<b>Councillor A S Dhaliwal</b>	<b>Performance &amp; Accountability</b>																
<b>Councillor Matloob</b>	<b>Opportunity &amp; Skills</b>																
<b>Councillor Pantelic</b>	<b>Education and Children</b>																
<b>Councillor Parmar</b>	<b>Environment &amp; Open Spaces</b>																
<b>Councillor Small</b>	<b>Health &amp; Wellbeing</b>																
<b>Councillor Swindlehurst</b>	<b>Neighbourhoods &amp; Renewal</b>																
<b>DATE AND TIME:</b>	<b>MONDAY, 14TH JUNE, 2010 AT 6.30 PM</b>																
<b>VENUE:</b>	<b>COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, BATH ROAD, SLOUGH</b>																
<b>DEMOCRATIC SERVICES OFFICER:</b> (for all enquiries)	<b>CATHERINE MEEK</b> <b>01753 875120</b>																

### SUPPLEMENTARY PAPERS

The following Papers have been added to the agenda for the above meeting:-

Item 5- was not available for publication with the rest of the agenda.

Item 8- is an updated version of the papers circulated with the agenda.

### PART I

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>REPORT TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>WARD</u>
4.	Statement of Accounts – Outturn Position for 2009/10 – Appendix B – Pre Audit Statement of Accounts – Provisional Draft - attached separately for Cabinet Members and available on request from Democratic Services	-	All
5.	Primary School Places Action Plan 2011-13	1 - 26	All
8.	Slough Borough Council's Carbon Management Plan: 2009 - 2014	27 - 28	All

This page is intentionally left blank

**SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**REPORT TO:** Cabinet **DATE:** 14<sup>th</sup> June 2010  
**CONTACT OFFICER:** Clair Pyper, Strategic Director of Education and Children's  
Services  
**(For all enquiries)** (01753) 87 5704  
**WARD(S):** ALL  
**PORTFOLIO:** Education

**PART I**  
**KEY DECISION**

**Primary School Places Action Plan 2011-13**

**1 Purpose of Report**

To agree in principle the Primary School Places Action Plan 2011-13. Also to agree areas of the plan as the preferred options for ensuring that sufficient Reception places are available for September 2011 and to note that there is no certainty regarding future grant income to create any additional school places that may be required from 2012 and beyond.

**2 Recommendation**

The Cabinet is requested to resolve that:

- (a) The Primary School Places Action Plan 2011-13 is approved in principle.
- (b) Current available funding is used to expand 6 primary schools (more if required) to meet the demonstrable shortfall in school places projected for 2011 and all funding for existing projects is profiled to ensure that the benefit of external funding is maximised and where necessary spent by 31<sup>st</sup> August 2011.
- (c) An amount (to be based on the outcome of the current feasibility study) is set aside to refurbish the old Town Hall building for use as a school, if the feasibility study indicates this is a viable option.
- (d) Sources of funding for a new school in the Chalvey area continue to be explored.
- (e) If demand increases further for September 2010 then consideration will be given to bringing forward schools for expansion based on the list of schools already identified for expansion in 2011 in the Primary School Places Action Plan 2011-13. Schools will be prioritised related to the location of demand and those schools who are sufficiently robust and receptive to proceeding early.

### 3 Community Strategy Priorities

- **Prosperity for All** – primary school places will be expanded to ensure that every Slough child entitled to a school place is offered a Slough primary school place for 2011 and 2012.

### 4 Other Implications

#### (a) Financial

- 4.1 As Cabinet is aware on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2010, it was agreed that £15.73m would be allocated to expanding school places in readiness for September 2010. These projects are shown in Appendix B(i). This paper now looks to allocate the remaining funding available to Slough, £7.469m, to create new places for 2011 and earmark funding for increases in 2012. This will mean that a total of £23.2m will have been spent on new primary school places over the period 2009-12.
- 4.2 The Primary School Places Action Plan 2011-13 is attached as **Appendix A**. Section 5 of the plan, in summary, states that the funding currently available is insufficient to create the full number of places required by 2013. Consequently the available cash envelope of £7.469m needs to be used to create the maximum number of new school places to meet known need.
- 4.3 A best value analysis attached as **Appendix B** examines the cost per pupil place both for the schemes already underway to create places for September 2010 and for the options proposed in the Action Plan. This analysis demonstrates that options being proposed for 2011 and 2012 provide better value for money than the schemes underway for 2010, this is to be expected given that the schemes currently underway include a number of major refurbishments. The cost per pupil place for the options now being proposed average £6,368 per place (Appendix B(ii)) compared to the average cost per pupil place for the schemes already underway of £11,652 (Appendix B(i)). It should be noted the funding allocation per place from central government was set at £11,000-13,000 via the Basic Need Safety Valve funding which demonstrates that Slough is achieving value for money.
- 4.4 In order to reduce vulnerability to changes in government funding policy and to provide flexibility regarding existing spending constraints, a number of funding streams have been reviewed and reprofiled. By changing the funding sources for current capital schemes from core funding (supported borrowing) to grant income the authority will ensure maximum use of government grant which needs to be spent by August 2011. The following changes will permit this:
- i) The £3m of core funding (supported borrowing) allocated to refurbish the former Lea Junior School will now be funded by Basic Need Safety Valve funding
  - ii) £1.193m of core funding (supported borrowing) allocated to the Westgate phase 2 expansion project will now be Modernisation funding.
- 4.5 The £7.469m, identified in paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 above, comprises the following funding streams:

Source	Funding	Description
Basic Need Safety Valve Funding	£3.276m	Slough was allocated £8.986m in 2009 to create permanent new school places in response to the unprecedented increase in demand experienced by many authorities for September 2009. £5.71m has been allocated on projects to increase places for 2010 as shown in Appendix B(i) as agreed by Cabinet on 8 <sup>th</sup> March 2010 (and is part of the £15.73m referred to in paragraph 4.1).
Core Funding	£4.193m	Assuming the changes outlined in paragraph 4.4, this funding is available for school places and does not have a deadline for spending.
Section 106 developer contributions	tbc	Funding has been requested from developers for current and proposed housing projects, however income dates are not predictable. As this becomes available Members will be provided with updates.
<b>Total Available</b>	<b>£7.469m</b>	

- 4.6 In order to meet the level of growth required within the funding limit of £7.469m the most cost effective option is to allocate funding for adding new modular annexes at a number of schools and also take advantage of the opportunity to add places at 2 existing schools (Claycots and Priory). Based on provisional costings by officers an initial allocation of £800K per school is suggested and made up as shown in the table below.

