

BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL

CABINET

21st July 2011

Report of: Strategic Director: Children, Young People and Skills

Title: School Organisation Strategy

Ward: Citywide

Officer Presenting Report: Service Director: Education Strategy and Targeted Support

Contact Telephone Number: 0117 903 7950

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the school organisation strategy is formally reviewed in the Autumn of this year and comments received during the consultation feedback are taken into consideration as part of this review;
2. That the Strategic Director: Children, Young People and Skills, in consultation with the appropriate Executive Members, is authorised to:
 - Progress short term proposals within Table 1 and 2
 - To undertake option appraisals and feasibility work to secure fixed price quotations for construction project proposals identified for the medium term
3. That the Cabinet endorses a co-ordinated approach to Central Government to ensure that the need for additional school places in Bristol is a priority consideration in the context of national policy changes.

Summary

The School Organisation Strategy identifies future pressures and needs in respect of pupil places and opportunities for providers to identify proposals to address these needs.

The significant issues in the report are:

The primary age population continues to grow and this requires more places to be provided in areas of the City. The uncertainty in respect of future capital financing limits the certainty with which some schemes can progress.

Policy

Council Corporate Plan 2008 – 2011

Consultation

Internal

- Legal Services
- Corporate Finance

External

- Bristol Diocese;
- Clifton Diocese;
- Schools through 'cluster meetings' held between April 2011 and July 2011;
- Citywide stakeholder consultation via the 'Ask Bristol' site from 18th May 2011 to 30th June 2011.

core proposal includes the development of a new 'Central Body' through which the DfE would deliver funding and buildings (to meet locally agreed needs);

- the requirement to establish new local process that will involve the Local Authorities being one of many 'Responsible Bodies' that will need to agree a 'local investment plan' of priorities for major projects and maintenance against a notional local budget;
 - the aggregation of devolved capital, which would normally be allocated to schools, to 'Responsible Bodies', for distribution to their individual institutions.
7. The James Review supports radical change in the delivery mechanism for local projects and, subject to Ministerial approval, whilst the new system becomes embedded it could impact on the delivery of future schemes in the Medium Term proposals for the School Organisation Strategy.
 8. Local flexibility in terms of changing demographic priorities could be fettered by a centralised procurement process and centralised contract management. The proposed system would have difficulty in coping and adapting to the constraints that currently exist at a local level such as site conditions, geography, population changes and parental choice

PRIMARY ADMISSIONS OUTCOME FOR SEPTEMBER 2011

9. Bristol has experienced an unprecedented rise in children requiring Reception places over the last 4 years with an increase of around 1000 children. The growth being experienced in the City is far in excess of most other areas of the country.
10. The initial program to provide additional places has concentrated on those areas that have shown the highest increases. This is mainly around East Central Bristol.
11. Current infant class size legislation prevents most primary schools from taking a 'few' extra Reception age pupils. Changes proposed to the Admissions Code (currently the subject of consultation) suggest that there will be no relaxation in relation to infant class size legislation. As a consequence, primary school expansions tend to be by a whole form of entry (30 pupils). Many existing primary schools are either one or two form entry primary schools. As a consequence, an extra form of entry is either a 100% or 50% increase in size. Changes of this nature have significant implications in terms of building solutions and capital works. These increases in pupil numbers are arising in the context of 60% capital funding reductions nationally.

12. The Council has a duty to promote diversity and choice. Local schools should be only part of the offer, alongside faith schools and other categories of schools. It is unlikely that there will be a position in the foreseeable future when 100% of parents' preferences can be satisfied. Currently 94% of primary age children have a place at a 'preference' school. This is the highest figure over the last 4 years.

KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION AND NATIONAL POLICY CHANGES

13. The immediate need to secure additional primary school places has been validated. However, there is recognition that more detailed planning for SEN and early years provision also needs to be undertaken and that longer term growth in relation to secondary provision will also need consideration. This will be particularly relevant in the context of the James Review recommendations and the production of a local investment strategy.

14. Current proposals in relation to some areas of the City are not ambitious enough. The following areas of the City are particularly relevant:

- The absence of local primary provision within the Redland Ward;
- Shortage of local primary provision within reasonable walking distances in relation to elements of Bedminster/Southville and Knowle areas;
- Acceleration of the timing of proposals in relation to the St. Werburgh's area of the City;

15. There is a need to work with parents and communities to examine innovative and imaginative ways of providing more school places. Improved information and communications will be essential to doing this. There is also the need to look at the structure of any future School Organisation Strategy documents as the 10 Locality Partnership Structure is not one which is recognised by parents.

16. Reconsideration of current admissions policy and criteria. One of the main issues raised has been the 'fairness' of the current siblings rule and whether or not to support a policy principle of local/community primary schools Admissions policy arrangements are expected to form part of the Children's Scrutiny Commission work programme.

PROPOSED WAY FORWARD

17. Given the feedback received and the current uncertainty in relation to capital funding, the following actions are suggested:

- The time-line published with the Draft School Organisation Strategy identified a formal review in the Autumn of this year. There have been no substantive objections to the short term proposals within the Strategy. As a consequence, it is recommended that the consultation feedback and data collected at the start of the next academic year form part of the formal review of the Strategy later in the year. This will also enable the Children's Scrutiny Commission to give consideration to the issue in detail as part of inquiry sessions planned for later in the year.
- That the short term proposals set out in Tables 1 and 2 are advanced. These include a number of technical changes to previously approved schemes to reflect a re-profiling of the Capital Programme.
- That further preparatory work is undertaken in respect of medium and long term proposals within the strategy. This work would include, but not limited to, feasibility studies to explore design options and establish certainty in terms of project costs. This will ensure that the council is in a position to respond quickly once there is certainty in respect of future capital funding arrangements. Having regard to the short term proposals within Tables 1 and 2 and grant allocations in the current year, there is sufficient capital funding to enable feasibility work to progress.
- That the feasibility work referenced above to also consider opportunities for additional provision from September 2012 working with local communities to address specific concerns that were raised during the consultation feedback in relation to SEN provision and primary places in relation to the Redland, Bedminster/Southville, Knowle and St. Werburgh's areas of the City.
- That the Cabinet endorses a co-ordinated approach to Central Government to ensure that the need for additional school places in Bristol is a priority consideration in the context of national policy changes.

Table One: Previous Cabinet approvals – short term proposals

Schemes	Aggregate Values	Cabinet Approval Date
Major Schemes		
Ashley Primary (Brunel Field)	£8,620,559	9 th March 2006 (CAB 101.03/06) 30 th April 2009 (CAB 73.4/09)
Bankleaze Primary School Sea Mills Primary School Parson Street Primary School Elmlea Infant School	£12,294,200	1 st October 2009 (CAB 19.10/09)
Minor Works		
Cabot Primary School Glenfrome Primary School Begbrook Primary School Two Mile Hill Primary School Air Balloon Primary School May Park Primary School Millpond Primary School Easton Primary School Avon Primary School Littlemead Primary School Headley Park Primary School St Anne's Infant/Junior School Hannah More Primary School	£4,040,000*	24 th March 2011 (CAB 53.3/11)

*As part of the Cabinet approvals on 24th March 2011, contingency provision was also made for other short term solutions which were not able to be specifically identified at a school level at that time. This funding has been used to provide additional accommodation at a number of other sites across the City, including Lockleaze Primary School; Ashton gate Primary School; Compass Point Primary School; and West Town Lane Primary School. Limited further places are also being provided at St Peter's Primary School with no additional capital funding implications.

18. Funding approvals are required to complete three major schemes within the short term proposals. The schemes are identified in Table Two.

