

BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL

Cabinet

10th January 2008

Report of: Director of Children and Young People's Services

**Title: Proposals to Increase Primary Capacity –
Ashley/Bishopston Wards**

**Wards: Ashley, Bishopston, and
Redland Wards**

**Contact Officer: Michael Branaghan, Strategy
Leader – Capital, Assets and
School Organisation**

Contact telephone number: 0117 922 3384

Recommendation

- A. That the Local Education Partnership (LEP) is requested to undertake Stage 0 and Stage 1 design and development for the extension of the Sefton Park schools.
- B. Where final cost proposals are within the approved capital programme the scheme is implemented.

Summary

The significant issues in the report are:

- There is an urgent need to address the shortfall of primary places within Ashley, Redland and Bishopston Wards (paragraph 1 refers);
- The expansion proposal for Sefton Park Schools will provide a better educational outcome than two schools on separate sites (paragraph 6 refers);
- The expansion of the Sefton Park Schools is consistent with the Primary Review (paragraph 9 refers);
- Other options have been considered and discounted at this stage (paragraph 17 to 28 refer).

Policy

2006-09 Corporate Plan objectives:

- **Learning and Achievement**
 - Implementing the national 'Change for Children' Programme;
 - Raising educational attainment;
 - Improving education for vulnerable children;
 - Providing new and better schools.

Consultation

Internal:

- Central Support Services
- Culture and Leisure Services
- Sefton Park Primary School
- Sefton Park Infants School
- Ashley Down Infants School
- Ashley Down Junior School
- Bishop Road Primary School
- St Bonaventure's Catholic Primary School
- Ward Members
 - Ashley Ward
 - Bishopston Ward

- Redland Ward

External

- Gloucestershire County Cricket Club

Context

Introduction

1. There is an urgent need to address primary school capacity shortfalls within Ashley, Redland and Bishopston Wards.
2. For a number of years the applications for school places in Sefton Park Infant School and other neighbouring schools has been significantly greater than the number of places available. For admission to school in September 2007, the Authority was unable to offer a place in a local school for a number of applicants and alternative school places had to be offered at some distance from their home address. The lack of school places in the area has led to an increasing number of school appeals.
3. Over the past few years Cabinet has considered various proposals to remedy the shortfall in school places. On 22nd February 2007(CAB 85.2/07) officers were instructed by Cabinet to consult on the establishment of a new school on the Brunel Field site (within the Bishopston Ward) and to commission the Local Education Partnership (LEP) to undertake the design of the school to Stage 1 (RIBA C) within the Strategic Partnering Agreement.
4. Prior to the implementation of the February 2007 Cabinet instruction, the DfES (now DCSF) advised local authorities that new school organisational arrangements were to come into force from 25th May 2007. As a result of these legislative changes the School Organisation Committee was abolished and new school organisation arrangements were published.
5. The new arrangements include the need for local authorities to enter into a competition phase when a new school is proposed. Developing new Council processes to meet these new statutory requirements created a delay in opening the consultation on the new school.

Sefton Park Proposals

6. Officers have undertaken an initial feasibility to develop a 210 place extension at the Sefton Park schools to increase the overall school capacity on the existing site. Officers are of the opinion that the enlargement of the Sefton Park schools will provide a better educational outcome than two schools on separate sites.
7. The new proposal excludes the original proposal to co-locate the Elmfield Primary provision on the Sefton Park site and involves the demolition of the Youth Service building to provide space for the extension of the existing schools. To achieve this proposal the management structure of the school may need further consideration.
8. The Director of Culture and Leisure Services has indicated that Youth Services would wish to relocate to the Settlement: subject to any necessary alterations that would need to be made e.g. DDA. Separate consideration would need to be given to re-accommodating the voluntary groups who currently work from the Youth Service building at Sefton Park and are Bishopston focussed. One possibility is that these groups could work from the new school.
9. The expansion of the Sefton Park schools is consistent with the Primary Review, considered by Cabinet on 25th October 2007 (CAB 19.10/07), which seeks to provide larger units.
10. The extension and refurbishment proposals will include:
 - The modernisation of the existing school (i.e. classroom extension);
 - The provision of new teaching areas, hall and kitchen facilities (including water sprinklers in the new building);
 - New 'off-street' car parking facilities (to reduce congestion in Saint Bartholomew's Road and Williamson Road. This will also make access and egress to all properties in these two locations much safer);
 - Additional external facilities (including a new 'all-weather' Multi Use Games Area (MUGA));
 - Safer new access and egress arrangements to the school;

- Full compliance of the whole school to the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) access requirements;
 - Improved external landscaping (improving the overall aesthetics of the area).
11. An initial feasibility has been undertaken on the Sefton Park proposal and the estimated cost of this scheme would be £6.62m (plus approximately £300k costs associated with relocating the Youth Services to the Settlement).