Items	Provisional costings
Modulars – purchase, installation and fitting out	£330K
Planning requirements – expansions for 2010 have required up to £200K for highways works	£70K
School infrastructure – adding a form of entry to a school (210 pupils plus staff) will put additional pressure on existing buildings.	£400K
Total	£800K

- 4.7 An alternative option to modular expansion would be to build a new school with the £7.469m currently available. It is expected that this would be sufficient funding to build a new 2-form entry school (420 places), as indicative costings suggest £7m is a suitable budget. However, a single new school would not create the number of school places required for 2011; **this would leave a shortfall of 7 Reception classes (210 Reception places) compared to the modular option.**
- 4.8 Although the current feasibility study has yet to be completed, a further option would be the refurbishment of the old part of the Town Hall, following demolition of the newer part later this year. This could add 2 or 3 forms of entry (420 or 630 places). A provisional sum of £1m has been used within this paper in order to provide budgeting options. A report will be brought back to cabinet once the feasibility information on viability and costs is available.
- 4.9 **The funding currently available is sufficient to complete one of the following options but not both:**
- i) **build a new school, or**
  - ii) **build new modular annexes on school sites across the town, take advantage of 2 existing opportunities and possibly refurbish the old Town Hall building.**

- 4.10 Note that the modular option will create 3 infant classes only, each school will still require a further 4 classrooms in 3 years' time to create the junior classrooms to complete the expansions. This would require at least another £7m to be allocated in 3 years' time.

(b) Risk Management

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Risk/Threat/Opportunity</i>	<i>Mitigation(s)</i>
<i>From section 2 above</i>	<i>Risk – Between 177 and 239 additional reception places are required for September 2011.</i>	<i>Maximise the use of funding to create at least 6 forms of entry for September 2011.</i>

(c) Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications

Local Authorities are under a statutory duty to ensure that there are sufficient school places in their area, promote high educational standards, ensure fair access to educational opportunity and promote the fulfilment of every child's educational potential. They must ensure that there are sufficient schools in their area and also promote diversity and increase parental choice.

(d) Equalities Impact Assessment

Not required at this stage.

(e) Workforce

There are no workforce implications.

**5 Supporting Information**

**Background Information**

- 5.1 As Members will be aware, since 2007 Slough has been planning for an increase in primary school provision. The funding of £15.73m referred to in paragraph 4.1 is fundamentally central government funding received during the period 2008-2010. This is outlined in Appendix B(i).
- 5.2 The funding of £15.73m has been used to increase the number of reception places available from 1677 in September 2008 to 1887 for September 2010.
- 5.3 Due to an increase in demand since these proposals were agreed a bulge Reception class has been added at the new school being planned for the former Lea Junior School site, meaning the school will now admit 90 reception pupils rather than 60. If demand increases even further for September 2010 then consideration will be given to bringing forward schools for expansion based on the list of schools already identified for expansion in 2011 in the Primary School Places Action Plan 2011-13 (Appendix A). Schools will be prioritised related to the location of demand and those schools who are sufficiently robust and receptive to proceeding early.

**Forecasting**

- 5.4 As part of Slough's school place planning procedures, forecasts are produced and updated on an annual basis. The methodology used for forecasting the Reception demand in future years is described in Appendix C.
- 5.5 Applying this methodology to current known birth data produces the forecasts summarised in the table below. These figures indicate that between 6 and 8

additional forms of entry will be required for September 2011 and between 14 and 16 additional forms of entry will be required by September 2013.

Year	Forecasts		Shortfall compared to current number of Reception places: 1887
	Low range projection	High range projection	
September 2010	1917	1947	30→60 places 1 to 2 classes
September 2011	2064	2126	177→239 places 6-8 classes
September 2012	2152	2216	265→329 places 9 to 11 classes
September 2013	2300	2369	413→482 places 14 to 16 classes

## Options

- 5.6 Consequently, options for building and funding such a significant growth are limited. The attached Action Plan outlines the key implications of 3 options and these are summarised below. (The financial impact of each option is outlined in paragraphs 4.2 to 4.10 above).

### **Option i) Use surplus existing primary accommodation**

Two existing schools will have surplus classrooms. Adding infant annexes at Claycots and Priory are best value options costing £2,833 per pupil place (as shown in Appendix B(ii)) – Priory already has the classrooms available (it formerly used these for additional junior classes) and Claycots School is adding junior classrooms with its own funding.

### **Option ii) Infant Annexes**

Phase in modular classrooms in a planned way across the estate, that is, add 3 classrooms (an infant annex) at a number of schools across the town. The factors to be considered when prioritising schools for expansion are summarised on page 7 of the attached Action Plan (Appendix A).

Each school would be allocated £800K to complete this project. An advantage of this approach would be that if demand should reduce in 5-10 years time this accommodation would provide flexibility to the school for specialist classes or extended services.

### **Option iii.a) Build new school(s)**

At a meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> April 2010, Cabinet agreed to undertake a feasibility study to look at the options for adding a new school in the Chalvey area. This will include the Town Hall site and 3 other nearby sites. The tender process to appoint consultants for this work is currently underway. An estimated budget to build a new 2-form entry school is c£7m and to build a 3-form entry is c£10m.