Table Two: Short term proposals requiring approval of funding

Schemes	Reason for Funding allocation	Values
Ashley Primary (Brunel Field)	Amendments to current proposals to meet additional planning requirements to expand the school to two forms of entry	£668,000
Cabot Primary School	Revised scheme to make internal improvements and provide additional facilities to existing school by September 2012.	£2,000,000
Millpond Primary School	Funding to undertake final phase of improvements by September 2012	£1,750,000
TOTAL PROPOSED REVISED FUNDING ALLOCATION		£4,418,000

Other Options Considered

19. There is no statutory requirement to produce a School Organisation Strategy. There is a statutory requirement to ensure that there are sufficient school places within the local authority's area of responsibility. If a School Organisation Strategy is not available the data and analysis will have to be available in a different and accessible format.
20. If there is no preparatory work to deliver an investment programme whilst we await the final decision of the DfE in terms of capital finance allocation there is a danger that the additional provision will not be available to meet the demands identified in the strategy for 2012 and the medium term.

Risk Assessment

21. A Risk Assessment has been undertaken as included at Appendix C.

Public Sector Equality Duties

22. Before making a decision, section 149 Equality Act 2010 requires that each decision-maker considers the need to promote equality for persons with the following "protected characteristics": age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief,

sex, sexual orientation. Each decision-maker must, therefore, have due regard to the need to:

- i) Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010.
- ii) Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to --
 - remove or minimise disadvantage suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic;
 - take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it (in relation to disabled people, this includes, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities);
 - encourage persons who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
- iii) Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to –
 - tackle prejudice; and
 - promote understanding.

23. One of the ways the council meets the general equality duties is to undertake equality impact assessments. Appendix D contains Part One Equalities Impact Assessments in respect of the proposal.

Environmental checklist – see attached.

The Environmental Impact Assessment is detailed in Appendix E.

- **The significant impacts of this proposal are:**

There will be a short-term increase in environmental impacts through the consumption of fossil fuels and raw materials in constructing and refurbishing schools.

Longer term, there will be on-going consumption of energy for heat and power, production of waste and staff and pupil travel to school.

Potential exists for positive effects from refurbishment & expansion projects, for example, renewable energy generation. There may be some positive im-

pacts through reduced travel, due to additional capacity near to the point of demand.

It is noted that the use of modular accommodation is proposed. This will require careful planning and implementation to minimise negative impacts.

The proposals include the following measures to mitigate the impacts:

Mitigation will be tailored on an individual basis, but will observe the following general principles:

- Construction of facilities to BREEAM standards:
 - To 2012: BREEAM “Very Good”.
 - 2013-15: BREEAM “Excellent”
 - 2016 on: BREEAM “Outstanding”
- Meet the planning requirement for 20% of energy demand to be met from on-site renewables.
- Use of Sustainable Drainage to ensure no net increase in peak surface-water run-off.
- Resilience to flooding and extremes of temperature.
- Travel plan to be operational within 6 months of the facility opening.
- It is noted that any new planning permissions will need to comply with the following policies from the Core Strategy:

BCS 13 - Climate change – mitigation and adaptation

BCS 14 - Sustainable energy

BCS 15 - Sustainable design and construction

BCS 16 - Flood risk and water management

The net effects of the proposals are:

Research indicates that direct energy-related emissions in primary schools are, on average approximately 300 kg/ CO₂/ pupil/ year. Provision of c. 3,000 extra places could therefore lead to an extra 900 tonnes/ CO₂/ year, plus additional emissions from transport and procurement of goods and services. This would increase the current total school building emissions by approximately 5%. In the longer term, there will also be increased emissions from increased secondary-school places.

Emissions can be significantly reduced through specification and design of the new facilities, and sustainable procurement of goods and services.

The overall impact is negative.

Legal and Resource Implications

Legal

The proposal would enable the LA to fulfil its functions in respect of the provision of schools for its area.

The statutory powers are:

Section 14 (1) of the Education Act 1996 obliges each local authority to secure that there are sufficient schools for providing primary education and secondary education available for their area although there is no requirement that those places should be exclusively in their area. The local authority is not itself obliged to provide all the schools required, but to secure that they are available.

Section 14(3A) of the Education Act 1996 provides that a local authority shall exercise their functions under section 14 “with a view to (a) securing diversity in the provision of schools; and (b) increasing opportunities for parental choice.”

Section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 empowers the local authority to facilitate the discharge of its statutory duty to secure that sufficient places are available for the primary and secondary education of Bristol’s children, under Section 14(1) of the Education Act 1996.

Acquisition of land by agreement under Section 120, Local Government Act 1972 and Section 226 Town and Country Planning Act 1990

School organisation proposals must follow the statutory framework set out in the Education and Inspections Act 2006, supporting regulations and statutory guidance. Any such proposals will need ongoing close liaison with Legal Services to ensure that the legal requirements are met throughout the process.

(Legal advice provided by Genny Seneque, Senior Solicitor, Legal Services)

Financial

(a) Revenue

The Schools Finance (England) Regulations state that funding for schools through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) must be based on the numbers on roll at the time of the January pupil count with no in-year adjustments other than for exclusions or individually assigned SEN resources.

The Schools Forum has the power to waive this rule by prior agreement with the Local Authority.

Funding has already been set aside through the Funding Formula for the continuation of new classes opened as at September 2010.

At its meeting on 8th February 2011 the Schools Forum agreed to LA proposals to provide 'per pupil' funding plus a £4k contribution to resources per new class for the planned new classes opening in September 2011.

(Revenue Financial advice provided by Geraldine Mead, Finance Business Partner – CYPS, Corporate Services)

(b) Capital

The DfE capital funding allocations for Basic Need (new pupil places) and Modernisation are unknown beyond the 2011/12 allocation. The DfE would normally make a three year medium term funding allocation. This was not the case for the allocations anticipated for 2011/12 to 2013/14. The funding announcement and allocation was only for one year (2011/12). The announcement was linked to the Government's financial deficit reduction plan and the James Review.

The failure of the DfE to identify funding allocations for the medium term is creating programming difficulties for the City Council's future investment strategy, especially in relation to the delivery of education projects beyond 2011/12. Any work undertaken to secure detailed feasibility on projects in the medium term proposals would be at risk.

Significant work has been undertaken with the Council's main delivery partner for school building projects (the LEP) and proposals are being developed to deliver quality teaching and learning environments at a significantly reduced cost. However, certainty in terms of capital funding will be material to moving forward these proposals.

Table Three: Medium/long term proposals funding allocations

	Aggregate of initial funding requirement to be approved and funded from current allocations from the DfE up to 2011/12	Aggregate total investment requirement (subject to DfE Funding confirmation)
Medium Term Investment	£8,410,000	£67,300,000
Long Term Investment	£1,200,000	£55,300,000

The estimated total investment that is required to deliver new pupil places over the short, medium and long term is £151,972,759, based upon experience of previous scheme costs. There are, however, concerted efforts to reduce future scheme costs to reduce the overall funding requirements.

- Short term (previously approved) £24,954,759
 - Short term (to be approved) £4,418,000
 - Medium term £67,300,000
 - Long term £55,300,000
- TOTAL £151,972,759**

24. There is currently £37,800,359 available to fund the programme including the capital allocations made in 2011/12. This is sufficient to fund short term requirements and enable feasibility work to continue in respect of medium term schemes.

25. In the event that the DfE provide funding to reflect the 2011/12 allocation (£14,890,855) over a three year programme from 2012/13, this would equate to £44,672,565 between 2012/13 and 2014/15. Some £9,383,565 of this three year funding allocation would be required to cover essential capital repairs. The balance of £35,290,000 would contribute toward the delivery of additional places (including SEN provision). The overall shortfall beyond 2014/15 would be £78,702,400.