Consultation

12. In February 2007 there had been a wide consultation on the proposals for the Brunel Field site. Sefton Park Infant and Junior Schools held a joint governing body meeting (on 23rd January 2007) to discuss that earlier report. The Chair of Sefton Park Infant School reported that:

“...the feeling of the meeting was very much to support the building of a single form entry school on the reserved site in Ashley Down [The Brunel site] as soon as possible”.

13. The joint governing body stated that:

“...with the impact of the new housing developments in the area now being felt, the need for increased primary provision in the area has become more pressing. More and more children are being denied the opportunity to go to a local school because adequate and appropriate provision has not been made for them. The single form entry school offers the best chance of making some improvement to this situation...”.

14. Governors expressed concerned that the new school would only provide places for the influx of children into the new housing developments. They expressed strong feeling that a larger school should be planned for in the area in addition to the urgently needed single form entry school. This would then deal with the larger shortfall of places in this part of Bristol.

15. Following a meeting on 11 December, 2007 between the CYPs Executive Member; an officer of Bristol City council; and representatives of the governing body, a subsequent meeting of the school governing body confirmed the previous statement and added that

“...the governing body is happy to support the expansion of our schools to three-form entry as long as the whole site and the buildings outlined in the plans shown to us can be provided. In view of the many years that the question of inadequate primary provision in this part of Bristol has been discussed, we would urge that, whatever is decided, plans should be turned into action with all speed...”

16. Ward Members have been consulted on the proposals. They have stated that

“...the paramount consideration, as it has been for years, is to provide sufficient good quality Primary places for local children in local schools. The new Sefton Park proposals contribute to this debate...”

Ward members have raised an number of detailed comments that will be addressed in correspondence by the CYPS Executive.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Sefton Park Schools

17. When Cabinet first looked at earlier proposals for the Sefton Park schools, three schemes were considered. These were:

- The re-location and enlargement of the junior school on the Brunel Field site and to enlarge the infant school on the existing site – this option was rejected because there was insufficient space on the new site for a school larger than one form of entry.
- To re-locate and enlarge the infant school on the Brunel site and to enlarge the junior school on the existing site – this option was rejected as there was insufficient space on the new site for a school larger than one form of entry.
- To expand both Sefton Park Infant and Junior Schools on the existing site (to include a relocated Elmfield Primary provision) – this option was rejected due to cost and space restrictions. The original scheme was also constrained by the retention of the Youth Centre building.

The Brunel Field Site Scheme

18. The Cabinet instruction of 22nd February 2007 (CAB 85.2/07) related specifically to the Brunel Field site. The site is currently a playing field and is in the ownership of the City of Bristol College. As part of a Section 106 Agreement the playing field will be transferred to the City Council to enable the development of a primary school. Additionally, the developer has made a financial contribution of £431,832 towards the development of the new school. This funding has a time-limit and will have to be spent by 29th May 2012 (see paragraph 23).
19. The Brunel field has been used for a number of years by the Gloucestershire County Cricket Club (GCCC) as an occasional car park and for the location of a 'food village'. In a letter dated 19th November 2007, to the Director of Children and Young People's Services (Appendix A), the Cricket Club have expressed concerns about the potential loss of the facility for major match days if the school were to be built on the field.
20. In their letter of the 19th November 2007 the GCCC conclude that:
- "GCCC has been very happy to work with Bristol City Council to discuss the problems posed by the school proposal. We continue to believe that, in arriving at a decision, it is essential to consider the social and economic needs of all parties including GCCC and the City of Bristol College. We now respectively submit that in our careful considered opinion the needs of all will not be best met by building a new school on the college site".*
21. The feasibility study for the Bishopston Ward School has produced a design that can accommodate some of the GCCC land requirements for car parking. During those periods of time when the GCCC require the playing field for car parking the school will use an enhanced multi-use-games-area (MUGA). There would be a permanent and secure separation of the hard play facilities and habitat/social areas from the playing field. Access to the playing field by the school would be through a secure lockable gate.
22. A formal arrangement would be required between the school and the GCCC to utilise the playing field for car parking during important matches such as one-day Internationals and 20/20 matches etc. (approximately 30 days each year during term time).

- 23.** If the land is no longer required by the City Council for a new primary school it might not transfer and could remain with the College. The financial contribution of £431,832 would be applied to other primary provision within the area. There is still an opportunity to have discussions with the College and the GCCC over the future of this site in the medium term. The site has potential if additional future school capacity is required in the medium term following completion of the Sefton Park scheme.