### **Option iii.b) Refurbish the Town Hall**

Building a new school will not create the number of places required, however the refurbishment of the old part of the Town Hall building may provide a cost effective alternative. The current feasibility study will consider the viability and potential costs for this work.

5.7 The table below summarises the number of places that could be created with each option and the funding required:

	Options	Costs	Total new places to be created	Additional Reception places added	Comment
i	Priory and Claycots	Up to £850K	300	60	This would add new build for a full new form of entry (210 places) at Claycots. Priory already has the classes for an infant annex.
ii	Infant annexes	£800K each	90 each	30 each	This adds 3 classes per school to accommodate a Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 class. 4 Junior classes will be required at each site in 3 years' time.
iii	a) New school	c£7m	420	60	New 2-form entry school
		c£10m	630	90	New 3-form entry school
iii	b) Refurbish Town Hall	c£1m	240	60 or 90	Option to be explored via feasibility study. It would still require additional classrooms in future years.

5.8 Given the scale of the forecasted growth in primary places (shown in paragraph 5.5) and the funding limit of £7.469m that is available, it is not possible to build a new school and still create the Reception places required for 2011 and beyond. The only affordable option is a combination of best value options as shown in the table in Appendix B(iii). Appendix B(iii) would create up to 1170 new school places this is equivalent to almost 3 x 2-form entry primary schools.

5.9 Appendix B(iii) demonstrates one permutation for spending 100% of available funding to create 1170 new school places. Due to the change in funding sources outlined in paragraph 4.4 it is no longer necessary to fully allocate all funding at this stage and an element of caution can be exercised. Members will understand that there is a difficult line to be followed to ensure that there is not an over-provision of school places due to a change in parental demand at some future date, and at the same time, to ensure Slough does not find itself with an under-provision as was the case in 2009. To minimise the risk of either option occurring the following is recommended:

- Change funding as described in paragraph 4.4 to ensure maximum usage of time-limited grant, permitting a measured approach to committing resources
- Phase delivery of the additional classrooms in line with levels of certainty to reduce the risk of over- or under-provision of classes
- Based on forecasts in paragraph 5.5 it may be prudent to add 6 new infant annexes for September 2011 (the lowest range of the forecast in paragraph 5.5), while at the same time progressing the planning and design work required for further infant annexes should the need become apparent during the application round in February 2011. The funding commitment to add 6 infant annexes would be £4.05m based on the following:

1.	Expand Claycots and Priory	£850K
2.	Add 4 infant annexes (4 x £800K) = £3.2m	£3.2m
	<b>Total</b>	<b><u>£4.05m</u></b>



- 5.10 Assuming the 6 expansion projects are agreed as shown in paragraph 5.9 this would leave reserve funding of £3.419m to address any additional growth required for September 2011. This figure is calculated by deducting £4.05m from the available funding described in paragraph 4.5, £7.469m.

Current available funding	£7.469m
Expand Claycots and Priory and add 4 infant annexes	(£4.05m)
Reserve funding for future primary expansions	<u>£3.419m</u>

### **Procurement**

- 5.11 The approach described above involves adding at least 4 infant annexes and therefore procurement of at least 12 modular classrooms as well as infrastructure improvements in 4 schools to be completed by August 2011. Following the corporate approach, this work will be commissioned through Slough Borough Council's Property Services team who will take advantage of competitive market tendering to ensure that the authority obtains the best available value for its investment.

### **2012 and future years**

- 5.11 Assuming growth in demand develops as indicated in the forecasts for future years then there would still be a shortfall of Reception places by 2013, unless further funding can be identified to continue adding infant annexes. And by 2014, for each infant annex added now, further funding will be required to add the junior annexes of 4 new classes necessary to complete the forms of entry. This will be looked at as part of the budget build process later this year.

## **6 Comments of Other Committees**

None

## **7 Conclusion**

Members are requested to recommend that available funding is used to expand primary places for September 2011 by using surplus existing accommodation (option i) and by adding infant annexes at 4 other primary schools (option ii). At the same time planning and design work could proceed on additional infant annexes, and funding approved as they become required. The results of the feasibility study for the Town Hall (option iii.b), when received, would be submitted to cabinet for further consideration.

## **8 Appendices Attached**

'A(i)' Primary School Places Action Plan 2011-13

'A(ii)' List of possible sites for Expansion – Sept. 2011, 2012 and 2013.

'B' Best Value Analysis

'C' Forecasting Model

## **9 Background Papers**

'1' School Places Plan 2009-19

This page is intentionally left blank

# **Primary School Places Action Plan For Sep 2011 to 2013**

Finance Division

For Education and Children's Services

**Draft v.c2: May 2010**

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>EXPANSION FOR SEPTEMBER 2010.....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	RECENT EXPERIENCE.....	4
2.2	CURRENT EXPANSION PROJECTS.....	4
2.3	DEMAND FOR SEPTEMBER 2010 .....	4
<b>3</b>	<b>PROJECTED DEMAND FOR SEPTEMBER 2011-13.....</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	NUMBERS OF BIRTHS .....	5
3.2	WARD LEVEL DATA .....	6
<b>4</b>	<b>OPTIONS FOR 2011-13.....</b>	<b>7</b>
4.I	USE ANY SURPLUS EXISTING PRIMARY ACCOMMODATION .....	7
4.II	ADD MODULAR CLASSROOMS IN A PLANNED WAY ACROSS THE ESTATE .....	7
4.III	BUILD NEW SCHOOLS .....	8
<b>5</b>	<b>FUNDING.....</b>	<b>10</b>
5.1	AVAILABLE FUNDING .....	10
5.2	FUNDING SHORTFALL .....	10
<b>6</b>	<b>NEXT STEPS.....</b>	<b>11</b>



## 1 INTRODUCTION

For some years now Slough has been predicting a shortfall of school places. In 2009, demand for Reception exceeded forecasts and 5 new Reception classes were required and put in place. The rise in demand between 2008 and 2009 was far higher than anticipated but was part of a similar trend experienced in many urban authorities in England in the same period.