Land

Some medium and longer term requirements may involve the acquisition of land or buildings from third parties following appraisal of all available options.

(Property advice provided by Rod Taplin, Corporate Property Manager)

Personnel

There are no personnel issues at this stage. Any additional staffing requirements will need to follow the Safer Recruitment procedure.

(Personnel advice provided by Bob Phillips,
HR Business Partner – Children and Young People's Services)

Appendices:

Appendix A	Consultation Outcomes: Annex 1 - School Organisation Strategy Consultation Questionnaire Annex 2 - Consultation Feedback: School Organisation Strategy Annex 3 - Equalities: School Organisation Strategy Questionnaire
Appendix B	Summary of James Review Recommendations
Appendix C	Risk Assessment
Appendix D	Equalities Impact Assessment
Appendix E	Eco Impact Checklist

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985 Background Papers:

None

CONSULTATION OUTCOMES

- As part of the consultation exercise for the draft School Organisation Strategy a questionnaire was placed on the 'Ask Bristol' web site. The consultation site had 1051 viewings during the consultation period. Additionally, within the web site an on-line public conversation was established to allow participants to comment and present their ideas on "...how the City Council can deliver additional primary capacity within the city... particularly in relation to the longer term trends." The consultation ran for six weeks from 18th May until 30th June.
- Although only twenty-one people participated in the discussion (see Annex 1) the quality of contribution was of a high standard and a number of the options proposed are currently being explored by Officers. There have also been a number of meetings and correspondence with parent groups in various parts of the City in which suggestions in respect of future provision have been made.
- In terms of the questionnaire (see Annex 2), there were 46 returns/ responses (note: the figures presented exclude missing data). The majority of those who responded (80%) were parents of a child at primary school and 10% were parents of a child at secondary school. 10% had a child at both primary and secondary school.
- Over 16% of those completing the questionnaire had been aware for three months or more that the City Council had prepared a draft School Organisation Strategy (24% never, 31% within the last seven days, 7% within the last eight to twenty-eight days, and 22% within between one and three months). 76% of respondents felt that the School Organisation Strategy was an important document in relation to pupil place planning, with 84% indicating that primary education provision was most significant to them.
- Of those completing the questionnaire, 67% of people believed that there was a major shortfall of primary schools places within the City (24% significant, 4% minor, and 4% not sure). Only 11% felt that the School Organisation Strategy identified appropriate solutions to the shortfalls in pupil place provision.
- Of those completing the questionnaire, 29% felt that the southern part of the City required greatest investment in primary provision (24% northern, 20% east central, and 27% not sure); whilst 24% felt that the east central part of the City required investment in Early Years provision (16% south, 9% north and 51% not sure); and 9% felt that the east central and south part of the City required investment in SEN provision (2% north and 80% not sure).

- Of those completing the questionnaire, 58% believed that the strategy was significant to them.
- In meeting the shortfall in primary school places 40% of people completing the questionnaire supported the use of modular accommodation (46% did not). 13% were not able to demonstrate a preference.
- Some comments were provided direct to officers during meetings with groups such as head teacher associations and in the form of e-mail communication. The issues raised included:
 - Specific concerns about the lack of Autistic provision within the City, and general concerns in relation to the impact of a growing population and the need for more specialist provision;
 - opportunities around greater linkage with early years planning and provision, and:
 - future secondary school provision, particularly in the context of rising infant age numbers.
- From the consultation with Head Teachers concern was expressed in terms of the impact of providing additional pupil places in those areas where there was already capacity. Although some schools were not a preference for some parents, the provision of additional pupil places to meet parental preferences was seen as potentially damaging to the financial viability of existing less popular schools.

School Organisation Strategy Consultation

Bristol City Council has a statutory duty to ensure that there are sufficient school places within the local authority's area of responsibility to meet the present and future demands for pupil places, ensure that there is diversity in the provision of schools and to ensure that there are increased opportunities for parental choice.

This questionnaire will help us understand the views of local people on these important issues.

Please answer all questions by ticking the appropriate box(es) or writing in the space provided. Your name is not required.

Data Protection

All the data you supply on this form will be held and used in accordance with the Data Protection Act.

Purpose: The information you provide on this form will be considered by the council as part of its consultation on the School Organisation Strategy. Any personal information you supply on the form is confidential. The council will only publish aggregate or summary results from the consultation which will not identify individuals.

Storage: The information will be stored securely in a database and only accessed by members the council's Consultation & Research and Public & Passenger Transport Teams

Time: The information will be stored for 2 years after the consultation closes and will then be deleted.

1. Are you..

- A parent
- A carer
- A grandparent
- Planning to have a family

2. What is your postcode?

3. How many children do you have?

4. Are these at...

- Primary
- Secondary
- Both

5. How long have you been aware that Bristol has prepared a School Organisation Strategy?

- Never
- Within the last 7 days
- Within the last 8 to 28 days
- Within the last one to three months
- Over three months

6. Do you think the School Organisation Strategy is an important document in relation to pupil place planning?

- No
- Yes
- Not sure

7. Which areas of education provision are most significant to you? (please tick all that apply)

- Early years
- Primary
- Secondary
- Post 16
- Special Education Needs (SEN)
- None of these

8. The School Organisation Strategy identified a *shortfall* of *primary* school places within the city. How much of a *shortfall* do you think there is?

- None
- Minor
- Significant
- Major
- Not sure

9. The School Organisation Strategy identified a *surplus* of *secondary* school places within the city. How much of a *surplus* do you think there is?

- None
- Minor
- Significant
- Major
- Not sure

10. Does the School Organisation Strategy identify the issues that are of interest/significance to you?

- No
- Yes
- Not sure

11. Do you believe the School Organisation Strategy identifies appropriate solutions to the shortfalls in pupil place provision?

- No
- Yes
- Not sure

12. In meeting the shortfall in primary school places, do you think the city council is right to move away from traditional build and move to modular provision (portable buildings)?

- No
- Yes
- Not sure

13. Which part of the city do you believe requires greatest investment in primary school places?

- None
- North Bristol
- East central
- South Bristol
- Not sure

14. Which part of the city do you believe requires greatest investment in early years provision?

- None
- North Bristol
- East central
- South Bristol
- Not sure

15. Which part of the city do you believe requires greatest investment in SEN (Special Educational Needs) provision?

- None
- North Bristol
- East central
- South Bristol
- Not sure

16. Do you agree that the School Organisation Strategy should be reviewed on an annual basis?

- No
- Yes
- Not sure

17. Do you believe the School Organisation Strategy should be published as a glossy brochure or as cheaply as possible?

- Publish as a glossy brochure
- Publish as a cheaper document
- Only make available on the Internet
- Not sure

Equalities Monitoring

How would you describe yourself?

18. If you do not wish to provide any of the equalities information requested on this form, tick the box below. Otherwise, click 'Next' to continue to the equalities questions.

I do not wish to answer the equalities questions

19. Age

- 16 to 24
- 25 to 49
- 50 to 64
- 65 and over
- Prefer not to say*

20. Gender

- Male*
- Female*
- Prefer not to say*

21. Transgender

- Yes*
- No*
- Prefer not to say*

22. Ethnicity

- White British background*
- Other White background*
- Black and minority ethnic background*
- Prefer not to say*

23. Do you have a religion or belief?

- Yes*
- No*
- Prefer not to say*

24. Do you consider yourself disabled?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

25. How would you describe your sexuality?

- Lesbian, gay or bisexual
- Heterosexual (straight)
- Prefer not to say

**Thank you for taking the time to give us your views.
Please return your completed questionnaire to:**

**Michael Branaghan
Service Manager
Capital, Assets and School Organisation
Room 355
Council House
Bristol
BS1 5TR**

CONSULTATION FEEDBACK: SCHOOL ORGANISATION STRATEGY

June 30, 2011

“As would be expected the Strategy focuses on how the Council can create enough school places in order to meet its statutory obligations. Unfortunately, the plan does not carry any discussion about the need to ensure that not only are school places available but that such places are, so far as reasonably possible, made available at local schools enabling that child to be an active part of their local community. Not only is it of critical importance to the children but it is also relevant to the Council’s responsibilities to ensure sustainable travel, carbon reduction and equality of opportunity.