Millpond and Glenfrome Primary Schools

- 24.** Other schools in a 2-mile radius of Sefton Park were also considered for expansion. Unfortunately, there is no possibility of absorbing any additional pupils into the other schools. Where there are surplus places they are relatively minor and tend to be located too far away for parents to realistically look for, or accept, a school place.
- 25.** With the exception of Millpond and Glenfrome Primary Schools, the existing school sites are too small to allow for additional accommodation to be provided.
- 26.** Millpond and Glenfrome Primary Schools are situated on the outer edges of the geographical locality and therefore it is unlikely that parents would seek school places at such a distance.
- 27.** There are practicalities on the Millpond and Glenfrome Primary Schools sites that make part of these sites unusable. In the case of the Glenfrome Primary school it is situated on a sloping site. Part of the Millpond Primary School accommodation is currently leased to an outside organisation. This effectively removes a substantial portion of the site from school use.
- 28.** Appendix B indicates other land options that have been considered for a 420 place primary school within the Ashley Down/Bishopston area that have also been discounted.

Proposal

- 29.** It is proposed that a 210 place extension is built on to the existing Sefton Park Schools. The LEP will be invited to undertake Stage 0 and Stage 1 design development in consultation with the two schools. If the final scheme remains within the capital funding available for the scheme it should proceed to completion.

30. Funding to the value up to £6.92m has been allocated in the CYPS draft capital programme to cover the cost of the scheme (including the cost of modifications to the Settlement).

31. The option to utilise the Brunel Field to increase capacity in the locality will remain open for reconsideration in the medium term.

Risk Assessment

A Risk Assessment is provided in Appendix C.

Some of the key risks are:

- Planning approval may not be granted for the proposed extension to the Sefton Park Schools;
- The Youth Club building may be the subject of a future Listed Building Application;
- The LEP pricing of the scheme may exceed the approved budget.

Equalities Impact Assessment

An Equalities Impact Assessment is provided in Appendix D.

Sustainability Impact Assessment

On the 13th December 2007, the DCSF wrote to all local authorities identifying the long term ambition of the Government to reduce carbon emissions from new school buildings by 60%, relative to those being built currently to 2002 Building Regulations.

The Government expect all local authorities to apply energy efficiency and renewable energy measures, to meet the 60% reduction in carbon emissions, to all new school buildings.

New schools will need to include energy efficiency measures that reduce energy requirements for:

- Heating (an cooling in some cases);
- Lighting;
- Small power, mainly ICT (Information and Communication Technology).

Low or Zero Carbon (LZC) energy generation:

- Renewable and LZC sources for heating (and cooling in some cases);
- Renewable sources for hot water;
- Renewable sources for electricity;
- Combined Heat and Power (CHP).

The Government have asked local authorities to consider the use of biomass (wood fuel) heating to make a major contribution to meeting the carbon reduction target. The feasibility of biomass as a heating fuel should be evaluated for all new school projects using the evaluation methodology developed by the DCSF.

Legal and Resource Implications

Legal

The proposals are likely to require the publication of statutory notices. Close liaison with Legal Services will ensure that all the legal requirements are met throughout the statutory procedure.

Genny Seneque, Solicitor, Legal Services

Financial

Revenue

Schools are funded on the January pupil count so it will be necessary to obtain Schools Forum agreement to hold back the funds for the additional classes for allocation in September. This will continue until the increase in numbers applies to all year groups.

Gerry Mead
Strategy Leader, Finance - Children and Young People's Services

Capital

The funding for this Capital Project would come from the DCSF New Places Grant Allocations and Prudential Borrowing.

• Previous Cabinet Approvals (2006-2008)	£4,821,677
• DCSF New Places (2008/9)	£598,323
• DCSF New Places (2009/10)	£1,000,000
• DCSF New Places (2010/11)	£500,000
TOTAL	£6,920,000

Land

Sefton Park Primary and Infant Schools are located on land in Council ownership and managed by CYPS. The Youth Centre is on land owned by the City Council and managed by Culture and Leisure.

Personnel

There are no HR implications in respect of the recommendations under consideration.

Mark Williams, HR Manager - Children and Young People's Services

Appendices:

- Appendix A – Letter from GCCC to the Director of Children and Young People's Services;
- Appendix B - Possible Sites for 420 Place Primary Schools in Bristol;
- Appendix C - Risk Assessment.
- Appendix D – Equalities Impact Assessment

ACCESS TO INFORMATION Background Papers

- Cabinet report April 2004, (CAB 113.4/04);
- Cabinet report March 2006 (CAB 101.03/06);
- Cabinet report February 2007 (CAB 85.2/07).