Local forecasts have now been revised in light of this change in trend. In response, the authority is allocating all available capital funding to increasing school places to keep pace with current and future demand.

The most important indicator of future demand for primary places is birth trends; this shows that Slough needs to plan for increasing the number of Reception places available by another 25% by September 2013. This is on top of the expansion projects already agreed for September 2010.

This plan looks at the options for increasing school places for September 2011, 2012 and 2013 with the funding currently available.

This plan concludes that there are 3 main options and some or all of these will need to be implemented to create the new places required:

- i) Use any surplus existing primary accommodation
- ii) Add modular classrooms in a planned way across the estate
- iii) Build new schools

## 2 EXPANSION FOR SEPTEMBER 2010

A number of projects are now being implemented to increase places for September 2010, these will add 210 permanent new reception places for September 2010. To address a recent increase in demand one bulge class has been created at the new Lea site school, this ensured every applicant was offered a place on 'offer day'.

### 2.1 Recent Experience

Slough had 1677 Reception places available in all schools for September 2008. This left 12 surplus places. For September 2009, demand rose to 1857 with only 1707 Reception places available (30 having already been added at Wexham Court); this left a shortfall of 150 places and 5 bulge classes were created at short notice. 14 of these places were still available in April 2010 as some parents chose not to take up places at the schools offered but to wait for a place to become available at their preferred schools.

The table below summarises this data. The increase in demand between 2006 and 2009 was 18% or 285 Reception places.

**Table 1 Comparison of demand and availability of reception places for 2006 to 2009**

	PAST YEARS			
	Sep-06	Sep-07	Sep-08	Sep-09
<b>Demand (Reception)</b>	1545	1621	1665	1830
<b>Availability</b>	1617	1677	1677	1707
<b>Surplus/shortfall</b>	72	56	12	-123
Number of Reception classes required to meet demand	0	0	0	5 bulge classes added
Equivalent number of schools				2 new schools required

### 2.2 Current Expansion Projects

For September 2010 expansion projects were proposed and approved to create 210 new reception places. These projects were

Proposal	Additional reception places created
Expand Western House School	30
Expand Parlaunt Park Primary School	30
Create new places (possibly via a new school) on the former Lea Junior site	60
Change Cippenham Junior to a Primary School	60
Expand Wexham Court Primary School*	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>

\*Wexham Court Primary School added 30 new Reception places from Sep 2009 and these are already included in table 1

### 2.3 Demand for September 2010

The number of applications received for September 2010 was broadly 90 higher than 2009 (1948 compared to 1855). Between the closing date for applications and the date offer letters are sent out there is always a drop in the number of applications following checks by the Admissions Team to ensure all applicants still require places. By adding an additional 30 places at the new Lea School every applicant was offered a place on offer day. Based

on experience from 2009, where new arrivals continued to arrive after the admission round, it is possible that a second bulge class (additional to the one created at the new Lea site school) will be required for September 2010. If this should be the case then a school from the attached candidate list will be expanded a year early.

### 3 PROJECTED DEMAND FOR SEPTEMBER 2011-13

The authority has now revised its forecasts in light of the change in trends experienced in 2009. The table below indicates the level of growth required over the period 2010-13. Note that the shortfall is not accumulative, so 8 new classes may be required for 2011, 3 more the next year and 5 more the year after that (16 altogether).

**Table 2 Comparison of demand and availability of reception places for 2010 to 2013**

	FUTURE YEARS			
	Sep-10	Sep-11	Sep-12	Sep-13
<b>Demand (Reception)</b>	1917	2108	2198	2349
<b>(Min→Max)*</b>	(based on current applications)	(2064→2126)	(2152→2216)	(2300→2369)
<b>Availability</b>	1887	1887	1887	1887
<b>Surplus/shortfall</b>	-(30→60)	-221	-311	-462
Number of additional Reception classes required to meet demand	1 as at 7/4/10	8 new reception classes required	11 new reception classes required	16 new reception classes required
Equivalent number of schools	<b>1 new school required</b>	<b>3 new schools required</b>	<b>4 new schools required</b>	<b>6 new schools required</b>

\* Projecting the demand for school places over a range is more accurate than using an exact figure particularly 2 or 3 years into the future, however, an exact figure is shown for the purposes of clarity.

The projections shown above are based on actual data and recent trends but will be subject to unforeseen changes, it is therefore important that they are updated regularly to reflect the current situation and to include any changes to the underlying assumptions.

#### 3.1 Numbers of Births

Table 3 overleaf outlines the rapid and continuing rise in births being experienced in Slough. Since 2001-2 births have risen by 47% and the majority of this rise has yet to be felt in schools as children have yet to reach school age. In the table below, those born in 2005-6 are the cohort currently applying for reception places. Note that over the following 3 years, births rise by a further 25%.

The table above shows the birth data received from the ONS<sup>1</sup> for previous years. Slough's forecasting methodology uses this figure and compares it to the number of pupils that start in Reception in a Slough school 5 years later. The comparison of the 'number that start in Reception' to the 'number of births' 5 year's earlier is called the 'retention ratio'. By multiplying the 'number of births' by the average retention ratio for the last 3 years estimates of future demand for reception places are produced. These are the forecast shown in table 2.

<sup>i</sup> Slough receives live birth data from the Office of National Statistics (ONS) on an annual basis. The availability of this data at postcode level in recent years is a big improvement over previous years however there is still a significant lag before data is made available, for instance 2008-9 data will not be available until September 2010.

