

Public Document Pack

NOTICE OF MEETING **CABINET**

www.rbwm.gov.uk



will meet on

THURSDAY, 27TH AUGUST, 2020

At 6.15 pm

in the

VIRTUAL MEETING – RBWM YOUTUBE

TO: MEMBERS OF THE CABINET

Councillor Johnson, Leader of the Council and Chairman of Cabinet, Business, Economic Development and Property

Councillor Rayner, Deputy Leader of the Council, Resident & Leisure Services, HR, IT, Legal, Performance Management & Windsor

Councillor Carroll, Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health

Councillor Cannon, Public Protection and Parking

Councillor Clark, Transport and Infrastructure

Councillor Coppinger, Planning and Maidenhead

Councillor Hilton, Finance and Ascot

Councillor McWilliams, Housing, Communications and Youth Engagement

Councillor Stimson, Environmental Services, Climate Change, Sustainability, Parks and Countryside

Karen Shepherd – Head of Governance - Issued: Wednesday, 19 August 2020

Members of the Press and Public are welcome to attend Part I of this meeting. The agenda is available on the Council's web site at www.rbwm.gov.uk or contact the Panel Administrator **David Cook** 01628 796560

The Part I (public) section of this virtual meeting will be streamed live and recorded via Zoom. By participating in the meeting by audio and/or video you are giving consent to being recorded and acknowledge that the recording will be in the public domain.

AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
1.	<u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u> To receive any apologies for absence	-
2.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> To receive any declarations of interest	5 - 6
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To consider the Part I minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2020.	7 - 18
4.	<u>APPOINTMENTS</u>	-
5.	<u>FORWARD PLAN</u> To consider the Forward Plan for the period September to December 2020.	19 - 24
6.	<u>CABINET MEMBERS' REPORTS</u> Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health i. Outcome Of Feasibility Work On Potential School Expansions Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health ii. New Provision For Children And Young People With Special Educational Needs	- 25 - 44 45 - 68
7.	<u>LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC</u> To consider passing the following resolution:- "That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion takes place on items 8-9 on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1-7 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act"	-

PART II

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
	<p>i. <u>MINUTES</u></p> <p>To consider the Part II minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 30 July 2020.</p> <p><i>(Not for publication by virtue of Paragraph 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Governmet Act 1972)</i></p>	69 - 70
9.	<p><u>CABINET MEMBERS' REPORTS</u></p> <p>Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health</p>	-
	<p>i. New Provision For Children And Young People With Special Educational Needs Part II Appendix</p> <p>Details of representations received on reports listed above for discussion in the Private Meeting: None received</p>	71 - 76

MEMBERS' GUIDE TO DECLARING INTERESTS IN MEETINGS

Disclosure at Meetings

If a Member has not disclosed an interest in their Register of Interests, they **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as they are aware that they have a DPI or Prejudicial Interest. If a Member has already disclosed the interest in their Register of Interests they are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed.

A member with a DPI or Prejudicial Interest **may make representations at the start of the item but must not take part in the discussion or vote at a meeting.** The speaking time allocated for Members to make representations is at the discretion of the Chairman of the meeting. In order to avoid any accusations of taking part in the discussion or vote, after speaking, Members should move away from the panel table to a public area or, if they wish, leave the room. If the interest declared has not been entered on to a Members' Register of Interests, they must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing within the next 28 days following the meeting.

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs) (relating to the Member or their partner) include:

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit made in respect of any expenses occurred in carrying out member duties or election expenses.
- Any contract under which goods and services are to be provided/works to be executed which has not been fully discharged.
- Any beneficial interest in land within the area of the relevant authority.
- Any licence to occupy land in the area of the relevant authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where the landlord is the relevant authority, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where:
 - a) that body has a piece of business or land in the area of the relevant authority, and
 - b) either (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body **or** (ii) the total nominal value of the shares of any one class belonging to the relevant person exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

Any Member who is unsure if their interest falls within any of the above legal definitions should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

A Member with a DPI should state in the meeting: ***'I declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Or, if making representations on the item: 'I declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will make representations, then I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'

Prejudicial Interests

Any interest which a reasonable, fair minded and informed member of the public would reasonably believe is so significant that it harms or impairs the Member's ability to judge the public interest in the item, i.e. a Member's decision making is influenced by their interest so that they are not able to impartially consider relevant issues.

A Member with a Prejudicial interest should state in the meeting: ***'I declare a Prejudicial Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Or, if making representations in the item: 'I declare a Prejudicial Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will make representations, then I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'

Personal interests

Any other connection or association which a member of the public may reasonably think may influence a Member when making a decision on council matters.

Members with a Personal Interest should state at the meeting: ***'I wish to declare a Personal Interest in item x because xxx'. As this is a Personal Interest only, I will take part in the discussion and vote on the matter.***

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

CABINET

THURSDAY, 30 JULY 2020

PRESENT: Councillors David Cannon, Andrew Johnson (Chairman), David Coppinger, Samantha Rayner, Stuart Carroll (Vice-Chairman), David Hilton, Gerry Clark, Donna Stimson and Ross McWilliams

Also in attendance: Councillors Taylor, Jones, Price, Bhangra, Baldwin, Singh, Sharpe, Bateson, Brar, Tisi, Knowles, Davies, Story, Shelim, Bhangra, Del Campo, C Da Costa and Taylor. Mrs Barbara Richardson (RBWM Property Company)

Officers: Russell O'Keefe, Adele Taylor, Louisa Dean, Kevin McDaniel, Hillary Hall, Nikki Craig, Louise Freeth, Duncan Sharkey, Andrew Valance, Shilpa Manek and David Cook.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None received.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Part I minutes of the meeting held on 25 June 2020 were approved.

APPOINTMENTS

No appointments were required.

The Leader asked the Deputy Leader of the Council, Resident & Leisure Services, HR, IT, Legal, Performance Management & Windsor who was the Armed Forces Champion to make an important statement.

The Lead Member informed that RBWM had been recognised as a supporter of the British Armed Forces by being awarded Gold in the U.K. Employer Armed Forces Recognition Scheme. The Council has added this to its Bronze and Silver Awards. She thanked officers for all their work.

Cllr Knowles thanked everyone including officers, partnership agencies and support services throughout the borough as a whole, being able to achieve this with Cllr Raynor's leadership. Not many Gold have been awarded. Bravo November – Well done!

FORWARD PLAN

Cabinet considered the contents of the Forward Plan for the next four months and noted the changes made since last published.

CABINET MEMBERS' REPORTS

G) RBWM OUTBREAK CONTROL PLAN

Cabinet considered the report that informed about the local outbreak control plan that had been introduced.

The Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health informed that the plan had been put together as part of the response to the pandemic as all local authorities had been requested to have a localised outbreak plan. This had been produced in collaboration with the NHS, public health and the local authority.

Local Directors of Public Health are responsible for producing the plans, working through Covid-19 Health Protection Boards. Local authorities also have a role to set-up Local Outbreak Engagement Boards which will provide political ownership and public-facing engagement and communication for outbreak response. The Engagement Board would be Chaired by Hilary Hall as Cllr Carroll was Chairing the Health and Wellbeing Board.

The Leader of Council said that it was important to show leadership across organisations and parties, they had all come together as one to deal with the pandemic and keep residents safe. He asked the Lead Member that given his professional background if he could contextualise the importance of the plan.

The Lead Member informed that data was being analysed day by day and that the challenge was that there was currently no vaccine. We are reliant on policies to contain the spread of the virus until a vaccine was in place. It was expected that there would be a difficult winter with C-19, influenza and the usual winter pressures on the NHS. He had therefore been in contact with NHS colleagues for an elevated winter plan. There may be further lockdowns but we now had a better understanding of the disease and protocols.

The Leader thanked the Lead Member and said that this showed the important of the next agenda item; the Interim Council Strategy in helping plan ahead.

Cllr Price said she was a member of the Outbreak Board and welcomed cross party working. This gives a lot of confidence with the plan and for residents.

Cllr Davey questioned the equalities element and asked why faith groups had been included. He was informed that this was in Government guidance, there were issues with clothing and the ability to wear face masks and there were issues with social distancing within buildings of worship.

Cllr Werner said that the Lead Member was ideally placed to cope with C-19. He questioned why the full plan had not been published with names redacted. He was informed that the final details of the plan were being worked through and a final version with redacted names would be published.

Cllr Bond mentioned that there could also be an issue with faith groups wishing to sing enthusiastically.

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet notes the report.

F) INTERIM COUNCIL STRATEGY 2020-21

Cabinet considered the report regarding the proposed Interim Council Strategy 2020-21.

The Leader of the Council and Chairman of Cabinet, Business, Economic Development and Property informed that informed that he wished to clarify something within the proposed strategy. With regards to the Windsor Museum he would ask the report to be amended to say that we would not be currently reopening the museum instead of saying the museum would be closed. This was a working document showing a direction of strategy given the current

situation. We needed to be flexible, nimble and responsive to changing needs. The council also needed to maintain focus on core critical services.

The current Corporate Plan was due to expire next year and was a strategy developed for different times. There was a new medium term financial strategy and thus a new strategy was required to meet these needs and the demands of the pandemic and future financial management. This interim strategy was required to help with the current position before a new strategy was developed. This was a statement of intention with any implemented actions requiring a review and for reports back to Cabinet as required.

A member of the public Alice Le Page had registered to speak on this item. She questioned why it was planned to close the museum as it seemed an opportunistic amendments to the papers. There had been no consultation with staff, no members of staff had been shielded and government guidance did not require shielding. Looking for others to take over the management of the establishment contradicted the statement that this was a temporary position. There would be no meaningful savings as the collection would need to be stored. There would need to be a cultural recovery and the government had announced emergency funds being available. It was premature to close the museum before all avenues had been explored. She felt that removing a learning resource was short sighted and how was it justified closing a beneficial community educational resource when the town needs it the most.

The Leader reiterated that it was proposed to delay the re-opening of the museum and that a further more detailed report would be brought forward before any final decision was made. All suitable options would be considered and that he had already been contacted by a number of parties.

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Resident & Leisure Services, HR, IT, Legal, Performance Management & Windsor informed that the library services had to close due to C-19. The team had been fantastic in their response and providing services to the public. A digital service was provided along with collection. The service will be reviewed due to the impact of C-19 and financial pressures. With regards to the museum it was much loved, 70 years old had 13,000 objects and had 65,000 visits with 100 events. It was supported by the Friends of Museum Group. The tourism information office was in the Royal Windsor Station and valued by tourists, shops and businesses. Tourism was important to Windsor and this was an opportunity to look at the offer.

The Lead Member for Finance and Ascot informed that the financial monitoring report being considered later in the report would provide some context to this item and the financial impact of C-19. It would be remiss that not to look at every service. The budget talks about transformation and transformation of services to provide valued services and balanced budget.

The Leader said that he had been clear at the start of the pandemic that not all services would re-open as they once were, the world had changed and services would be subject to an options review.

Cllr Knowles reported that things may be different but there still remained a need for tourism in Windsor and tourists needed an offer and guidance. With regards to the tourism information office there were overheads and thus it could move to the Guildhall as a better location or temporarily have a stall in the covered market. Being in the Guildhall would be more visible and bring visitors to the area.

Cllr Bowden reported that the library was very important to Windsor; students and the elderly used the internet access on offer. Council services had successfully been delivered in the library before moving back to York House. The museum may need to stay closed but it remained important to Windsor, it could be run by a CIC. With regards to the information centre it was currently in a listed building, however moving to the Guildhall could raise difficulty

due to opening hours. Buckingham Palace was due to close for refurbishment and the royal family would move to Windsor.

Cllr Davey asked what the cost of keeping the museum was and how long it was expected to be closed. He felt the needs of pensioners were being ignored. He asked for the cultural heritage fund to be explored and he suggested that the Windsor Local Heritage Group could have a role to play.

Cllr Davies said that the re-opening of the museum and tourist information office needed a full review with lead member, staff and volunteers being included. It was expected that the final decision would come back to Cabinet.

Cllr W Da Costa said that there were more than 65,000 visitors to the museum and 630 trips to the Guildhall. The Royal Family would be re-locating to Windsor and thus there was a need of a quality service for tourism. The museum needed to be kept going and if RBWM could not do this then the Windsor Town Council needed to be established as soon as possible.

Cllr Singh raised concern that temporary closure of libraries may become permanent

Cllr Rayner informed that the NET cost of running the museum was £130k and she would revisit moving the information centre to the Guildhall.

Cllr Price raised the equalities impact assessment and asked if the impact of C-19 on multiple areas of deprivation and those with existing health conditions. She said that local data and evidence should be considered. She also mentioned that the 10 characteristics of equality should always be considered.

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Approves the Interim Council Strategy 2020-21 as amended to say museum will not be currently opened; and**
- ii) Requests Officers to develop reports for relevant decision making bodies to progress the objectives therein.**

A) INTRODUCTION OF NEW ORGANISATIONAL VALUES

Cabinet considered the report regarding the introduction of a new set of organisation values and their implementation.

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Resident & Leisure Services, HR, IT, Legal, Performance Management & Windsor informed that in December 2019 work began on setting a new set of values for the organisation. Discussions began with CLT and there were a number of workshops that were attended by 83% of the organisations employees. Workshops were also held with Members and CLT. Over 1400 behaviour statements and nearly 200 values statements were collected.