APPENDIX A

19th November 2007

Ms Heather Tomlinson
Director of Children's Services
Bristol City Council
The Council House
College Green
Bristol BS99 7EB

Dear Ms Tomlinson

We have been in discussions with Mr Michael Branaghan from your Directorate concerning our submission on a proposed new primary school on the City of Bristol College Ashley Down site. He has advised me that I should forward this to you in order that it can be included in your report on the Ashley Down and Sefton Park sites. Accordingly, our submission is attached.

Please could you or Mr Branaghan contact me if you have any concerns?

Tom Richardson
Chief Executive

Enclosure:

1. Submission to Bristol City Council.

Copy to:

Mr Michael Branaghan – by email

Submission to: Bristol City Council

From: Gloucestershire County Cricket Club

Re: A Proposed New Primary School on the City of Bristol College Ashley Down Site

While Gloucestershire County Cricket Club (GCCC) fully recognises the need to increase primary school capacity in this part of the proposed East Central 1 area, we would like to make the following

representations to summarise the Club's point of view, which we hope will be of value to you in formulating policy.

Our main concern rests on the fact that the building of a school and its grounds means *the loss of an area critical to the Club in providing facilities for spectators, broadcasters and up to 1000 crucial parking spaces* on major match days. This poses a major threat to the retention of International matches, development of the Ground and the continued viability of the Club at Neville Road – where it has been in existence for over 150 years. We set out these issues in more detail below.

Current use of the proposed school site by GCCC

On match days from April to October the hard standing area of the proposed site is used for spectator parking. The hard standing also has to be used by all the Outside Broadcast vehicles and equipment whenever matches are televised.

For Internationals and major matches, parking is extended to the playing field as well. A tented food village, children's coaching area and other spectator facilities also have to be sited on the field.

Implications of building a school on the College site

1. International Matches:

Bristol has hosted televised International matches since 1998 and England will play New Zealand at Neville Road in 2008. However, the loss of the key on-site parking and catering facilities coupled with very specific requirements for television vehicles and equipment would create a major barrier to being awarded future Internationals.

Bidding for International matches is a complex process and the bidding criteria required by the England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB) have become more and more stringent. Competition from other Counties has become fiercer as they develop their grounds to meet the new ECB requirements eg those in Taunton (Somerset CCC) and Cardiff (Glamorgan CCC). The ability to provide on-site parking is a significant element in overcoming such competition.

GCCC is the only venue in the city to consistently stage high profile International matches. The loss of these would, we understand, be a serious blow to the City's overall aspirations – particularly given the longer-term intentions of GCCC to join the small group of cities and grounds with full Test Match status. Such status would focus worldwide attention on both the Club and the City and attract valuable publicity and revenue streams for each.

The money from International matches is a crucial income stream to GCCC. In addition to this, the loss of these matches also not only affects revenue for companies supplying services but also employment figures. For example, about 250 additional staff to act as stewards, security personnel etc and about 400 catering and bar staff are required for each match.

2. Ground Capacity:

One of the major factors in determining the capacity of a sports ground is the width and number of exits provided for the emergency evacuation of spectators. The county ground has three major exit routes through the area of the proposed school which, if it goes ahead, will reduce the capacity by 60% and puts into question the viability of GCCC on its present site.

3. The impact on the local community:

GCCC does all it can to encourage spectators to use public transport and, for major matches, introduces a well-developed traffic management plan and park and ride scheme. Despite all these efforts, the loss of on-site parking both for the Club and the College will add to an already serious congestion problem in the area. We feel that this will give rise to a strong reaction from local residents.

Throughout the season, instead of being able to use the proposed school site, members and other spectators will attempt to park in all the surrounding roads. This will be exacerbated on Internationals and major match days when the playing field would also have been used for parking.

City of Bristol College students park on the hard standing throughout the year and will similarly attempt to park in nearby roads.

Added to all this, should the school be built, will be the daily parent traffic and parking.

4. Potential loss of revenue:

GCCC cannot afford the cuts in revenue that would come from:

- the loss of International matches
- a drop in membership and gate receipts if spectators are no longer able to park next to the Ground or in adjacent roads
- potentially lower numbers at highly profitable matches eg Twenty20
- reduced match-related Catering and Hospitality income.

These revenue streams are critical to the Club's ability to employ high calibre players and staff so it can compete successfully and, in the long term, survive.

5. Possible problems for the school itself:

There will only be one access road shared by the school, the College and GCCC. This could present potential Health and Safety problems – particularly when large numbers of spectators are arriving for Twenty20 matches or other high profile games.

Match days are likely to cause noise pollution for the school. Public commentaries and announcements feature in all matches and limited-overs games also include bursts of music. Crowd singing, cheering etc would be very loud at big matches.