Table 3 Birth numbers 2001-2 to 2008-9

YEAR	Number of live births	Increases in Births:		Application year
		compared to previous year	compared to 2001-2	
2001-2	1865			
2002-3	1946	+4.3%	+4.3%	
2003-4	1984	+2.0%	+6.4%	
2004-5	2051	+3.4%	+10.0%	
2005-6	2234	+8.9%	+19.8%	Sep-10
2006-7	2457	+10.0%	+31.7%	Sep-11
2007-8	2561	+4.2%	+37.3%	Sep-12
2008-9	2738*	+6.9%	+46.8%	Sep-13

\* This is adjusted provisional data and subject to change

### 3.2 Ward Level Data

The table shown below displays the birth data in each Slough ward for 2005-6 to 2007-8. Those born in 2005-6 are the ones currently applying for places for September 2010. Highlighted on the right are those wards where births have risen by over 20 and a new Reception class or classes may be required.

Table 4 Birth Data at Ward Level

Ward	Applying now for Sep 10			Growth 2005-6 to 2007-8
	2005-6	2006-7	2007-8	
Baylis & Stoke	228	258	235	7
Britwell	141	177	174	33
Central	231	234	280	49
Chalvey	202	226	277	75
Cippenham Green	120	132	154	34
Cippenham Meadows	221	248	244	23
Colnbrook & Poyle	96	88	102	6
Farnham	193	202	195	2
Foxborough	128	117	149	21
Haymill	150	177	171	21
Kedermister	124	135	138	14
Langley St Mary's	101	106	115	14
Upton	122	144	139	17
Wexham Lea	177	213	184	7
<b>Slough total</b>	<b>2234</b>	<b>2457</b>	<b>2561</b>	<b>327</b>

This data should not be looked at in isolation and current expansion plans will need to be considered as well as growth in adjacent wards and situations, such as Upton, where significant numbers of resident pupils will miss out on a place in their catchment school (Castleview) for September 2010. New housing is also a key factor when prioritising future expansion projects.



## 4 OPTIONS FOR 2011-13

3 options for expanding places for 2011, 2012 and 2013 are explored in this section. The option of creating further bulge classes (as happened at Montem and St Mary's in 2009) is not discussed at this stage, as this option provides the poorest value for money and should only be considered as an emergency measure or where demand is expected to fall in future years. Similarly, the option of using the classes that will be temporarily surplus at Western House, Parlaunt, Wexham Court and the new school is not considered at this stage although this will need to be reviewed and considered annually.

New applications for places are received on a weekly basis, therefore at the start of the school year it is desirable to have 30-60 surplus school places in any one year group. If this small surplus is not created then there is likely to be a need to create a bulge class or classes mid-year – the aim is to avoid this situation by building some surplus into the system. At the same time it would not be cost effective to 'overbuild' which might be the case if demand should reduce in future years. This is considered in the options below.

### 4.i Use any surplus existing primary accommodation

The scale of growth required in the primary sector and the associated costs mean Slough needs to make maximum use of existing accommodation. This was considered in 2009-10, with projects such as the change of Cippenham Junior to a primary school where existing surplus accommodation was utilised. There are two schools where something similar might be explored, others will be explored if they become apparent:

- Priory School: The school has surplus classrooms which have traditionally been used for admitting additional pupils at Key Stage 2, the demand for these places has fallen away and the school now has surplus classrooms. An allocation of up to £100K would permit the school to make minor adjustments for the additional pupils.
- Claycots School: The school has set aside significant funding to add an additional form of entry for Key Stage 2 classes. The school has requested funding to also expand its Key Stage 1 accommodation to raise the PAN to 120 from September 2011. Costs are estimated at £500-£750K.

### 4.ii Add modular classrooms in a planned way across the estate

This option is being considered based on the need to add 11 forms of entry in by 2012 within the funding limits currently available and ensuring grant funding is fully spent by August 2011. The proposed plan is to add 3 modular classrooms to a large number of existing schools over the next two years. The funding available would be sufficient to create the full number of Reception classes required for 2011 and 2012 (based on current forecasts) and would provide accommodation for those pupils to move up to Years 1 and 2 at the same time. This would create an 'infant annex' at each school. There would then be a 3-year window of time to source the additional funding required to add accommodation for Key Stage 2 (a further 4 classrooms).

A current candidate list is attached as Appendix 1 and this will be updated on an ongoing basis. Candidates would be prioritised after considering the following factors although others may apply for particular schools:

- i) Site size and footprint for situating 3+ classrooms
- ii) School performance and Ofsted assessment
- iii) Opportunity to join funding with school project
- iv) Local demand, popularity and new housing

## v) Type of school (F, C, VC, VA or Trust)

This option has the following benefits:

- No new sites are required
- Costs would be far lower than new build
- Funding currently available would provide most, if not all, the places required over the next 2 years
- Putting classes in place would be much quicker than planning for new build, there would be less design work required, for instance
- Funding currently available needs to be spent by August 2011, new build projects would make this difficult/impossible
- If demand should fall in a few years, the new block could be removed or changed to specialist/community spaces and the published admission number could be reduced to its former level
- Each scheme would allow for some improvements or enlargement to existing accommodation as required by each school. New build costs would be unlikely to permit these works
- Modular buildings are now of a high standard and can even be brick-clad with a pitched roof to blend with current buildings
- Funding might permit improved sports facilities to replace lost playing fields (and this might be required by Sport England whatever the build type to gain planning permission on some sites)

The negative aspects would include:

- Modular accommodation is more likely to be single storey and require a larger footprint
- There is likely to be a greater loss of playing fields than with new build
- Expenditure on highways and transport to obtain planning permission would be significant given the number of sites likely to be involved.

#### **4.iii Build new schools**

Based on a Cabinet decision taken in March 2010, Slough is conducting a feasibility study on the planning issues and costs with building a new school on each of the candidate sites currently available across the town, and particularly in or around the Chalvey ward.