In the words of the Council:

“Many schools are at the heart of their communities, enriching and being enriched by the communities they serve. Not all are, with significant consequences for community cohesion, for travel and transport across the city ...” (Greater the Sum of the Parts: Developing the School System in Bristol – June 2010)

Linked to Paragraph 2 above, I am concerned by the statement “For administrative purposes, the City is divided into 10 Localities”. It was my understanding that the intention behind these localities was more than just administrative. Indeed, according to the Council’s submission to the Secretary of State entitled “World Class Primary Schools” (2010) the Council trumpets the 10 localities which it claims to have been established to provide a framework for joint working between the school and community partners. Indeed, these localities were, according to the Council’s submission, intended to “engage with local children and families to develop a better understanding of local need” and to “maintain a relationship with appropriate neighbourhood partnerships in order... to avoid... gaps in locally commissioned and provided services.” It is disappointing that for the purposes of the Strategy which will determine the future for many children across Bristol for many years, this commitment is reduced to nothing more than being for “administrative purposes”.

Has the Council considered its obligations under the Equality Act 2010? It is well understood judicial assumption that females will bear the

greater responsibility for childcare. On this basis, I am surprised that in the Equalities Impact statement (Appendix 1) such potential issues are not discussed or even identified given the historic and continuing problems that the Council has had securing local school for local children. I am concerned that the issue has not even been thought about let alone addressed.

The Strategy does not appear to give any consideration to the growing problems associated with the fragmentation of education provision. There are an increasing number of academies in Bristol (including the new St Ursula's Academy and 9 other applications across the City) which creates practical difficulties for the Council in terms of managing demand and planning capacity. This year, the Council has consistently defended the absence of sufficient school places in North 3 by attributing blame on the Department of Education for delays in the process of approving the new Academy on Brecon Lane. On this basis, I am surprised that the impact of the growing Academy and Free School movement is not discussed in the Strategy other than a brief mention in Paragraph 2.12. Given the problems it has apparently caused the Council this year, I would have expected it to appear as a "Headline Issue". This needs to be factored in to the Strategy to avoid a repeat of the 2011.

The Strategy does not appear to address the growing problems associated with the "Sibling Rule". Although most parents support the Sibling Rule there are concerns that it is being abused and that certain areas of the City (e.g. Redland, Westbury Park, Henleaze) are suffering from over demand because parents are moving out of the area upon entry of their eldest child to a local school. This frees up properties for even more parents to move into the area thereby creating more demand than there are places. It does not appear that any consideration has been given to this problem or the problem of fraudulent applications or temporary lets. It seems logical that the Council needs to address these issues as much as it needs to secure additional places.

The Strategy shows a very worrying lack of foresight for even the most immediate needs of local communities let alone the needs of those communities over the next ten years. For example:

In the East Central Area 1 the Strategy proposes:

A medium term (3 to 5 year) option to extend Lockleaze to 2FE dependent on future housing development. In fact, this has already been extended to 2FE entry for September 2011 with the additional class originally allocated to children living in Westbury Park, Redland and Henleaze. Initially Council officers and members claimed that this was just bringing forward an existing

plan but they have now conceded that it was an emergency measure taken the weekend before allocations letters were distributed as means of ensuring that it did not fail to meet its statutory duty in respect of children in North 3. As the situation in North 3 is unlikely to improve next year, how will this impact on medium term plans for the children of East Central Area 1.

It is only in the longer term (5 to 10 years) that the Council are planning to consider the explore opportunities to increase capacity at St Werburghs to 2FE. The fact that this will not even be considered for another 5 years is incomprehensible given the urgent need for additional places at that school for September 2011. It seems incredible that the no doubt lengthy and expensive research that went into this Strategy did not reveal that there was a far more urgent need for additional capacity in that school and that it could not wait for another 5 years. In truth it seems that it is complicated (because of its proximity to a lower tier COMAH site) but that just seems to reflect a mentality of deferring difficult issues irrespective of the detrimental effect that doing so will have on the local community. In five years the absence of local schooling could have destroyed that otherwise flourishing community.

In the North 1 Area the Strategy proposes:

A short term option is included to extend Avon Primary School by September 2012. As with Lockleaze, it is our understanding that this has already been extended for September 2011 to meet demand on children from North 3. How does this impact on future provision for children resident in North 1?

In the North 3 Area:

The Strategy does not specifically identify the predicted short fall for 2011 (despite the fact that the Authority had received applications by the date that it was published). It has been difficult to obtain exact numbers but we know that at least 90 children from North 3 were not allocated any of their three preference choices for September 2011. This is considerably more than the 1.5FE schools identified in the Strategy as needed by 2013 and the 2FE schools identified as needed by 2014. This has been alleviated by the opening of the St Ursula's Academy (if it happens by 2011) but there is still a significant shortfall bearing in mind the anticipated growth. The point is that proposals in this area need to be brought forward. They cannot be deferred to the medium or longer term as proposed.

The above examples (of which I am sure there are more) are evidence that this Strategy is out of date before it has even been implemented. That is very worrying for a ten year plan of such critical importance to the future of Bristol's children".

June 25, 2011

"I do not understand why parents whose 3 options are not met are being offered places at schools a restrictive distance away. Talking to parents I have learned that alternatives are offered usually 2 miles away ('s.e' below is another example) even when on average there are 6-8 schools closer. Is there no distance staggering? There is open source software out there that can be used to provide logical and fair distance solutions to such problems. But what seems a thoroughly Neanderthal and uncaring approach of Council officers seems based on a 'lazy' paper based allocation system, i.e., 'look at a map and see where we can dump them'.

In the case of my friend, a hard working single mum, she will have to walk a child who will only be 4 in August 2011 2 miles to and from a school damned by Ofsted in an area where he/she knows nobody and with no prospect of the child developing friends he can see after school. She is scared. Her child will be the youngest in his year and at risk of bullying. At just 4 when the school year starts he will already be tired when he reaches school. But Council officers do not care and conveniently lose her pleading letters. In her case her 3 choices have been denied but she has also been denied options at 9 other schools closer to her than the one offered! Crazy. She will probably have to pack in work to find time to walk him to and from school or take him out of education and school him at home, making themselves dependent on benefits. All because the Council officers lack the ability to stagger allocations by distance. She suffers from disabilities and a degenerative disease too, so will be exhausted walking to and from herself – but who at the Council gives a damn".

[June 25, 2011](#)

"I would be interested to know if the Council has consolidated the register of all available community assets it holds, these being spread between different departments, and whether the Council now knows all the assets it holds, which was not the case 2 years ago. If they have been consolidated the assets should be made known, transparently, so that those that might use them to develop new schools, either independently or in partnership with the Council, can offer valuable suggestions for the development of new sites. Assuming, of course, assets are in areas of need. A year ago I was told there were over 50

assets to be discharged. Where are they? How many could be utilised for primary school development in areas of population growth? With the potential for schools to be developed as 'academies' not all funding would need to come from the Council".

June 10, 2011

- “1. Old Fairfield site.
2. Old First Bus Depot on Muller Road – build the school at the back with admin offices etc at the front nearest the busy road and have the entrance opposite B&Q utilising the new cycle track bridge?
3. Old Brooks site.
4. Compulsory purchase the car exhaust site on the corner opposite the Polish Church.
5. Compulsory purchase houses on Ashley Down Road in front of Sefton Park School and expand there.
6. Memorial Ground when Bristol Rovers leave for Stoke Gifford – rather than a supermarket”.