The outcome of the activity is a proposed group of 4 new values, which are:

- Invest in strong foundations.
- Empowered to improve.
- One team and vision.
- Respect and openness.

These were supported by a number of sub statements and an action plan attached as appendix B.

The Lead Member for Environmental Services, Climate Change, Sustainability, Parks and Countryside said she had worked in organisations on organisation change and that she

supported the proposed new values and that the headlines being clearly seen on the two page plan.

Cllr Jones reported that she welcomed the paper and that it was well thought out. It had been a while coming since the peer review. Members had also taken part and the proposals had been discussed at Corporate O&S Panel. The values should also apply to elected members and she mentioned that the LGA had set out a new code of conduct for consultation. The Leader agreed with extending the values to Members and he would look at additional training for Members by the LGA. Members should have the highest standards for all values.

Cllr Werner welcomed the paper and the inclusion of staff. He highlighted that you can have an excellent document but it was important to deliver and imbed within the organisation. He also mentioned that it would be good for new Members to get raining when they are elected.

The Leader said that as a Group leader he would hope all Group leaders would endorse the ethics and they should transcend party politics.

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet notes the report and:

- **endorses the new values and supports their implementation.**

B) OUTCOME OF REVIEWS OF ACHIEVING FOR CHILDREN AND OPTALIS DELIVERY ARRANGEMENTS

Cabinet considered the report regarding the CIPFA reviews of Optalis and Achieving for Children (AFC).

The Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health informed that as part of the budget setting process for 2020-2021, it was recommended that the arrangements that the Royal Borough had through AFC and Optalis for the delivery of children's and adult services respectively should be reviewed to ensure that they were fit for purpose.

The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) was commissioned in April 2020 to undertake the review. The aim of the review was to understand whether the current arrangements, which have been in place since 2017, were still the appropriate models to deliver the Council's ongoing strategic transformation objectives for adult and children's services.

With regards to Optalis the CIPFA report noted that Optalis had brought considerable benefits to the Royal Borough in terms of service improvement, which justifies the original decision to transfer services into the company. However, the Royal Borough as the minority shareholder (45%) did not have sufficient control over major service transformation for Optalis. There was tension between the Council and Wokingham that was impacting organisation development.

With regards to AFC children's services have improved considerably, now rated as good by Ofsted. This is an enormous achievement in a relatively short time and reflects extremely well on AFC and its staff. There had been few financial savings and costs had risen, in part, are reflected nationally. Plans to expand the company are on hold, which leaves little scope for further costs savings.

The Lead Member for Finance and Ascot informed that this was a very timely report detailing reasons why we should remain with these companies and some sensible thoughts on how best to achieve our objectives. In both cases the boards need to come together to revise and agree clear longer-term objectives to allow AfC and Optalis to develop their own business plans and financial strategies.

When we joined AfC cost savings were not the driving force but service improvement was and there has been real success with our Children's services now rated as good. He had no visibility as to the objectives of Richmond and Kingston but evidence suggests that the cost of provision of children's services was increasing and inevitably both Council's would be looking to deliver their excellent services at lower cost. This should assist RBWM to create a greater focus on driving costs down.

The report recommended a service level agreement to ensure the delivery of our priorities. In the CIPFA report there were 9 separate recommendations all very sensible. In relation to finance I hold the view that AfC's business plan 2020/2024, which is devoid of financial information, is not adopted until cost and service pressures are clarified in a medium-term financial strategy.

He felt that relationships between Wokingham and RBWM must improve and was sure that the Leader and the Managing Director were committed to achieving this. It was anomalous that Optalis manages £36M of RBWM's social care and £10M of Wokingham's but we were a minority shareholder with 45% of the shares. It was recommended that the shareholder agreement should be changed so that the respective councils have greater control of the service areas that apply specifically to them.

He informed Cabinet that this was essential if the arrangement is going to work for us, as last year it was input from RBWM that prompted changes in operations at Optalis and helped to recover an adverse financial variance. CIPFA's 4th recommendation that RBWM should challenge Optalis to demonstrate that it provides added value over and above delivering the day to day service is not necessary as the Council and its transformation team are already working in partnership with Optalis to develop this capability.

The Lead Member for Planning and Maidenhead informed that he had been Lead Member responsible for moving services to Optalis and was a member of the Holdings Board. He was delighted to see an excellent offer for residents that was above the services provided by most council's. There was no concern about the service provision just the finances.

Cllr Knowles informed that there was no doubt that joining the organisations was the right thing to do at the time and no other model would have provided the improvements seen. He was however concerned about the nature of the contracts. Optalis' risk register had the relationship with Wokingham going from high to medium. CIPFA had raised this relationship as an issue so it should remain high on the risk register. The contract was three years in and Wokingham had not met its obligations so there could be a breach of contract, break clauses and a plan B should be considered. With regards to AFC he was concerned that the agreement that the share of ownership had not been fulfilled leaving RBWM still with 20%, CIPFA felt this should be reviewed.

(Cllr Johnson lost connectivity and left the meeting, Cllr Carroll took the Chair).

Cllr Bond mentioned that the report said that costs were under review but with no timescale and that he had first heard about the concern with the relationship with Wokingham a year ago. The report into AFC mentioned had a line about an issue regarding the pension transfer and this was still ongoing. With regards to Optalis he questioned why Wokingham saw the service differently to RBWM.

The Lead Member for Planning and Maidenhead reported that there was a difference in how both authorities viewed shared services, however this disagreement was not impacting services.

With regards to AFC and pension the Director reported that this formed part of the transfer of staff to AFC and the sharing of pension risks. AFC were working on their MTFs and pensions would be included.

Cllr Sharpe reported that these types of issues often arose in these types of relationships. Partners need to work together as they both had a share in Optalis.

Resolved unanimously: That Cabinet notes the report and:

a) Delegates authority to the Managing Director, in consultation with the Lead Member for Finance and Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health, to implement the recommendations set out in the two respective CIPFA reports annexed to this report.

c) CIPFA REVIEW OF GOVERNANCE RESPONSE TO THE FINAL REPORT AND DEVELOPMENT OF AN ACTION PLAN

Cabinet considered the report regarding the proposed action plan following the CIPFA review of governance.

The Lead Member for Finance and Ascot informed that his direct involvement with CIPFA started at a meeting with them on the 29th July 2019, so yesterday was the first anniversary. One year on, a big chunk of his life and an interesting learning process, we have reached the beginning of the end of the review. Legislation and best practice continued to change so he will never stop work to improve all aspects of governance.