6. Ground Development:

As long as the uncertainty over the siting of the school continues, GCCC is unable to consider any of the options for Ground Development that it needs - including improved facilities and amenities of benefit to both the Club and to Bristol. Although GCCC has been engaged in feasibility studies, it cannot commit the considerable sums of money that are required to take it beyond this stage. Timing is a real problem for the Club because the next round of bidding for 2009+ Internationals also requires submission of Counties' Development Plans.

Conclusion

GCCC has been very happy to work with BCC to discuss the problems posed by the school proposal. We continue to believe that, in arriving at a decision, it is essential to consider the social and economic needs of all parties including GCCC and the City of Bristol College. We now respectfully submit that in our carefully considered opinion the needs of all will not be best met by building a new school on the College site.

APPENDIX B

POSSIBLE SITES FOR PRIMARY SCHOOL IN BISHOPSTON/ASHLEY

SITE	WARD	PROP ID	AREA (HA)	OWNERSHIP	EXISTING USE	PROS	CONS
Concorde Lodge and Land to Rear	Bishopston	251	0.5*	BCC/DE Courcey	Care Centre and void site	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Existing building is in poor condition and likely to become surplus. 2. There is a playing field immediately adjacent to the site. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Majority of site in private ownership. 2. Very poor access. Planners' sceptical of overcoming highway issues. 3. Access is over common land and would need widening. Legal issues. 4. Enclosing playing field may prove unpopular as at Purdown. 5. Site is on edge of search area, away from prime area of need.
Ashley Down Allotments	Bishopston	8208	2.6	BCC (DCLS)	Allotments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Located close to area of prime need. 2. Access from Muller Road 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of allotments likely to be opposed by DCLS and local residents. 2. Sloping site difficult to develop other than perhaps on the Muller Road side.

SITE	WARD	PROP ID	AREA (HA)	OWNERSHIP	EXISTING USE	PROS	CONS
Ashley Vale Allotments	Ashley	85426	3.3	BCC (DCLS)	Allotments	1. Located close to area of prime need.	1. Loss of allotments likely to be opposed by DCLS and local residents. 2. Sloping site difficult to develop. 3. In a Conservation Area and classed as a Prominent Hillside by Planners. 4. No easy access to site.
Ashley Hill Allotments	Ashley	83426	5.3	BCC (DCLS)	Allotments	1. Located close to area of prime need.	1. Loss of allotments likely to be opposed by DCLS and local residents. 2. Sloping site difficult to develop other than perhaps at top of site but require off site playing fields. 3. Difficult access to site other than perhaps Ashley Down Road.
Fairfield School	Ashley	379	0.49	BCC (DCYPS)	School	1. No planning issues-existing school building. 2. Site will be available.	1. Building is listed and must be retained. Age and design of building are not ideal for a new primary school. 2. Located away from prime area of need. 3. Site is identified for a capital receipt.
Welsman/St Paul's Day/PG Enterprises	Ashley	518/519	1.6	BCC/PGE	Offices/Day Centre/Industrial	1. Site is currently being considered for redevelopment.	1. Located away from prime area of need and very close to an existing Primary School. 2. Need to relocate existing occupiers.

SITE	WARD	PROP ID	AREA (HA)	OWNERSHIP	EXISTING USE	PROS	CONS
Land at Merton Road (Rear of Somerfield)	Bishopston	n/a	1.1	STOREGAP	Industrial	1. Located near area of prime need. The site is already identified for development	1. Site is private ownership and identified for a new supermarket - high acquisition cost. 2. May require land assembly from more than one owner. 3. Located close to an existing school. 4. Possible access issues.
SITES NOT AVAILABLE							
Kelloway Avenue Playing Fields	Bishopston	241	2.7	BCC (DCYPS)	School playing field		
Bishop Road Playing Fields	Bishopston	1054		BCC (DCYPS)	School playing field		

RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk assessment for the extension to the Sefton Park Schools