June 10, 2011

“There are long term plans to utilise St Matthias and Fairfield, as well as a plan to expand St Werburghs but we need school places in this area now, not in 3 -5 years.

Although porta cabins are not a great long term option it is preferable to children being sent to unsuitable schools and communities being split by having local children being sent to schools outside of their community”.

June 2, 2011

“Long term, sustainable solutions will require innovation, political will and leadership. Now that urgent action is under way, the constraints are more to do with lack of finance and scarcity of land/buildings in the right places. And landlords will tend to drive up prices when they “see the Council coming”.

Pressure needs to be put on private land owners, e.g., persuading businesses that the default option of cramming apartments to maximum density into their surplus office buildings is not the preferred option. Without that, the necessary space cannot be had at an affordable price.

Expansion of existing, already cramped, sites will require creative thinking; many communities have this on tap — e.g., artists, artisans and architects among parents and others in the local community. Tap into this, rather than going with the “same old” contractual obligations.

To sum, the major problems are finding affordable new space and also refurbishing existing premises in an imaginative way. Focus activities on these: money, imagination, leadership are essential”.

May 31, 2011

“There has been primary school crisis groups in place in Bristol since about 2005! The council have seen this coming for years but refused to address it!! I dont think that small primary schools should be forced to be larger than 2 form entry unless they are very large sites otherwise the school community with struggle but it is clear that urgent action is needed for this September and for next year. Temporary classrooms are a really expensive and rubbish alternative to a proper school. I can understand why head teachers are resisting it as what they need is for the council to commit to a proper primary school building program to expand small school to 2 form entry without losing playgrounds / playing fields.

Creative thinking for using existing buildings in communities. (Sorry I dont believe libraries should close to these serve a much wider community than just school age)

In my area I cant understand why The Brooks site in St Werburghs remains empty or the old Fairfield site in Montpellier is underused when a primary school could have eased problems in my area

As someone who has moved to Bristol about 5 years ago (yes British but not a local) I find the comments about immigration disgusting. Bristol is a vibrant multicultural city like many European cities thats why people like it!

Would also like to say that I found the survey for the online strategy to be pointless – was it just done to tick a box?”

May 30, 2011

“Clearly we need to agreed some actions on this issue or face being in the same place in future. I would guess that a lot hinges on available cash so that is the first priority, to achieve extensions and new build in a way that doesn’t tie the council to years of expensive PFI projects which offer no additional value to the city.

Second – there are lots of primary schools which are popular and oversubscribed so it may be useful to see how they can extend to other sites under the same ‘brand’ and management and maybe take over less successful schools – providing they are kept within the LEA structure (if the LEA structure is capable of thinking outside the box that is). This might help to address issues of low demand in certain schools and this must be part of a solution for the city.

Finally, maybe we would gain a lot as a city if we were to think of stacking up other activities around new school sites so that other activities that added value such as youth work etc could be offered on the same site. This might work better in secondary school campuses (the non PFI ones) and it would help to reduce the overall cost of developing the site. Dare I say it, but maybe we need to pilot this type of idea and see who else would come in – perhaps it would be worth offering school catering to the organisation that offered to pay for the build of the catering space? As there is probably little in the way of new money, this could go some way in answering my first point. Time to look to the future and forget some of the cherished but unachievable past”.

[May 28, 2011](#)

“One way to ensure the best use of existing places are used more efficiently would be to allow parents an much longer list of preferred schools and advise them to make use of all their preferences. We have been caught in the reception places ‘black hole’ in BS3 this year, our boy has been offered a place at a school more than two miles walk from home as we didn’t live close enough to our 3 preferred schools. If we had been allowed a much longer list, he would have probably been allocated one of the six schools within a mile of home as it is obvious from the ‘farthest distance’ stats from the less popular local schools that children are traveling from farther afield to get to these schools rather than attend their local schools in Knowle and beyond. If everyone had a long list of preferred schools, hardly anyone would have to travel far to get to school”.

[May 24, 2011](#)

“Sorry i am going to be blunt.

We are one of the families involved in this c**k up by the council, and we are so angry that the “system” has failed our son. Lets be honest, immigration into Bristol plays a huge part in this problem and people are afraid to say it. Myself and my husband were born in Bedminster/Ashton, having now lived here for 45yrs+.we want our son to go to local schools, be brought up in our local community as we did, yet we were offered a place 2miles away from our community, why should immigrants take preference?

We have both worked bl**dy hard as most of us do to move into a fairly decent area to hopefully give our son the best possible start in life, yet people who have just moved to Bristol have had no problems, it makes me livid.

the council knew this problem would arise years ago yet sat back and did nothing, but add more, apartments, shops etc to the area!”

[May 25, 2011 at 15:39](#) *Bristol City Council*

“Immigration is only one of a number of factors that influence the availability of schools places. The City Council has no control over what international immigration occurs into the City.

Other factors that have influenced the availability of places include: the popularity of some school over others, the increase in the number of houses that have been converted into flats which are being occupied by families, the increase in the birth rate, and economic factors that have resulted in a slow-down of the movement of people within the city”.

[June 10, 2011 at 19:03](#)

“It is clear that despite the council being ‘legally’ obliged to provide a local school place, they have not fulfilled this. If I did not do my job, there would be serious repercussions. The council have not done theirs. They have known about this for years and insufficient action has been taken. What consequences will THEY face for not doing their job properly?

Furthermore, what are they actually doing to ensure this does not happen in the future? More temporary classrooms? More parents facing uncertainty and insecurity?”

[May 23, 2011](#)

“A local primary school is an important part of any local community. It is a focus for young parents and a means by which children and parents can get to know each other and support each other in the context of a child’s education. A sense of family and friends gives security to a child and helps them develop their own personality and skills inside and outside the class room.

The debate about the provision of new buildings in this context is most important.

Cost is important but not as important as making the right long term decision even though that may appear to be more important today. Good education and social togetherness of families reduces other costs eg policing and welfare costs.

On this basis consideration ought to be given to primary school buildings as part of a bigger complex which would see GPs surgeries, Government Department public counters, post offices, libraries, day nurseries and the like [including a coffee shop] all brought together with a decent bus service.

With parents leading busy lives having everything at hand would make their lives easier and thus improve the quality of life for the child as well as being a place where people of all ages would meet.

One larger complex would be less costly than say five separate buildings. Running costs would probably be less and more effective eg the school library could be part of the general library and young children could get used to a library as a place to go to find out more than could be given in the class room and improve reading skills.

The point of all this is to say that the lives of busy parents where both parents work should be factored in to decisions as two jobs in a family is a fact of life these days that does affect the way young children have to live.

A centre such as the one I am proposing could have after school hours provision for children which children might enjoy as well as taking stress off parents in arrangements to collect children.

So the message is at this stage think much more broadly about children in the family and the community as well as at school”.

[May 21, 2011](#)

“New thinking might avoid such expensive capital plans. My suggestions are:

- Convert libraries into schools and reduce the footprint of the library component. Councils have no statutory obligation to provide libraries.
- Work with the Anglican Church and other churches and faiths to take over little used or redundant church buildings and convert into schools or agree a dual use of buildings as they tend to use their buildings outside of school hours. Churches are widely located throughout the city.
- If new build is needed look at retail shed style construction with partitions. By using an existing standard design you will keep costs down.
- Embrace Academy Schools and sponsors. Tony Blair founded academies, the Coalition approves of them so get on board if you can. That way others pick up the bills and you might access central government cash if there is any”.