He informed that at the June cabinet that timely and accurate financial information was essential to enable the Council to properly manage its business and to facilitate appropriate decision making. He also said, and repeated now, that on becoming Lead Member, frustratingly and unacceptably, this was not made available to me or Cabinet, leaving us exposed.

He had discussions with the Managing Director and supported his decision for an internal investigation of Financial Governance by CIPFA and took part in meetings with CIPFA to establish a structured work programme. This administration invited the review, has accepted the finding, has already acted on many of the recommendations and this evening Cabinet considered an action plan developed by our Director of Resources to address a number of outstanding issues.

There were two appendices to the report, Appendix 1 covered actions that were addressed by the interim CIPFA accountants during the 2020/21 budget build and appendix 2 was the action plan developed by the Director of Resources to resolve the outstanding issues. The action plan identified the issues, the proposed actions, when these will be completed, who will be responsible and what success would look like.

The report was robustly debated by Corporate O&S on Monday and they proposed that the wording in the MTFs section on page 116 under the column headed, "what does success look like" should be changed to, "A clear and timely understanding of the resources the Council has to manage its services and address its priorities". It was agreed to add the word 'Timely'. The action plan which is proposed to be reviewed by Overview and scrutiny quarterly.

The Director of Resources informed Cabinet that the report had been considered by O&S and their one recommendation had already been mentioned. There was another of concern raised and this was around Clewer and Dedworth where the report mentions concerns about ward members at the time. It was important to remind this meeting that that comment related to ward councillors who were no longer the ward councillors. With regards to the proposed action plans appendix two timelines were questions and O&S were informed that they were realistic and would be delivered to.

The Lead Member for Transport and Infrastructure informed that this had been a robust evaluation and investigation by CIPFA and has resulted in firm recommendations that were

the right way forward. The problems of the past had to be put behind us and we must move forward dealing with the current difficult position facing the country.

The Lead Member for Public Protection and Parking reiterated that his was a forward looking documents identifies what we need to do to move forward ad what has already been done to move forward. A positive and constructive report.

Cllr Jones reported that she was happy that her suggested amendment had been accepted. She also saw this as a constructive paper but just wanted to highlight Member oversight and Member training. As per the peer review Member training on scrutiny was important, there needed to be challenge to Cabinet. She gave the example of an O&S Chairman who did not accept a report going to O&S and said Members could go to Cabinet to discuss the report. We needed friendly critical challenge.

Cllr Price informed that she welcomed the Director of Resources comments about past Ward Councillors as she felt this had not been reflected in the O&S minutes. The CIPFA comments did not relate to the current 6 ward councillors.

Cllr Larcombe said he found the CIPFA report shocking and incomplete as it concentrated on finance and governance. The organisation had not been funded sufficiently and had been weakened by lack of resources. The Leader had given his apologies and talks about a new way and people working together. He said he still had issues such as the lack of organisation loss of memory and issues will not be fixed. It has been expensive to have CIPFA do the review and issues such as flooding have still not been addressed. His ward floods regularly and has not been addressed as the culture fails to perform. Drainage infrastructure not being looked at and fixed. Where is the £43 million for the river Thames that was agreed by Cabinet three years ago.

The Lead Member for Public Protection and Parking said that the issue of flooding was being taken seriously but was not an issue for the CIPFA report.

Cllr Sharpe said that the report was comprehensive, actions have been taken to address errors and there was a change in the way the council now operated.

Cllr Baldwin mentioned that he needed to discuss the historical record, Cabinet had discussed forward looking and how the past was the result of previous leader and administration. He mentioned that Cllr Coppinger, Cllr Hilton, Cllr Carroll and Cllr McWilliams had failed to point out that they had all been appointed to Cabinet by the then leader and that they had failed to vote against him in a vote of no confidence at Council. He said that if they wanted to make a fresh start they should be honest about their past records.

The Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health informed a factual inaccuracy by Cllr Baldwin as it has been recorded that he did offer criticism at the time.

The Lead Member for Housing, Communications and Youth Engagement said that Cabinet took a view that the authority would advance by understanding mistakes made and addressing the problems. The new administration investigated the concerns and sought to address them. 'I told you so' argument was not helpful and was trying to be right rather than constructive. He made reference to his own experience of being removed from Cabinet and how this made him aware of actions and behaviours.

Cllr Davey said that he was saddened that it had not been mentioned that these issues had been brought up back in June that lead to the CIPFA review.

Cllr Jones reiterated that there was a need for scrutiny training for current and future members and chairman of panels.

The Lead Member for Finance and Ascot said that he thanked Cllr Davey for raising the Clewer and Dedworth problem as this and other concerns helped spark the review. Cllr Baldwin seemed to have forgotten that the administration started the review and accepted the findings. With regards to culture he referred to items 3.8 and 3.9 on page 109 as this action states that values and behaviours were to be developed so we had a strong culture. There had been cultural change as seen in the Financial Update report. With regards to O&S training this had been covered in the Council meeting.

(the Leader of the Council and Chairman of Cabinet, Business, Economic Development and Property re-joined the meeting but due to his connectivity issues he said Cllr Carroll should remain in the Chair)

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet reviews the report and:

- i) Approves the implementation of the proposed action plan**
- ii) Agrees that a quarterly progress report be considered by the appropriate committee or panel**

D) CONTRACT AWARD FOR EMERGENCY DUTY SERVICE

Cabinet considered the report regarding the award of contract for the emergency duty service.

The Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health informed that the report sought approval to let a direct award contract for an Emergency Duty Service (EDS) with Bracknell Forest Council. The service provides out of hours emergency social care for adults and children and emergency homelessness support. The contract, if approved, will commence 11 August 2020 for seven years with the option to give 12 months' notice at any time and for any reason. Cost would be £228k per year, which was within budget. All Berkshire authorities commissioned this service which provided economy of scale and better service delivery.

Cllr Price asked if this service was the same as the normal out of hours service or was this an additional service. She was informed that this was a specialist service for Adult Social Care, Children's Services and Homelessness. There was a separate out of hours service run by the council.

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Approves a direct award contract for an Emergency Duty Service between The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead and Bracknell Forest Council from 11 August 2020 for seven years.**

E) FINANCE UPDATE: JULY 2020

Cabinet considered the latest Financial Update report.

The Lead Member for Finance and Ascot reported that he propose to say a few words and ask The Director of Resources, who was the architect of this report to explain her reporting strategy. He also asked Cllr. Carroll to comment on Adult Social Care and Children's Service as well as the fully funded capital budget addition of £500K for SEND Special Provision.

The new format for the Finance monitoring provides more detail and is more transparent than any reported in the past. He asked if publishing Finance update reports was enshrined in legislation, to his surprise, apart from the annual outturn report there was no legal obligation.