Chalvey was the resident ward of a significant proportion of the pupils without a primary place in 2009. As well as having a higher than average mobile population, its catchment area school is Montem Primary, located some way outside the ward. Table 4 in section 3.2, shows that the birth rate is rising faster here, than in any other ward.

With a number of candidate sites in the area, the main reason for possibly delaying this decision would be the cost of building and the availability of funding. A new 2-form entry school would cost c£7m and a 3-form entry school would cost c£10m.

This would mean that building one new school adding 60 Reception places would cost the same as adding perhaps as many as 9 Key Stage 1 blocks across the town, creating 270 new Reception classes.

Building a new school would likely require additional funding from the council as all funding currently available for school places (which is 100% government grant) needs to be spent by August 2011 and a new school project would take longer than this to complete (a

minimum of 2 years to build). With the bulk of the funding being spent at the tail-end of the project.

**Infant Option:** An alternative option and one that would create 2 or 3 times the number of Reception places would be to build an Infant School (as opposed to a primary). With a budget of c£7m, this might be sufficient for a 5-form entry school. The downside being a 5-form entry Junior School would be required after 3 years to complete the project (another c£9m).

**Refurbishment rather than new build (option 4.iii.b):** The feasibility study underway will look at the possibility of using the old part of the Town Hall building as a new school. This may be a more affordable option than new build and would allow options (4.i) and (4.ii) to also go ahead. The number of classrooms that could be accommodated in the old part of the building would be relatively low, therefore new modular classrooms would need to be added 2 or 3 years later to create sufficient classes for a primary school. This could create 2 or 3 forms of entry if the feasibility study suggests this is a viable option.

All costings given above are approximate at this stage and are based on recent, local experience of tendering capital projects. Actual costs and the number of school places that can be built for the budgets mentioned will be site- and market-dependent.

The earliest date for opening a newly built school would be 2012, therefore options 4.i and 4.ii will need to be considered the only options that can provide the places required in the timescale permitted. Although the refurbishment of the Town Hall could also be considered if it proves to be viable.

## 5 FUNDING

### 5.1 Available Funding

Slough currently has 3 main funding sources (other than council capital) that can potentially be allocated to this project, all are external in nature:

#### 1. Unallocated Basic Need Safety Valve funding - £6.28m

The allocation to Slough (£9.0m) is based on the shortfall of places projected to 2012, so the number of places funded by the £9.0m will be deducted first before any future allocations are made through Basic Need. This funding needs to be spent by **August 2011** or it is subject to claw back. Slough cannot rely on any future allocation of Basic Need funding for 2 reasons:

- i) This is an advance allocation, if future demand proves to be lower than projected then Slough would have been over-allocated funding and there would be a case for claw back from future allocations
- ii) In recent years it has been allocated as supported borrowing (Slough requires grant funding) and this may be the case again with future allocations.

#### 2. Modernisation funding - £1.19m

This grant funding has yet to be allocated but must be fully spent by **August 2011** or it may be clawed back.

#### 3. Section 106 funding from developers

Funding received to date has been fully allocated. Future funding is anticipated from large projects already approved or underway; e.g. Cippenham Wedge and Castleview Site 16.

In summary, there is **£7.469m** remaining to be allocated, all of which must be fully spent by August 2011. In addition some section 106 funding may be received, although the amounts and timing are unpredictable and dependent on a number of external factors beyond the control of the council.

### 5.2 Funding Shortfall

Capital allocations for the period 2011-14 will be announced through the Comprehensive Spending Review (expected late 2010), but given the current financial climate there is no certainty of any future capital grant allocations. Slough requires grant funding and not supported borrowing to fund any shortfall. Until new funding sources are identified there will remain a funding shortfall for the council, as it needs to meet its statutory duty to provide sufficient school places. To fund any shortfall the council will require capital receipts.

Using the following assumptions, the table below shows one scenario for the shortfall of funding:

- i) Priory and Claycots together would add 2 forms of entry
- ii) Could in theory add any number, average cost estimated at £800K
- iii) Each new primary would equate to a cost of £3m-£3.5m per form of entry. This cost would be split in two if infant places are built first and junior places built 3 year's later.

The table below shows one possible scenario for creating the 16 forms of entry for 2013. The actual shortfall would be dependent on the combination of options adopted. For

instance, not building the new school (reducing cost by £10m) but adding 3 more modular infant blocks (at a cost of £2.4m) would reduce the shortfall to £4.75m for 2013.

OPTION	Expansion Option	Forms of entry	2010-11 £m	2011-12 £m	2012-13 £m	Total £m
i	Priory and Claycots	2	£0.30	£0.55	£0.00	£0.85
ii	Modular infant blocks	11	£1.00	£6.20	£1.60	£8.80
iii	New schools*	3	£0.30	£9.00	£0.70	£10.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>£1.60</b>	<b>£15.75</b>	<b>£2.30</b>	<b>£19.65</b>
	<b>Available funding</b>		<b>£1.60</b>	<b>£5.70</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£7.47</b>
	<b>Shortfall</b>		<b>£0.00</b>	<b>-£10.05</b>	<b>-£2.30</b>	<b>-£12.18</b>

\* The refurbishment of the Town Hall has been given a provisional budget of £1m but the feasibility study currently underway will test the viability of this option and the likely costs.