[May 20, 2011](#)

“2 cheap suggestions:

(1) Allow classroom places to rise and fall as waves of population occur at different ages.

(2) Don't sell off schools again when class sizes fall like the council did in the 80's and 90's".

[May 20, 2011](#)

"Perhaps for a trial period, could our secondary schools consider looking at the possibility of merging or working with any local oversubscribed primary schools and organize turning an area of the secondary school over to primary teaching until such time as the children become eligible for secondary school education?"

[May 20, 2011](#)

"Additionally to my previous post the council should attempt in procurement for primary school architects and contractors to work on more than one school with the same contractor to try and achieve economies of scale.

In terms of school sizes I also believe that the best performing schools are those that are small so I would be reluctant and most disappointed to see any primary school created or expand with more than a year group intake of 60 the equivalent to two classes. so a 210 space or 420 space primary school in my opinion should not be exceeded in order to maintain a healthy pupil/community ratio in which children can thrive".

[May 20, 2011](#)

"You should have built schools big enough to cope with demand fluctuations. If you can't afford to build enough school places to cope with demand fluctuations then you need to find a better solution than portacabins. Why not work with the private sector to take up some of their surplus places. Perhaps go into partnership with them to purchase excess places at a discount? Filling portacabins with surplus pupils on existing schools is an unacceptable solution. You won't be putting my kids in a portacabin.

It isn't rocket science that private schools will be less busy in a recession. Everyone knew there was a recession coming. Why not the City Council?

Why did you not know how many people had been born and were living in the city. Most of them have been here for 4 years by the time you

need to find them a primary place. Surely health visitors, hospitals and preschools have this information to help you.

The rest of the places you did not predict will be for eastern Europeans no doubt. Another reason why we should close our borders I'm afraid. If children in Southville cannot get a primary school place because there are lots of Polish and Ukrainian children getting them first then something needs to be done about that".

[May 20, 2011](#)

"Additional Primary school places should be provided for in the areas where they are required most. If as stated those areas are peripheral areas then they should be built in these locations. With south Bristol expected in the core strategy to be the focus of most new housing development over the next few years then it would make sense for these developments to contribute through s10g agreements to the provision of new primary schools in these areas. The council should also consider the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy which can be used in tandem with s106's and not instead of. My understanding is there have also previously been s106 agreements secured for school places provision and that this remains unspent. This should be utilised urgently towards a primary school in the North of the city where the situation is already acute. In terms of land as has been previously suggested there is an excess in some areas of open space provision particularly in the peripheral areas of the city then some of this land could/should be used for primary schools.- it would also be relatively cheap considering most of this land is council owned.

I'm not particularly a fan of free schools or academies but as these are what are on offer at the moment these options should also be considered along with faith schools.

In some areas of Bristol that are heavily built up the council should look to learn from some continental schools such as in the Netherlands, Germany and Sweden, where existing buildings have been refurbished to accommodate school. There is also a precedent here in the UK for urban primary schools e.g. Hampden Gurney COF E in Westminster, where space is limited".

[May 20, 2011](#)

"I've never given any thought to this before but now that the question has been asked I'd suggest the following:

Where possible rebuild sections of existing primary schools in stages over a 10 year project. All existing schools where the population around them has the highest demand should see buildings with up to five

floors, a basement floor, grand floor and three higher floors with new halls and conferencing centres on the lower levels.

Space is key to the new designs so innovation is required to put Bristol at the forefront of change, making use of space and offering three times more for less!

Existing parks and open spaces need to be used as Friends of the local parks scheme joins forces with education provision. Library services linked with schools and an extra-curricular programme implemented so that local universities and secondary schools play a greater role in assisting primary education and provision.

Community centres rebuilt and used as outreach centres to play a bigger role in connecting people and places and places of worship which are empty in the day used as multi-media centres to watch documentaries, alternative lecture theatres and guest speaking rooms for an alternative teaching method in moving with modern use of technology and space.

This doesn't have to be a real concern, it is actually a very exciting situation to be in and a very creative way to deal with it so that the suburbs of Bristol are linked, involved and embraced by a new way of educational learning and movements. To build education links around change and keep spending minimal can see all young people enjoying the journey and playing a role in their own future".

[May 20, 2011](#)

"Why not explore using spare capacity in the private sector as an alternative to incurring large capital costs in putting in temporary structures, or new builds. There are other ways of providing for people's educational needs which this reports hasn't considered. The council could also put out to tender the requirement to provide education in order to get the extra provision it requires. That way, when it isn't needed, the council can terminate the contract at an appropriate break point".

Appendix A - Annex 3

Response to the Equalities Questions

Counts Analysis % Respondents	
Base	33 100.0%
Age	
16 to 24	- -
25 to 49	29 87.9%
50 to 64	2 6.1%
65 and over	2 6.1%
Prefer not to say	- -

Counts Analysis % Respondents	
Base	33 100.0%
Gender	
Male	13 39.4%
Female	20 60.6%
Prefer not to say	- -

Counts Analysis % Respondents	
Base	28 100.0%
Transgender	
Yes	1 3.6%
No	27 96.4%
Prefer not to say	- -

Counts Analysis % Respondents	
Base	33 100.0%
Ethnicity	
White British background	29 87.9%
Other White background	2 6.1%
Black and minority ethnic background	2 6.1%
Prefer not to say	- -

Counts Analysis % Respondents	
Base	33 100.0%
Do you have a religion or belief?	
Yes	10 30.3%
No	19 57.6%
Prefer not to say	4 12.1%

Counts Analysis % Respondents	
Base	33 100.0%
Do you consider yourself disabled?	
Yes	1 3.0%
No	31 93.9%
Prefer not to say	1 3.0%

Counts Analysis % Respondents	
Base	33 100.0%
How would you describe your sexuality?	
Lesbian, gay or bisexual	- -
Heterosexual (straight)	30 90.9%
Prefer not to say	3 9.1%

SUMMARY OF JAMES REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS¹

- Capital investment and apportionment based on objective facts and clear, consistently-applied criteria, with allocation focused on the need for high-quality school places and the condition of facilities (knowledge of which will improve over time);
- Demand-led programmes (such as Free Schools) funded from the centre with a centrally retained budget set aside for them;
- Apportionment of the available capital as a single, flexible budget for each local area, with a mandate to include ministerial priorities in determining allocations;
- Notional budgets apportioned to local authority areas, which would draw up a 'local investment plan', through a process involving all Responsible Bodies (i.e. those which own and manage facilities) and hosted by the Local Authority;
- A light-touch approval process through a new 'Central Body', which could thereby identify similar types of project in order to create 'pipelines' of work to provide the basis for securing better deals with contractors and suppliers;
- Modest allocations to individual institutions for small capital works and ICT provision, aggregated up to Responsible Bodies wherever possible according to the number of institutions for which they are responsible, for them to use for appropriate maintenance across their estate (working in partnership with their institutions) – with clear guidance on legal responsibilities for building maintenance, including on how revenue funding may be used;
- A central database on the condition of buildings based on existing data, with a rolling 20% sample of independent condition surveys to provide a full picture over five years, and thereafter;
- Development of a standardised suite of drawings and specifications that can be easily applied across a wide range of projects, which would be coordinated centrally to deliver best value and would be continuously improved through learning from projects, including post occupancy evaluations;

¹ Martin Rogers, LGiU/CSN Associate, LGiU/csn essential policy briefing, 15/04/2011

- A Central Body with the capacity and expertise to act as the 'expert client' across the system, with responsibility for data collection, allocation of funding and setting expected outputs, signing off local investment plans, procuring and managing national contracts with suppliers, directly procuring and managing most new build and other major contracts, monitoring the performance of contractors and Responsible Bodies, ensuring continuous improvement through the system, working with the industry supply chain to drive down costs and timescales, and deliver high quality buildings on time and on budget.