He said that the administration absolutely get that they are spending public money and it is important for those who have an interest, from councillors to residents and the local press that finance papers are regularly published, are clear, easy to read and carry a strong narrative.

The CIPFA consultants who worked on the 2020/21 budget suggested just four reports a year but the Director of Resources shared his view that this was too few and reports would be published bimonthly starting from this report in July.

A summary of the budget was shown in table 2 on page 196 which forecasts an adverse variance of £4.1M which will need to be supported from reserves, leaving just £1.85M which was below the minimum level.

Government had announced that it would refund Councils up to 75% of 95% of lost income and lost income is by far the most significant issue that we face. Very recent guidance advises that we will be able to include lost income associated with the schedule of fees and charges as published in the 2020/21 budget booklet. This excludes income from commercial properties and our Leisure offer which is managed by a charitable trust. Many other Council's Leisure facilities are managed in the same way and we are hopeful that our Leisure losses will be included. Whatever we receive from Government will be used to increase the level of reserves.

Had COVID 19 not happened, at the end of month 2 we would be reporting a favourable variance of £2.7 million. When this is added to the £1.7m reduction in the 2019/20 overspend reported in the Outturn report, we would be well on track not only to deliver a balance budget this year but with current savings of £4.4 million, exactly what the MTFS said we needed, to deliver a balance budget next year too. The clear message is that like Councils up and down the country our financial position has been derailed by Covid 19.

Finance monitoring is a best estimate of the outturn of the budget. Budget setting and finance monitoring is a shared responsibility between services and finance and robust finances depends upon strong working relationships.

The close monitoring of Adult Social care costs is shown in Charts 1 and 2 on pages 201 and 202 which includes the detail maintained on the number of spot nursing placements for older people and the daily expenditure on homecare including the impact of COVID on the numbers and costs.

Parking revenue will be significantly hit by COVID 19. The use of modelling by the team is based on past experience, income to date, the anticipated changes in demand as lockdown eases and the nature of past demand, which is a very solid approach to forecasting income. Charts 3 and 4 on page 205 show income loss and revenue growth for Windsor and Maidenhead. These charts reflect the fact that Windsor is driven by tourism and Maidenhead by commuters.

The impact of Covid 19 on our Leisure Centre income is profound and the Place Directorate forecasts no income in the present year and not to return to pre-covid income levels until beyond 2022/23. Table 11 on page 211 shows how this will significantly impact our MTFS.

Revenues & Benefits rightly feature more prominently in the report as CT and Business rates account for around £89M of our income. Despite COVID the collection rates are holding up quite well, surprisingly and inexplicable Business rate collection is 4% ahead of target at the end of June.

Managed by Louise Freeth, Head of Revenues & Benefits, Library and residential services, in the past months the Revenues and benefits team, have been under pressure as they administered £26M of Government grants to businesses, dealt with challenge from those businesses that did not qualify and managed four times the number of changes of circumstances for housing benefits. These staff deserve our special thanks.

Continuing Health Care is an ever-present risk. Fairly regularly the Council will propose that a resident in Adult Social Care should be managed by Health and the CCG at their cost or the CCG asserts a resident is no longer eligible for CHC and the cost of their support package should be borne by the Council. On page 203 the Director of Resource has included a section on CHC that clearly indicates the number of cases under review, explains the risks and importantly ensures that those risks remain very visible.

On Capital, a Capital Programme Review Board has been established and their first meeting led to the crystallisation of savings of over £2.4 M on the capital programme with the detail shown in appendix D on page 240.

A RAG rated savings report is included at appendix B, page 233. A narrative is provided where savings can no longer be made including remedial action planned to address underperformance and Mitigation Strategies. A shortfall in savings of £1.7M is anticipated which prompted the Director of Resources to release the £1.3 Million savings contingency.

The Director of Resources said that with regards to the key headlines it was important that this report showed the position as of month two and thus was forecasted on information then. £8.1 million Covid funding had been included but some of this would have been for the previous financial year. We are still awaiting full guidance on any claims for losses and she would be making this claim and signing it off so only legitimate claims would be made.

The Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health said that with regards to his area of responsibility he was please more detail had been included so demand could be tracked, especially in adult social care where there would be a lot more demand management. For children's services a lot had been done on commissioning on high cost placements to ensure vulnerable children getting stable care with more permanent social workers. With regard to SEND there would be a report coming forward to Cabinet.

The Leader reiterated that had it not been for C-19 the budget strategy would be on track. We still continue to lobby Government for resources for long term stability.

Cllr Jones reported that this was a much better report and detailed. She felt that some of the detail was not appropriate for Cabinet and could be better discussed at O&S. she asked if it was possible to have an overview of borrowing going forward and asked why the magnet development did not cover the cost of the Braywick LC as previously informed.

The Lead Member of Finance said that the Magnet LC had included all the land originally included it would have cover the new LC.

The Director of Resource said that in terms of borrowing some detail had been provided but this area will be covered by the new audit panel in the treasury management reports.

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Notes the council's projected revenue & capital position for 2020/21.**
- ii) Notes the budget movements;**
- iii) Approves the Capital variances and slippage.**
- iv) Approves a fully funded capital budget addition of £500,000 for SEND Special Provision. See 11.2 for further information.**
- v) Approves a virement of £200,000 from the Secondary Expansions Risk Contingency to Bisham General Refurbishment. See 11.3 for further information.**

- vi) Approves a fully funded capital budget addition of £87,000 for a Wider Area Growth Study. See 11.4 for further information.
- vii) Approves a fully funded capital budget addition of £140,000 for the Emergency Active Travel Fund. See 11.5 for further information.
- viii) Approves a fully funded capital budget addition of £381,000 for design and construction changes to Braywick Leisure Centre. See 11.6 for further information.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public were excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion took place on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1 and 3 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.