## 6 NEXT STEPS

Action	Responsibility	Dates	Notes
Consult Primary Heads on options for expansion	Bob Garnett/ Julian King Harris	29 April 2010	Distributed draft plan and heads consulted
Consult School Organisation Group (SOG) on these and other options for expanding provision	Bob Garnett	12 May 2010	Action Plan agreed by SOG – 9 candidate sites identified
Carry out feasibility study on sites for a new school in or around Chalvey	Neil Simon/ Tony Madden	To be completed by June/July 2010	Brief drawn up and work about to be tendered
Take feasibility back to Cabinet	Clair Pyper	12 July or 20 September 2010	Feasibility may not be ready for July meeting
Continue to develop candidate list for expansion for 2012 and 2013	Tony Madden/ Julian King Harris	Ongoing	
Take Action Plan to Cabinet for agreement and way forward	Clair Pyper	14 June 2010	Decision required to start planning for expansion projects
Get preliminary costings for modulars and prepare a procurement method	Tony Madden/ Neil Simon	June 2010	Start immediately following Cabinet approval

This page is intentionally left blank

## List of Possible Sites for Expansion - September 2011, 2012 and 2013

RANKING CRITERIA								Potential candidates for 2011
Status	First preferences above PAN	Increase in births 2005-7 for ward	Total Site Size	Site size per FE	Potential planning issues	Best Value		
Castleview School	Foundation	58	17	18,000	9,000	No	3 mods	✓
Cippenham Infant School	Community	34	34	7,000	3,000	Yes (site size)	3 mods	✗
Claycots Primary School	Community	13	33	28,000	9,300	No	Funding opportunity	✓
Colnbrook CE Primary School	VC		6	12,000	12,000	Yes (contamination)	3 mods	once contamination dealt with
Foxborough Primary School	Community		21	25,000	12,500	No	3 mods	more discussion required
Godolphin Infant School	Community		7	18,000	5,700	No	2 classrooms	✗
Godolphin Junior School	Community					Yes (site size)		
James Elliman School	Community	10	49	36,000	12,000	No	3 mods	✓
Lynch Hill School	Foundation		33	28,000	9,300	No	3 mods	✓
Marish Primary School	Community		14	32,000	10,600	No	3 mods	✗
Montem Primary School	Community		23	56,000	18,600	No	2 mods	✓
Penn Wood School	PFI	1	7			PFI	3 mods	more discussion required
Pippins School	Foundation		6	6,000	6,000	Yes (site size)	3 mods	✗
Priory School	Foundation	4	21	40,000	13,300	No	No mods required	✓
Ryvers School	Foundation	16	14	33,000	16,500	No	3 mods	✓
St. Mary's CE Primary School	VC	31	17	17,000	8,500	? (site size)	2 mods plus new build required	more discussion required

## VA Schools - Cannot claim VAT back on VA schools. Therefore these are not first choice schools for SBC investment.

Holy Family RC Primary School	VA	13	14	18,000	9,000	No	3 mods
Iqra Slough Islamic Primary School	VA	47	49	35,000	11,600	No	3 mods
Khalsa Primary School	VA	8	7	37,000	18,500	No	3 mods
Our Lady of Peace RC Infant	VA	13	21	21,000	7,000	Yes (site size)	3 mods
Our Lady of Peace RC Junior	VA						
St Anthony's RC Primary School	VA	18	2	26,000	13,000	No	3 mods
St. Ethelbert's RC Primary School	VA	4	7	34,000	17,000	No	3 mods

## 2010 expansions - all will have vacant classrooms from Sep 2011

Western House School	Community	35	23	20,000	10,000
Cippenham Junior School	Foundation		34	30,000	8000
Parlaunt Park Primary	Community		14	26,000	8,600
Wexham Court Primary School	Community	17	7	34,000	11,300

Note that individual schools may not agreed to expand. This is a list of potential candidates sites only. Many schools have agreed to expand

As places are being added for infant pupils only, this does not affect the playing field requirements under the Statutory Minimum Playing Field regulations, although additional classrooms may reduce current playing fields slightly. It would have an impact once pupils reach the age of 8. School places has a higher priority than playing fields at present but MUGAs (which count as double area for playing field calculations) should be considered where possible as a mitigation.

Where additional classrooms impact areas laid out as pitches then Sport England would be able to object unless equivalent or better facilities replace what is lost.

This page is intentionally left blank



## BEST VALUE ANALYSIS

## Expansions already approved in readiness for September 2010

APPENDIX B(i)

Project	Budget	Total new places to be created	Additional reception places added	Cost per new school place	Funding Source
Expand Western House Primary School	£3,020,000	210	30	£14,381	1. £1.52m – PCP grant 2. £1.5m - s106 received
Expand and modernise Parlaunt Park Primary	£4,000,000	210	30	£19,048*	1. £3m – PCP grant 2. £1m – Basic Need Safety Valve
Refurbish former school building	£4,250,000	420	60	£10,119	1. £4.25m - Basic Need Safety Valve
Change Cippenham Junior to a Primary School	£460,000	300	60	£1,533	1. £460K - Basic Need Safety Valve
Expand and modernise Wexham Court Primary School	£4,000,000	210	30	£19,048*	1. £4m – PCP grant
<b>Total</b>	<b>£15,730,000</b>	<b>1350</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>£11,652</b>	

**PCP - Primary Capital Programme** - Original condition of this funding was that it should be spend on modernisation. Therefore the funding above will be used to fully modernise Wexham Court and Parlaunt Park Primary Schools as well as add additional school places.

**s106** - Section 106 contributions from developers

\* These two schools are being fully modernised as well as expanded, which makes the cost per pupil place appear high

## Future Expansion Options

APPENDIX B(ii)

Options	Costs	Total new places to be created	Additional reception places added	Cost per new school place	Comment
i Priory and Claycots	Between £600,000 and £850,000	300	60	£2,833	This would add new build for a full new form of entry at Claycots. Priory already has the accommodation for an infant annex
ii Infant annexes	£800,000 each	90 each	30 each	£8,889	This adds 3 classes per school to accommodate a Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 class. 4 Junior classes will be required at each site in 3 year's time.
iii a) New school <sup>^</sup>	£7,000,000 £10,000,000	420 630	60 90	£16,667 £15,873	New build 2-form entry school New build 3-form entry school
iii b) Refurbish Town Hall	£1,000,000	240	60	£4,167	Option to be explored via feasibility study. If building can be used and is affordable, it would still require additional classrooms in future years.

<sup>^</sup> These are estimated costs based on recent experience both locally and in other authorities.