Risk Assessment

SCHOOL ORGANISATION STRATEGY

No	RISK Threat to achievement of key objectives of the report	RISK CONTROL MEASURES			ASSESSMENT OF RESIDUAL RISK	
		Impact	Probability	Mitigation (ie controls) and Evaluation (ie effectiveness of mitigation)	Impact	Probability
1	The demographic changes forecast do not occur and either there is a shortfall or over capacity of provision in all education sectors.	High	Medium	The forecasts are based on GP register information from public health which forms a major part of the predictive model used in estimating future roll numbers. Additionally, the model looks at previous years trends and adds information concerning residential planning applications. Unless there are extraordinary influences on the mortality of the population the model is considered robust.	High	Low
2	Planning approval required to develop the mitigation for the increased population trends is not achieved.	High	Medium	Officers will continue to work closely with planning officers and highways officers to explore options for mitigation of aspects of the additional provision that may cause problems securing approval.	High	Low
3	Given the current economic climate there may be insufficient financial resources in the future to resource the additional building requirements.	High	High	There will be a need to prioritise projects. The key priorities will be meeting statutory obligations in terms of pupil places and health and safety.	Medium	Medium
4	The construction project overruns and additional pupil places are not available in the timeframes required.	High	Medium	Work has already been undertaken to meet short term priorities. The LEP have demonstrated that projects can be designed and built within 18 to 24 months and recent work has looked at different construction approaches to radically reduce delivery timescales.	Medium	Low

No	RISK	Impact	Probability	Mitigation (ie controls) and Evaluation (ie effectiveness of mitigation)	Impact	Probability
5	The proposed new facilities within the School Organisation Plan fail to attract sufficient pupils and therefore the schools have funding difficulties.	High	Medium	The strategy has focused on locality areas. This has enabled Admission trends to be modelled at an area level. The knowledge base within the Admissions Team is such that they have been able to identify which schools would benefit from additional accommodation without negatively impacting on adjacent schools. Additionally, feedback from the series of locality meetings has meant that schools have been able to comment and advise on trends at a local level.	Medium	Low
6	The investment proposals in some schools impact on parental preferences of adjoining.	High	Medium	The knowledge base within the Admissions Team is such that they have been able to identify which schools would benefit from additional accommodation without negatively impacting on adjacent schools. Additionally, feedback from the series of locality meetings has meant that schools have been able to comment and advise on trends at a local level.	High	Low
7	Schools that are currently less popular with parents remain unpopular.	High	High	During the locality meetings held in June to September 2010 it was suggested that there should be a concerted investment in marketing less popular schools.	High	Medium

BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL

Equality Impact Assessment – Part One - Screening

Part one of an EqlA – the screening – should be carried out at the planning and development stage of a policy, project, service, contract or strategy. This form should be used in conjunction with the guidance and as the first part of a full EqlA.

Name of policy, project, service, contract or strategy being assessed	School Organisation Strategy
Directorate and Service	Children and Young People's Services - Education Strategy and Targeted Support
Names and roles of officers completing the assessment	Michael Branaghan: Service Manager - Capital, Assets and Access
Main contact telephone number	0117 922 3384
Date	7 th July 2011

1. Identify the aims of the policy, project, service, contract or strategy and how it is implemented

	Key Questions	Notes / Answers	Neutral/Positive/ Negative Impacts	Any actions needed? By whom?
1.	Is this a new policy, project, service, contract or strategy or a review of an existing one?	This is a new strategy arising as a recommendation of the review undertaken by Cambridge Education in 2009.	Neutral:	The short term proposals within the School Organisation strategy were approved by Cabinet on 24 th March 2011 (CAB 53.3/11) to ensure that the required Reception places would be available for September 2011. Following approval of the recommendations by Cabinet on 21 st July 2011 work will commence on undertaking feasibility work for the development of additional capacity for September 2012.
2.	What is the main purpose of the policy, project, service, contract or strategy?	Education Act 1996 s14 The Local Authority has a duty ...to ensure the provision of 'sufficient schools' for the provision of primary and secondary education in their area.	Positive: The School Organisation Strategy will clarify future requirements for capital investment to ensure that there is suitable and sufficient provision of school places.	There will be a need to invest capital funding in the provision of additional school places to meet forecast demand.
3.	What are the main activities of the policy, project, service, contract or strat-	To provide enough school places and to increase	Positive:	There will be a need to invest capital funding in the provision of additional

	Key Questions	Notes / Answers	Neutral/Positive/ Negative Impacts	Any actions needed? By whom?
	egy?	diversity and choice of educational provision.	The strategy will identify the future needs in terms of educational provision within the local communities and will enable greater parental choice.	school places to meet forecast demand.
4.	Who are the main beneficiaries? Whose needs are it designed to meet?	Children in the age range of 8 to 18.	Positive: The strategy will identify the future needs in terms of educational provision within the local communities and will enable greater parental choice.	There will be a need to invest capital funding in the provision of additional school places to meet forecast demand.
5.	Which staffs carries out the policy, project, service, contract or strategy?	The Capital, Assets and Access Team within CYPS working with the Local Education partnership (LEP).	Neutral:	The projects will be delivered through the Local Education Partnership (LEP).
6.	Are there areas of the policy or function that could be governed by an officer's judgement? eg. home visits "where appropriate". If so, is there guidance on how to exercise this to prevent	None	Neutral:	None

	Key Questions	Notes / Answers	Neutral/Positive/ Negative Impacts	Any actions needed? By whom?
	any possible bias/prejudice creeping in?			
7.	<p>Is the Council working in Partnership with other organisations to implement this policy or function? Should this be taken into consideration? eg. Agree equalities monitoring categories</p> <p>Should the partnership arrangements have an EqIA?</p>	<p>The City Council is working in partnership with the Local Education Partnership (LEP) and other construction partners in relation to the build element of the scheme. The City Council is also working with schools, the Diocese and the DfE.</p>	Neutral:	None
8.	<p>Taking the six strands of equalities: do you have any initial thoughts that any of the six equalities strands have particular needs relevant to the policy or function?</p> <p>Or is there anything in the policy, project, service, con-</p>	<p>The School Organisation Strategy addresses aspects of inequality that currently exists in terms of access to local education provision within localities and also in terms of meeting DDA Requirements.</p>		None

	Key Questions	Notes / Answers	Neutral/Positive/ Negative Impacts	Any actions needed? By whom?
	<p>tract or strategy that you can think of at this stage that could discriminate or disadvantage any groups of people? ie.</p> <p>Gender (include Transgender)</p> <p>Disability</p> <p>Age</p> <p>Race</p> <p>Sexual Orientation</p> <p>Faith/Belief</p> <p>Do any other specific groups have particular needs relevant to the policy, project, service, contract or strategy?</p>	<p>Gender – None:</p> <p>The strategy makes no distinction in terms of gender in relation to provision:</p> <p>Transgender – None:</p> <p>The strategy makes no distinction in terms of gender in relation to provision</p> <p>Disability – Yes:</p> <p>The strategy identifies the need to increase SEN provision to meet 1% positive change in the demographics for children with ASD and Severe Learning and Communication Needs (SLCN).</p> <p>Age – Yes:</p>	<p>Gender – Neutral:</p> <p>Transgender – Neutral:</p> <p>The strategy is not expected to have any impact in relation to transgender.</p> <p>Disability – Positive:</p> <p>The strategy and consultation feedback identify the need for more SEN provision and the need to explore opportunities for inclusion.</p>	<p>SEN Team working with the Capital Assets and Access Team to identify development opportunities.</p>