Category	Risk	Impact Probability	Mitigation	Risk	Impact Probability	Mitigation
Financial	The DCSF could reduce or remove future New Places grant allocations which would affect the funding viability for the scheme.	High Impact Low Probability	Funding allocations from earlier DfES School Capital Grants (SCG) have been to the scheme and previously approved by Cabinet to the value of £4.8m. The DCSF have confirmed the SCG allocation for the next three years starting in 2008/9.	Previously approved Prudential Borrowing is not available	High Impact Medium Probability	Look to re-phasing the funding to include an allocation from the forecasted DCSF New Places Grant for 2008/9. See first risk
Financial	When the LEP undertakes Stage 0/1 design and development unforeseen abnormals are discovered that add additional costs to the scheme.	High Impact Medium Probability	Where the budget is going to be exceeded seek Cabinet approval on an increase in allocation in accordance with financial regulations.	Even though extensive site investigative work has been undertaken abnormals are still identified during construction	High Impact Low Probability	Ensure that the Risk Register is kept up to date and mitigations options are confirmed with the LEP. Undertake value engineering on the project. Where appropriate undertake more site analysis to identify and mitigate against risks.
Financial	Following site analysis and risk mitigation the estimated costs for the project will exceed the budget.	High Impact Medium Probability	Ensure that feasibility costs are fully tested by qualified and experienced QA's and where appropriate undertake Value Engineering.	Even after testing of the feasibility study the tender price exceeds the allocated funding	High Impact Medium Probability	Prepare status report for Cabinet to identify if the scheme should continue.
Financial	The scheme starts to overspend due to unforeseen abnormals.	High Impact Low Probability	Ensure we procure through the LEP with the 'Fixed Cost' contract. Once the scheme has reached	The LEP 's Stage 1 estimates are too high to consider the scheme viable.	High Impact Medium Probability	Undertake 'Bench Marking' of the LEP's prices and carry out independent VFM evaluation. Use the information to ensure the LEP re-evaluates the costs associated with

			Stage 2 the cost of the scheme is fixed and the abnormal risks are at the LEP's risk.			the scheme. If the LEP costs are too high, refuse to accept the bid and offer the scheme to other LEP's in the DCSF Framework Agreement.
Financial	The Sefton Park schools fail to attract sufficient pupils and have funding difficulties.	High Impact Low Probability	Ensure that forecasts support the need for the school.	Where there are sufficient children to fund the school it is still running at a deficit budget	High Impact Low Probability	The Sefton Park Schools have a successful track record. The likelihood of this occurring are minimal. There would be central support available to assist the schools out of a difficult 'patch'.
Financial	The land that was assigned by the Brunel College housing developer for the scheme under the Section 106 agreement does not transfer to the Council because the school is not built on the site.	High Impact Medium Probability	Ensure that the developer and college are aware of the City Council's medium term plans for the site.			
Political Risk	The 210 place primary school is not large enough to cope with the demand.	High Impact Medium Probability	Ensure that the Primary Review provides strategic guidance for the medium and long term provision of primary places within the city to address the changing population density.	Even though adequate provision exists in the community some schools are not attracting pupils whilst others are over subscribed.	High Impact Medium Probability	Ensure that educational standards are improved in least attractive schools and look to investment if the infrastructure is sub-quality.
Media Risk	There may be concerns expressed about the move from delivering the school on the Brunel Field.	High Impact Medium Probability	Ensure that the media/community are kept informed of the proposals why the decision to stall the development at the Brunel Field was made.			
Employment	None identified					
Environmental	None identified					

Risk assessment for not developing the extension to the Sefton Park Schools

Category	Risk	Impact Probability	Mitigation	Risk	Impact Probability	Mitigation
Financial	Although the LEP have given a Fixed Price for the development of a school at the Brunel Field there are abnormals that were unforeseen that add additional costs to the scheme.	High Impact Low Probability	Extensive surveys have been undertaken on the site to ensure all risks have been identified and mitigated against. All additional costs will be at the LEP's expense.	Client changes to the original scheme cause the scheme budget to over-run	High Impact Low Probability	Ensure that variations to the project brief can only be made by the project manager.
Financial	The new location for the school has not attracted sufficient pupils and is running with a deficit budget	High Impact Low Probability	Ensure that forecasts support the need for the school.	Where there are sufficient children to fund the school it is still running at a deficit budget	High Impact Medium Probability	Ensure that Finance Offers within CYPS intervene at an appropriate stage to prevent the Revenue Budget situation become too dire.
Political Risk	The 210 place primary school is not large enough to cope with the demand.	High Impact Medium Probability	Ensure that a wider Primary Strategy is developed to ensure that appropriate provision is available in all communities.	Even though adequate provision exists in the community some schools are not attracting pupils whilst others are over subscribed.	High Impact Medium Probability	Ensure that educational standards are improved in least attractive schools and look to investment if the infrastructure is sub-quality.
Media Risk	If the Brunel Field option is chosen there may be concerns expressed about the proximity of the school to the Cricket Ground and the dual use of the playing field on some match days.	High Impact Medium Probability	Ensure that the mitigation for risks that are foreseen have been communicated to the media.	Even though there has been an explanation of the mitigation there are still concerns about pupil safety	High Impact Low Probability	Ensure that the planning application addresses all the concerns expressed.
Media Risk	There could be adverse comment from the County Cricket Club about the school proposals	Medium Impact Low Probability	The Gloucester County Cricket Club (GCCC) has been consulted on the proposals and this will continue at all stages.			
Business Continuity	When the GCCC require use of the playing fields it could affect the delivery of the curriculum	High Impact Low Probability	There will be an enhanced MUGA constructed on site to meet the curriculum needs of the school in	After the Playing Field has been used by the GCCC it is unfit for school use.	High Impact Low Probability	The playing field will have sub – soil reinforcement to ensure it is suitable for vehicular traffic. A similar system has been tested by Bristol University and is successful.