The meeting, which began at 6.15 pm, finished at 10.05 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

Agenda Item 5

CABINET

FORWARD PLAN - CHANGES MADE SINCE LAST PUBLISHED:

ITEM	SCHEDULED CABINET DATE	NEW CABINET DATE	REASON FOR CHANGE
Community, Options, Maidenhead.	N/A	24 Sept	New Item
Library Stock Purchase Contract	N/A	24 Sept	New Item
Maidenhead United Football Club – Request for Relocation	N/A	29 Oct	New Item

FORWARD PLAN OF CABINET DECISIONS

NB: The Cabinet is comprised of the following Members: Councillor Johnson, Leader of the Council and Chairman of Cabinet, Business, Economic Development and Property, Councillor Rayner, Deputy Leader of the Council, Resident and Leisure Services, HR, IT, Legal, Performance Management and Windsor, Councillor Carroll, Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health, Councillor Cannon, Public Protection and Parking, Councillor Clark, Transport and Infrastructure, Councillor Coppinger, Planning and Maidenhead, Councillor Hilton, Finance and Ascot, Councillor McWilliams, Housing, Communications and Youth Engagement, Councillor Stimson, Environmental Services, Climate Change, Sustainability, Parks and Countryside

The Council is comprised of all the elected Members

All enquiries, including representations, about any of the items listed below should be made in the first instance to Democratic Services, Town Hall, St Ives Road, Maidenhead. Tel (01628) 796560. Email: democratic.services@rbwm.gov.uk.uk

FORWARD PLAN

ITEM	Private Meeting - contains exempt/confidential information? See categories below.	Short Description	Key Decision, Council or other?	REPORTING MEMBER (to whom representations should be made)	REPORTING OFFICER / DIRECTOR (to whom representations should be made)	Consultation (please specify consultees, dates (to and from) and form of consultation), including other meetings	Date and name of meeting	Date of Council decision (if required)
20 Compulsory Purchase Order – Nicholsons Walk Shopping Centre, Maidenhead	Fully exempt - 3	Land assembly for site known as Nicholsons Walk Shopping Centre, Maidenhead.	Yes	Leader of the Council and Chairman of Cabinet, Business, Economic Development and Property (Councillor Andrew Johnson)	Russell O'Keefe	Internal process	Cabinet 24 Sep 2020	
Financial Update	Open -	To consider the latest financial update.	No	Lead Member for Finance and Ascot (Councillor David Hilton)	Adele Taylor	Internal process	Cabinet 24 Sep 2020	

N.B. All documents to be used by the decision maker to be listed in the report to Cabinet

ITEM	Private Meeting - contains exempt/confidential information? See categories below	Short Description	Key Decision, Council or other?	REPORTING MEMBER (to whom representations should be made)	REPORTING OFFICER / DIRECTOR (to whom representations should be made)	Consultation (please specify consultees, dates (to and from) and form of consultation), including other meetings.	Date and name of meeting	Date of Council decision (if required)
Community Options, Maidenhead.	Fully exempt - 3	Options for community facilities within the regeneration area of Maidenhead.	Yes	Leader of the Council and Chairman of Cabinet, Business, Economic Development and Property (Councillor Andrew Johnson)	Russell O'Keefe	Internal process	Cabinet 24 Sep 2020	
Library Stock Purchase Contract	Open -	This reports seeks approval for the Royal Borough remaining an Associate Member of the Central Buying Consortium for the supply of library stock and the use of the new framework for procurement purposes.	No	Deputy Leader of the Council, Resident and Leisure Services, HR, IT, Legal, Performance Management and Windsor (Councillor Samantha Rayner)	Louise Freeth	Internal process	Cabinet 24 Sep 2020	
School places and projections	Open -	This report provides an update on projected demand for school places in the Royal Borough and may propose options for further development and consultation.	Yes	Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health (Councillor Stuart Carroll)	Kevin McDaniel	External	Cabinet 29 Oct 2020	

21

N.B. All documents to be used by the decision maker to be listed in the report to Cabinet

ITEM	Private Meeting - contains exempt/confidential information? See categories below	Short Description	Key Decision, Council or other?	REPORTING MEMBER (to whom representations should be made)	REPORTING OFFICER / DIRECTOR (to whom representations should be made)	Consultation (please specify consultees, dates (to and from) and form of consultation), including other meetings.	Date and name of meeting	Date of Council decision (if required)
Development of a Youth Council within the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Open -	To seek agreement to establish a Youth Council to complement the existing governance committee structures of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) Council.	No	Lead Member for Housing, Communications and Youth Engagement (Councillor Ross McWilliams), Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health (Councillor Stuart Carroll)	Kevin McDaniel	Internal process	Cabinet 29 Oct 2020	
Maidenhead United Football Club – Request for Relocation	Fully exempt - 3	Request for Land availability for the relocation of the club.	Yes	Leader of the Council and Chairman of Cabinet, Business, Economic Development and Property (Councillor Andrew Johnson)	Russell O'Keefe	Internal process	Cabinet 29 Oct 2020	
Financial Update	Open -	Latest financial update.	No	Lead Member for Finance and Ascot (Councillor David Hilton)	Adele Taylor	Internal process	Cabinet 26 Nov 2020	
Q1 and Q2 Performance Report	Open -	Latest performance report.	No	Deputy Leader of the Council, Resident and Leisure Services, HR, IT, Legal, Performance Management and Windsor (Councillor Samantha Rayner)	Hilary Hall	Internal	Cabinet 26 Nov 2020	

N.B. All documents to be used by the decision maker to be listed in the report to Cabinet

ITEM	Private Meeting - contains exempt/confidential information? See categories below	Short Description	Key Decision, Council or other?	REPORTING MEMBER (to whom representations should be made)	REPORTING OFFICER / DIRECTOR (to whom representations should be made)	Consultation (please specify consultees, dates (to and from) and form of consultation), including other meetings.	Date and name of meeting	Date of Council decision (if required)
------	--	-------------------	---------------------------------	---	---	---	--------------------------	--

DESCRIPTIONS OF EXEMPT INFORMATION: ENGLAND

1	Information relating to any individual.
2	Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual.
3	Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).
4	Information relating to any consultations or negotiations, or contemplated consultations or negotiations, in connection with any labour relations matter arising between the authority or a Minister of the Crown and employees of, or office holders under, the authority.
5	Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.
6	<p>Information which reveals that the authority proposes</p> <p>(a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; or</p> <p>(b) to make an order or direction under any enactment.</p>
7	Information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime.

This page is intentionally left blank

Report Title:	OUTCOME OF FEASIBILITY WORK ON POTENTIAL SCHOOL EXPANSIONS
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information?	<i>No - Part I</i>
Member reporting:	Councillor Stuart Carroll, Lead Member for Adult Social Care, Children’s Services, Health and Mental Health
Meeting and Date:	Cabinet – 27 August 2020
Responsible Officer(s):	Kevin McDaniel, Director of Children’s Services
Wards affected:	All

www.rbwm.gov.uk



REPORT SUMMARY

1. The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead has assessed the feasibility of expanding all schools in the borough, in response to likely increases in demand arising from planned new housing. Those feasibility studies have now been published.
2. This report explains the school expansions feasibility programme and highlights some key overall findings. These studies will now be used to underpin development of a strategic school expansion programme.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION: That Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) **Places on record its thanks to all schools in the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead for their help with the school expansion feasibility programme.**
- ii) **Requests that the feasibility report for each school is published on the Royal Borough’s website.**

2. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Background

Long-term need for school places

- 2.1 In November 2017, Cabinet considered a report on the longer term need for school places in the Royal Borough, resulting from an objectively assessed need for 14,298 new dwellings in the Borough Local Plan period to 2033.
- 2.2 As part of the Borough Local Plan work, the Royal Borough produced an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which identified significant potential shortfalls in school places over the local plan period. A high-level desktop exercise had been carried out to assess which schools could expand to meet this demand.