	Key Questions	Notes / Answers	Neutral/Positive/ Negative Impacts	Any actions needed? By whom?
		<p>The Strategy identifies the need to ensure that there are or meeting statutory requirement to ensure the provision of 'sufficient schools' for the provision of primary and secondary education in their area.</p> <p>Race – None:</p> <p>The strategy makes no distinction in terms of gender in relation to Race.</p> <p>Sexual Orientation – None:</p> <p>The Strategy is not expected to have any impact in relation to sexual orientation.</p> <p>Faith/Belief – Yes:</p> <p>The strategy identifies the need for Faith based provision.</p>	<p>Age – Positive:</p> <p>The Strategy will ensure that there is suitable provision and provide opportunities for the diversity of provision.</p> <p>Race – Neutral:</p> <p>Sexual Orientation – Neutral:</p> <p>The Strategy is not expected to have any impact in relation to sexual orientation.</p>	<p>Capital Assets and Access Team to identify development opportunities.</p>

	Key Questions	Notes / Answers	Neutral/Positive/ Negative Impacts	Any actions needed? By whom?
		<p>Other Groups (Social economic deprivation) – None:</p> <p>The strategy makes no distinction in terms of social economic deprivation.</p>	<p>Faith/Belief – Positive</p> <p>Other Groups (Social economic deprivation) – Neutral:</p>	
9.	<p>Did you use any data to inform your initial thoughts above?</p> <p>What data do you already have?</p>	Data from the Admissions Team.	Neutral:	None
10.	<p>Are there gaps in the data that require you to do further work?</p> <p>What are these gaps?</p>	None	Neutral:	None
11.	Impact on community relations	None	<p>Neutral:</p> <p>The strategy is not expected to have a negative im-</p>	None

	Key Questions	Notes / Answers	Neutral/Positive/ Negative Impacts	Any actions needed? By whom?
			pact on community relations.	

If the result of the screening process is that there is the potential for a significant impact on any equality group or if any equality group has significantly different needs, then a full equality impact assessment must be carried out. If you are unsure please seek advice from a directorate or corporate equalities officer.

Signed

Service Manager: Capital, Assets and Access

Date 7th July 2011

Signed

Directorate Equalities Adviser/Officer or Equalities Contact

Date

Eco Impact Checklist

Title of report: School Organisation Strategy
Report author: Mick Branaghan
Anticipated date of key decision

Summary of proposals:
 That the School Organisation Strategy is approved.

That the Strategic Director: Children, Young People and Skills, in consultation with the appropriate Executive Members, is authorised to undertake option appraisals and feasibility work to secure fixed price quotations for subsequent approval by Cabinet prior to the final implementation of the construction project proposals.

Will the proposal impact on...	Yes/ No	+ive or -ive	If yes...	
			Briefly describe impact	Briefly describe Mitigation measures
Emission of Climate Changing Gases?	Y	-ve	<p>In the short-term, there is a potential for secondary emissions of climate changing gases arising through the use of energy and materials during the construction works. Additionally, new buildings on sites that have not previously been occupied by buildings will increase the overall carbon footprint of the site.</p> <p>By increasing capacity near to the point of demand, travel impacts may be reduced.</p>	<p>Alternatives to resistance electrical heating to be implemented where feasible.</p> <p>20% of energy demand to be met through on-site renewables. (BCS 14 planning requirement)</p> <p>New builds to be:</p> <p>To 2012: BREEAM “Very Good”.</p> <p>2013-15: BREEAM “Excellent”</p>

				2016 on: BREEAM “Outstanding”
Bristol's vulnerability to the effects of climate change?	Y	-ve	<p>New buildings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -May be at risk of flooding. -May increase the area of impermeable surfaces -May not be robust enough to cope with extreme temperature variations, or violent storms -Consume water 	<p>Sustainability Statement to detail how the development responds to the need to mitigate and adapt to climate change. (BCS13 planning Requirement).</p> <p>Ensure that peak surface-water run-off is not increased.</p>
Consumption of non-renewable resources?	Y	-ve	<p>In the short-term, there is a potential for the consumption of fossil fuels and other non-renewable materials products arising through the use of energy and materials during the construction works.</p> <p>In the long-term, there will be consumption of fossil fuels for heating and power, and also for travel to and from the sites</p>	<p>Sustainability of materials is considered as part of the BREEAM assessment.</p> <p>School travel plans are required for all schools within the LEA.</p>
Production, recycling or disposal of waste	Y	-ve	<p>Waste will arise from construction and demolition works</p> <p>Waste will arise from the normal operation of the school</p>	<p>Construction contractors will be legally obliged to prepare site waste management plans for all projects in excess of £300k, which detail how waste will be minimised, and recycling promoted.</p> <p>All schools will be required to provide recycling facilities – in particular, paper, glass, cardboard and food.</p>

The appearance of the city?	Y	?	New, refurbished or rebuilt schools will alter the appearance of the city	The suitability of the buildings' appearance will be considered as part of the planning applications
Pollution to land, water, or air?	Y	-ve	If brownfield sites are chosen, they may be contaminated There is a risk of hazardous materials (e.g. fuels or paints) being spilled during construction works.	The Pollution Control team will advise as part of the planning application The construction contractor will be subject to site inspection to ensure that hazardous materials are adequately controlled
Wildlife and habitats?	Y	?	It is possible that sites for new schools will: Impact upon protected species or habitats Reduce green spaces/ corridors Remove trees	-Seek guidance on protecting species & habitats from the Natural Environment team, and implement their recommendations.

Consulted with: Steve Ransom, Sustainable City Group.

Summary of impacts and Mitigation - to go into the main Cabinet/ Council Report

The significant impacts of this proposal are....

Short-term increase in environmental impacts through the consumption of fossil fuels and raw materials in constructing and refurbishing schools. Longer term, there will be on-going consumption of energy for heat and power, production of waste and staff and pupil travel to school. Potential exists for positive effects from refurbishment & expansion projects, for example, renewable energy generation. There may be some positive impacts through reduced travel, due to additional capacity near to the point of demand.

It is noted that the use of modular accommodation is proposed. This will require careful planning and implementation to minimise negative impacts.

The proposals include the following measures to mitigate the impacts ...

Mitigation will be tailored on an individual basis, but will observe the following general principles:

- Construction of facilities to BREEAM standards:
 - To 2012: BREEAM “Very Good”.
 - 2013-15: BREEAM “Excellent”
 - 2016 on: BREEAM “Outstanding”
- Meet the planning requirement for 20% of energy demand to be met from on-site renewables.
- Use of Sustainable Drainage to ensure no net increase in peak surface-water run-off.
- Resilience to flooding and extremes of temperature.
- Travel plan to be operational within 6 months of the facility opening.
- It is noted that any new planning permissions will need to comply with the following policies from the Core Strategy:

BCS 13 - Climate change – mitigation and adaptation

BCS 14 - Sustainable energy

BCS 15 - Sustainable design and construction

BCS 16 - Flood risk and water management

The net effects of the proposals are....

Research indicates that direct energy-related emissions in primary schools are, on average approximately 300 kg/ CO₂/ pupil/ year. Provision of c. 3,000 extra places could therefore lead to an extra 900 tonnes/ CO₂/ year, plus additional emissions from transport and procurement of goods and services. This would increase the current total school building emissions by approximately 5%. In the longer term, there will also be increased emissions from increased secondary-school places. Emissions can be significantly reduced through specification and design of the new facilities, and sustainable procurement of goods and services.

The overall impact is negative.

(CO₂ data source: Global Action Plan – UK Schools Carbon Footprint Scoping Study)

Checklist completed by:

Name:	Mick Branaghan
Dept.:	CYPS
Extension:	0117 922 3384
Date:	Revised 29 th June 2011
Verified by Sustainable City Group	Steve Ransom