			the short time they will not be able to use the facility.			
Employment	The GCCC have indicated that the Brunel Field site could restrict capacity at the ground and would have an adverse it on employment within the club.	High Impact Medium Probability				
Economic	Failure to work with the County Cricket Club in utilising the Playing Field as a car park could affect the future viability of International and County Cricket in Bristol.	High Impact Medium Probability	CYPS has been working in consultation with GCCC			
Environmental	There may be a traffic impact caused by the development of the school on the Brunel Field Site	High Impact Medium Probability	The access and egress arrangements at the new school will allow for a smooth flow of traffic at the school. Off-Street parking will provide for staff and visitors to the school.			
Environmental	Traffic Problems at the Sefton Park Schools will not be resolved	High Impact High Probability	Work with Road Safety advisors in Highways to look at ways to reduce problems.	The traffic problems will not be resolved without investment at the Sefton Park Schools	High Impact High Probability	Develop a scheme to resolve traffic issues and identify as a project for capital funding.
Environmental	The Sefton Park Schools will not be fully DDA compliant	High Impact High Probability	Identify priority against other schools and put in Capital programme.			
Education	The school on two floors may not be suitable for the delivery of the curriculum	High Impact Low Probability	Two storey schools are permissible within the DCSF guidance.			

The Initial Impact Assessment of a policy or function

Name of policy or function to be assessed: Bishopston Primary School Development	Name of manager responsible for assessment: <i>Michael Branaghan Strategy Leader - Capital, Assets & Schools Organisation</i>
Is this a new or existing policy/function? New	<i>Date of assessment: January 2007</i>
Step 1. Describe the aims; objectives and purpose of the policy or function (include how it fits in to wider aims or strategic objectives).	<i>To provide a new 210 place Primary School on the site of an existing playing field adjacent to Gloucestershire County Cricket Club. To provide sufficient school places to meet demand in the area.</i>
Are there any associated objectives of the policy or function (i.e. setting a standard of good practice, improving consumer confidence in the service)?	<i>Implementing the national 'Change for children' Programme Raising educational attainment Improving education of vulnerable children Providing new and better schools</i>
Who is intended to benefit from the policy/function and in what way?	<i>Children of ages from 5 to 11 by the provision of 'state of the art' facilities. Use of these facilities, with a focus on learning, will be extended to pupil families and local people out of school hours.</i>
What are the intended outcomes of this policy/function?	<i>To provide sufficient school places to meet demand in the area.</i>
Step 2 What baseline quantitative data do you have about the policy/function relating to equalities groups (e.g. monitoring data on proportions of service users compared to proportions in the population)?	<i>Number of children of each ethnic group, see Annex A - January 2006 Numbers on Roll by Ethnic Group for Sefton Park Infants and Junior Schools which are the nearest schools. Also comparative data on all Bristol Schools. See Annex B for Ethnicity and Poverty data for Bishopston and adjacent wards.</i>
What qualitative data do you have on different groups (e.g. results of previous consumer satisfaction surveys, feedback exercises, or evidence from other authorities undertaking similar work)?	

<p>Name of policy or function to be assessed: Bishopston Primary School Development</p>	<p>Name of manager responsible for assessment: <i>Michael Branaghan Strategy Leader - Capital, Assets & Schools Organisation</i></p>
<p>Step 3 Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on different racial groups? Yes What evidence do you have for this? Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination? If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p>No differential impact on different racial groups because: i) <i>The number of places available will be increased, not reduced.</i> ii) <i>For admission to primary school, after the admission of children with a Statement of Special Education Needs, places are allocated to children in public care, siblings and then on the basis of proximity to the school.</i></p>
<p>Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on boys/girls or men/women? If Yes What evidence do you have for this? Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination? No If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p><i>No. The provision and operation of a new primary school will follow the DCSF policies and guidance.</i></p>

<p>Name of policy or function to be assessed: Bishopston Primary School Development</p>	<p>Name of manager responsible for assessment: <i>Michael Branaghan Strategy Leader - Capital, Assets & Schools Organisation</i></p>
<p>Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on Disabled than on non-disabled children or adults? Yes What evidence do you have for this? Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination? No If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality if opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p><i>No. Any new building will be fully accessible. Children with a Statement of special Educational Needs naming a particular school are admitted and children in public care are the highest priority for admission. This will be unchanged if the proposal is implemented. A new primary school would comply with DCSF code of practice on admissions, SEN and with current guidance on exclusions.</i></p>
<p>Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on Lesbians, Gay Men and Bi-sexuals than on heterosexual young people or adults? No What evidence do you have for this? Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination? No If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality if opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p><i>No. See step 3</i></p>