- 2.3 Cabinet agreed that further detailed work was required to assess the capacity of schools to expand over the Borough Local Plan period. This would develop deliverable expansion options on each site, in consultation with schools, and allow the borough to move much more quickly on implementing proposals once need is identified.
- 2.4 This report provides the outcome of the school expansion feasibility programme. It does not provide an updated analysis of the impact of new housing on demand for school places in the borough. It is intended that this aspect will be reported to Cabinet in October 2020, alongside the annual projections of demand for school places. Accordingly, this report makes no recommendations for specific school expansions, which will also be covered in the October Cabinet report.

The school expansions feasibility programme

- 2.5 The work, which began in Spring 2018, was split into six batches of roughly ten schools each, taking three to four months on each batch. The Royal Borough employed architects from Atkins for Batch one, and HLM Architects for Batches two to five. They worked alongside officers (from Achieving for Children and Wokingham Shared Building Services) and the schools to develop options for each school site.
- 2.6 The completion of the final batch was delayed by the onset of the Covid-19 crisis.
- 2.7 The reports do not cover special schools or nursery schools. The need for expansion of both special educational needs provision and early years provision was identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and will be addressed in separate processes.
- 2.8 In preparing the feasibility reports, the borough and the architects visited every school to explain the programme, get an understanding of the site and buildings, and get the school's views on expansion options. Pre-planning advice was also sought to give an initial view on planning and highways matters that might affect each option.
- 2.9 Once draft options had been drawn up, each school was given the opportunity to discuss those with officers and the architects. The resulting feasibility study was then circulated to the school for their final comments.

The Windsor three tier system

- 2.10 Although the feasibility programme focused on school expansions, the Royal Borough took the opportunity to examine the potential of school sites in Windsor to support a move from a three tier (first, middle and upper schools) system to a two tier (primary and secondary schools) system. Although the Royal Borough is not pushing for such a change, it was recognised that a number of schools in Windsor have been considering the future of the system, and that this could come within the Borough Local Plan period.
- 2.11 The biggest practical barrier to such a change is adapting each site to a two tier school. The feasibility studies examine how this might happen on each site. This work should not be read as an endorsement of any proposal to change the system in Windsor, which could only happen after public

consultation. The borough will only support further work on a change of system if requested by the Windsor Cluster of schools.

New school sites

2.12 In addition to existing school sites, the feasibility programme covers two new school sites, identified in the draft Borough Local Plan. These are potential sites for primary schools at:

- Land known as Spencer's Farm, North of Lutman Lane, Maidenhead (The reference of this site in the Borough Local Plan is AL25).
- The former Oldfield Primary School site at Chiltern Road, Maidenhead.

2.13 A further feasibility report is being prepared in relation to the potential special school to be located at West of Windsor (site reference AL21), but that is not within the scope of this Cabinet report.

Publication of the feasibility reports

2.14 This report proposes publishing the feasibility reports on the borough website in September 2020. While the borough will not be formally consulting on the options at this stage, the webpage includes a form for feedback from residents, which will allow us to further refine options if and when they are implemented. Publication in September will mean that the reports are available ahead of the likely start of the Borough Local Plan hearings in Autumn 2020.

2.15 Each report includes:

- an overview of the school site and buildings.
- a comparison of the site and buildings with national guidelines on school spaces.
- a summary of likely parking and access issues, and overview of comments from planning and highways.
- one or more potential options for school expansions, and a comparison of the resulting site and buildings with the national guidelines.
- a brief summary of the condition of the school buildings.

2.16 Each report also contains an assessment of the deliverability of each option by the architects, taking into account cost, highways and planning, the extent to which a proposal adheres to guidelines on space, impact on teaching and learning, value for money, practicality of construction and disruption during build period. These are then weighted¹ and aggregated to provide each option with a score out of three, where a score greater than 2.3 is highly feasible, and less than 1.7 is less feasible.

2.17 A summary of the options, including the architects scoring/grading is attached to this report as Appendix A.

Summary of the school expansion feasibility programme conclusions

2.18 The feasibility reports set out 151 options for school expansions, excluding changes to the Windsor three tier system. Table 1 summarises the feasibility gradings for the options, by school area.

¹ The weightings are given in Table 3.

Table 1: No. of options by feasibility grade and school area

School area	Feasibility grade			
	Highly feasible	Feasible	Less feasible	Unfeasible
Ascot	3	5	2	4
Datchet & Wraysbury	3	2	4	3
Maidenhead	16	29	23	27
Windsor	12	10	4	4
The Royal Borough	34	46	33	38

2.19 Of course, some schools had several highly feasible or feasible options, whilst others had none. Table 2 takes the highest graded option for each school, and summarises the count of those feasibility gradings by school type and area.

Table 2: No. of options by feasibility grade, school area and type, based on school's highest feasibility grading,

School area and type	Feasibility grade			
	Highly feasible	Feasible	Less feasible	Unfeasible
Ascot				
Primary	1	1	2	1
Secondary	1	0	0	0
Datchet and Wraysbury				
Primary	1	0	1	0
Secondary	1	0	0	0
Maidenhead				
Primary	10	11	4	2
Secondary	3	1	1	1
Windsor				
First	6	4	2	2
Middle	2	1	1	0
Upper	1	1	0	0
The Royal Borough				
All schools	26	19	11	6

2.20 Across the borough, 45 schools have at least one highly feasible or feasible option for expansion. However, 15 of these would require additional land to implement their highest graded options, ranging from the redrawing of boundaries on co-located school sites to the acquisition of adjacent land. The proposals for land acquisition have not been examined further in this programme and no formal talks with landowners have occurred.

2.21 As noted in paragraph 2.16, the feasibility grading is made up of seven different elements. Table 3 below shows the average score across the 151 school expansion options for each element.

Table 3: Average score, across all 151 expansion options, for each grading element

Feasibility element	Weighting	Explanation	Average score (out of 3)
Cost	30%	Based on the likely cost of delivering the option.	1.92
Planning & highways	20%	Based on parking, access and traffic, together with green belt, flood zone.	1.81
Site potential	15%	Based on how well the option adheres to national guidance on site and building sizes.	1.86
Teaching value	15%	Based on potential benefits to teaching and learning arising from expanded buildings.	2.25
Value for money	10%	Based on the overall cost compared to the number of new places generated.	2.10
Ease of construction	5%	Based on the practicality of construction.	2.12
Disruption	5%	Based on the disruption to pupils and staff during the construction process.	2.11

2.22 Generally, the options score better on the design and function of the buildings, representing good value for money and a positive impact on teaching and learning. The options score less well in terms of overall cost, impact on planning and highways and adherence to the guidance on sites and buildings.