## Example Best Value Permutation (100% allocation of funding)

This omits new schools due to high cost per pupil place

APPENDIX B(iii)

Options	Costs	Total new places to be created	Additional reception places added	Cost per new school place
i Priory and Claycots	Up to £850,000	300	60	up to £2,833
ii 7 x Infant annexes	£5,600,000	630	210	£8,889
iii b) Refurbish Town Hall	£1,000,000	240	60	£4,167
<b>Total</b>	<b>£7,450,000</b>	<b>1170</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>£6,368</b>

All costings given in Appendices B(i) and (ii) are approximate at this stage and are based on recent, local experience of tendering capital projects. Actual costs and the number of school places that can be built for the budgets mentioned will be site- and market-dependent.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Forecasting Model

In order for Members to understand the standardised forecasting model, used across local authorities for forecasting Reception demand for future years, the following summary has been prepared.

The tables below show the birth data received from the ONS<sup>1</sup> for previous years and compares this to the number of pupils that start in Reception in a Slough school 5 years later. The comparison of the 'number that start in Reception' (column 4) to the 'number of births' 5 year's earlier (column 2) is called the 'retention ratio'. How this is calculated is shown below in Step 1. Step 2 then shows how to apply the average retention ratio for the last 3 years to forecast future demand.

**Table 1: Lower Retention Rate Period – 2000-2006**

1	2	3	4	5	
Year	Number of Births	5 years after birth data	Number that start in Reception	Retention ratio	
1996	1869	2000-1	1482	79.3%	(see Step 1)
1997	1826	2001-2	1496	81.9%	
1998	1786	2002-3	1409	78.9%	
1999	1799	2003-4	1388	77.2%	
2000	1825	2004-5	1464	80.2%	
2001	1864	2005-6	1488	79.8%	

**Table 2: Higher Retention Rate Period – 2006-2010**

1	2	3	4	5
Year	Number of Births	5 years after birth data	Number that start in Reception	Retention ratio
2001-2	1865	2006-7	1545	82.8%
2002-3	1946	2007-8	1621	84.2%
2003-4	1984	2008-9	1665	83.9%
2004-5	2051	2009-10	1831	89.3%
2005-6	2234	Sep-10	Forecast shown below	
2006-7	2457	Sep-11	Forecast shown below	
2007-8	2561	Sep-12	Forecast shown below	
2008-9	2738 <sup>2</sup>	Sep-13	Forecast shown below	

**Table 1** above shows that demand (column 4) was falling over the period to 2003-4, reducing to a low of 1388. However, since the opening up of the European Union this has reversed the trend and since 2004-5 demand has risen and this trend is still continuing.

Note also that in 2006-7 there was a change in trend in retention ratios (column 5), this has been highlighted by separating the tables above into 'higher' and 'lower' periods.

**Table 2** shows that retention ratios have risen significantly compared to the period 2000-1 to 2005-6 and in 2009-10 the figure rose to its highest level of 89.3%. As members can see, based on experience over the long term, it was not possible to predict the large rise in the retention ratio (seen in Slough and in many other authorities) experienced in 2009-10.

<sup>i</sup> Slough receives live birth data from the Office of National Statistics (ONS) on an annual basis. The availability of this data at postcode level in recent years is a big improvement over previous years however there is still a significant lag before data is made available, for instance 2008-9 data will not be available until September 2010.

<sup>ii</sup> Provisional data provided by the PCT and adjusted to reflect past experience. Final data will be provided by ONS late 2010.

**Step 1 - Calculate the retention ratio for each year using the formula below:**

$$\frac{\text{No. of children that start in Reception (column 4)}}{\text{No. of births (column 2)}} = \frac{1482}{1869} = 79.3\% \text{ retention ratio (column 5)}$$

**Step 2 - Average the retention ratios for the previous 3 years and use this average to predict the demand for future years.**

The average of the last 3 year retention ratios (2007-8 to 2009-10) is 85.8%. Applying the 3 year average retention ratio directly to the birth data for 2005-6 to 2008-9 gives the following forecasts:

<b>Future Year</b>	<b>Forecast using 3 year average retention ratio</b>
<b>2010-11</b>	<b>1917</b>
<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2108</b>
<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2198</b>
<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2349</b>

**Volatility**

Members will appreciate that there is a degree of volatility in predicting demand for school places. Therefore it is prudent to look at a range of forecasts rather than an exact number. This gives a greater degree of accuracy with forecasts including for a degree of +/- variation.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Forecasts</b>		<b>Shortfall compared to current number of Reception places: 1887</b>
	<b>Low range projection</b>	<b>High range projection</b>	
September 2010	1917*	1947*	30→60 1 to 2 classes
September 2011	2064	2126	177→239 6-8 classes
September 2012	2152	2216	265→329 9 to 11 classes
September 2013	2300	2369	413→482 14 to 16 classes

\* These figures are based on actual admissions figures rather than forecast data

**CABINET 14<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2010**

**Agenda Item 8 - Slough Borough Council's Carbon Management Plan  
2009 – 14**

**CORRECTION SHEET FOR AGENDA ITEM [8]**

**COVERING REPORT**

Page 83

The figure of £307,770 in the 'Provisional costs and sources of funding for the remainder of the Plan table' should be amended to read £370,770

Page 84

Amend the first sentence of the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph to read:

"Other sources of external funding will need to be -explored....."

**APPENDIX A - CARBON MANAGEMENT PLAN 2009 - 20 14**

Page 13

Please delete the following text from box 3 of the Excluded column of the table

"Any other item you wish to include (e.g. embodied CO<sub>2</sub> of paper). This is because it is difficult to gather with little direct control over production".

Page 26, table 5.5

The figure £307,770 in the 'Provisional financial costs and sources of funding required for sections 4.3 and 4.4 of the Plan ' should be amended to read £370,770.

This page is intentionally left blank