<p>Name of policy or function to be assessed: Bishopston Primary School Development</p>	<p>Name of manager responsible for assessment: <i>Michael Branaghan Strategy Leader - Capital, Assets & Schools Organisation</i></p>
<p>Are there concerns that the policy/ function could have a differential impact on younger or older people? Yes What evidence do you have for this? Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination? No If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p><i>No. The primary school will provide the appropriate school age range See step 3</i></p>
<p>Step 4 Should the policy proceed to a Partial Impact Assessment (see Appendix 3) and if so why have you decided this? Date by which the Partial Impact Assessment will take place: Should the policy function move to a Full Impact Assessment (see Appendix 4) and if so why have you decided this? Date by which the Full Impact Assessment will take place:</p>	<p><i>No. There will be increased numbers of places to the appropriate school education age range if the proposal is agreed.</i></p> <p><i>No.</i></p> <p><i>See above.</i></p>
<p>Signed (completing officer): Job Title :</p>	

Annex A to Step 2 Baseline Data

Percentages

Name	African	Any other Asian Background	Any other Black background	Any Other Ethnic Group	Any other Mixed Background	Any other White Background	Bangladeshi	British	Caribbean	Chinese	Gypsy/ Roma	Indian	Information not yet obtained	Irish	Pakistani	Refused	Traveller of Irish Heritage	Unknown	White and Asian	White and Black African	White and Black Caribbean	BME	British fixed	Irish fixed	White other fixed	BME - White Other and Irish
Sefton Park Infant	1.3	2.2	2.2		4.0	4.4	0.9	71.2	0.4	1.3		2.2	0.9		2.7	0.9			1.8	2.2	1.3	28.8	71.2	0.0	4.4	24.3
Sefton Park Junior	2.1	1.7	4.2	0.3	5.5	4.8	0.7	65.7	1.4	1.0		0.7			3.1				1.4	1.7	5.5	34.3	65.7	0.0	4.8	29.4
Bristol Primary & Nursery	4.1	1.0	1.0	0.7	2.5	2.2	0.8	75.9	2.0	0.4	0.0	1.7	0.2	0.3	3.0	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.8	0.6	2.4	24.1	75.9	0.3	2.2	21.5
Bristol	3.8	0.9	1.1	0.6	2.2	2.1	0.7	76.8	2.2	0.4	0.0	1.6	0.3	0.4	2.5	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.7	0.5	2.6	23.2	76.8	0.4	2.1	20.6

Numbers

Name	African	Any other Asian Background	Any other Black background	Any Other Ethnic Group	Any other Mixed Background	Any other White Background	Bangladeshi	British	Caribbean	Chinese	Gypsy/ Roma	Indian	Information not yet obtained	Irish	Pakistani	Refused	Traveller of Irish Heritage	Unknown	White and Asian	White and Black African	White and Black Caribbean	Total NOR all ages
Sefton Park Infant	3	5	5		9	10	2	161	1	3		5	2		6	2			4	5	3	226
Sefton Park Junior	6	5	12	1	16	14	2	190	4	3		2			9				4	5	16	289
Bristol Primary & Nursery	1245	306	293	201	764	681	248	23318	625	111	0	521	55	91	908	83	25	55	258	177	742	30707
Bristol	1838	430	526	293	1058	1030	330	37045	1038	188	6	778	162	192	1229	124	29	56	351	265	1251	48219

Annex B to Step 2 Baseline Data

This Ethnicity and Poverty data has been extracted from the Equalities Audit 2006.

The location of the proposed Bishopston Primary School Development is in the South East corner of the Bishopston Ward near to the boundary with Ashley ward. Data for Bishopston ward and for adjacent wards Ashley, Henleaze, Horfield, Lockleaze and Redlands is noted below.

Ward	Ashley	Bishopston	Henleaze	Horfield	Lockleaze	Redlands
Percentage of White British pupils	34.6	79.8	87.1	75.8	68.7	82.4
Percentage of pupils with English as an Additional Language	32.4	6.4	2.9	9.5	15.4	5.2
Index of Multiple Deprivation (the higher the score the more deprived)	46.1	8.6	4.9	26.	40.3	7.3
Percentage of pupils with Free School Meal eligibility (these figures correspond to the deprivation figures)	35.5	3.2	2.2	19.2	29.6	2.7