Cost and site potential

2.23 The Royal Borough has expanded many schools over the past decade, increasing the number of places but reducing the scope for further expansion. It is not surprising, therefore, that many of the remaining options are more complicated and costly. Many of the options involve the replacement of existing accommodation to make more efficient use of the available space (by building more two and three storey blocks, for example). A number also consider complete demolition and rebuilds as the only way of saving enough site space to adhere to guidelines.

2.24 In all cases the options have adhered to or exceeded the national guidelines on the size and number of rooms within the school buildings. Many options, however, involve compromises on the amount of outdoor space available. The loss of space can be wholly or partially offset by including all-weather pitches, which can be used much more intensively than grass playing fields. They do, however, add to the cost of the options.

2.25 The assessment of costs does not include the acquisition of land.

Planning and Highways

- 2.26 The lowest average score for the 151 options was related to planning and highways issues, partly reflecting the extent of the green belt and flood zones in the borough. The low score also reflects discussions with the Highways team, who highlighted major issues with parking, access and traffic relating to 40 of the 62 sites involved. A further five were identified as not to be expanded at all, due to the impact of increased pupil numbers on the local road network.
- 2.27 Most options, therefore, will generate significant objections from Highways to any planning applications, without either measures to significantly reduce travel to school by car, or costly re-engineering of local road networks. These costs are not reflected in the option costs in this report, and funding given to the local authority for the purposes of increasing the number of school places does not cover external highways works. These costs, therefore, will fall on the borough's Highways capital programme.

Using the feasibility studies

- 2.28 The feasibility studies are the first step towards strategically managing future rounds of school expansions. The borough will continue to produce annual projections of demand for school places, taking into account underlying demographic change, parental preference and the expected impact of new housing. Where there is a shortfall between the demand and the number of available places, options for new school places will be brought to Cabinet.
- 2.29 Those proposals will be based on the options identified in the school expansion feasibility programme. It is proposed that these are given in priority order, based partly on the feasibility scores referred to in this report. In addition, options for school expansion will be prioritised based on:
- geographical proximity to the area(s) of growing demand.
 - Ofsted gradings.
 - pupil performance.
 - parental preference.
 - school inclusion.
- 2.30 In the short term, the feasibility studies will also be used to update the education element of the Royal Borough's Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
- 2.31 Officers intend to bring a report to Cabinet in October 2020 with the updated pupil projections and longer analysis of demand. If options for school expansion are required at this stage, then the report will include a prioritised list of proposals for consideration ahead of public consultation.

Options

Table 4: Options arising from this report.

Option	Comments
Places on record its thanks to all schools in the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead for their help with the school expansion feasibility programme. Recommended	Schools have been instrumental to the success of this programme, and the resulting options have been greatly improved through their involvement.
Requests that the feasibility report for each school is published on the Royal Borough's website. Recommended	Publication of the feasibility reports will ensure transparency, and also allow residents to comment on proposals. These comments will in turn assist with the improvement of those options.
Do nothing. Not recommended.	

iii) KEY IMPLICATIONS

Table 5: Key Implications

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
There are no key implications arising from this report.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

3. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

Table 6: Financial Impact of report's recommendations

REVENUE COSTS	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Additional total	£0	£0	£0
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net Impact	£0	£0	£0

CAPITAL COSTS	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Additional total	£0	£0	£0
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net Impact	£0	£0	£0

- 3.1 There are no capital or revenue implications arising from the recommendations of this report. The feasibility expansion programme had a

budget of £1.3m, and the feasibility studies themselves cost £681k. A further £100k is being retained to assist with the next stages of development for any school expansion schemes proposed in the October 2020 Cabinet report on school places. The remaining budget has been returned as a saving.

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 There are no legal implications arising from the recommendations of this report.

5. RISK MANAGEMENT

Table 7: Risk Management

Risks	Uncontrolled Risk	Controls	Controlled Risk
The feasibility reports undoubtedly contain elements that will be controversial with residents, as school expansions often are. This could generate a high level of enquiries.	High	The webpages where the reports are published will contain a feedback form to direct enquiries to the relevant team. The webpages will emphasise the exploratory nature of the programme, and any responses received will be used to improve the options.	Medium
The feasibility studies become gradually outdated as changes are made to the sites and buildings, reducing their usefulness.	High	Officers keep school building and site plans as up-to-date as possible as part of day to day duties. Most changes carried out by schools are, in any case, likely to be minor in terms of their impact on expansionary potential.	Low
Government guidance on school buildings and sites changes significantly, making the feasibility studies redundant.	Low	There have been relatively few changes to the guidance on school buildings and sites over the past decade.	Low

6. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

- 6.1 **Equalities:** There are no implications under the Equality Act 2020 arising directly from the recommendations in this report.
- 6.2 **Climate change/sustainability:** There are no climate change and sustainability implications arising directly from this report. The government is, however, placing increasing importance on the sustainability of school buildings, which will have implications for school expansion projects in the future. The borough already meets high carbon reduction targets in its new school buildings, and officers will be looking at how to further reduce environmental impact in future projects.
- 6.3 **Data protection/GDPR:** There are no data protection implications arising from this report as no personal data is being processed. A Data Protection Impact Assessment has not, therefore, been carried out.

7. CONSULTATION

- 7.1 In preparing the feasibility reports, the borough and the architects HLM visited every school (excluding nursery schools and special schools) to explain the school expansions feasibility programme and get their views on expansion options at their site. Once draft options were drawn up, each school was then given the opportunity to discuss those with the architects. The resulting feasibility study was then circulated to the school for their final comments.
- 7.2 The feasibility documents will be available on the Royal Borough website from early September 2020. Although the borough is not currently formally consulting on any of these proposals, the webpages will include a feedback form so that residents can contact us with any questions or concerns. These will then assist with the further refinement of any schemes that are then implemented.
- 7.3 Proposals to expand schools to meet growing demand will still be subject to the normal public consultation.

8. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Table 8 Timetable for implementation

Date	Details
September 2020	Publish the feasibility reports on the borough website.

- 8.1 Implementation date if not called in: September 2020.

9. APPENDICES

Paper

- Appendix A: Summary of options identified in the school expansion feasibility programme.

10. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- [Delivering new school places for the Borough Local Plan](#), Cabinet Report, 23rd November 2017.

11. CONSULTATION (MANDATORY)

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Commented & returned
Cllr S Carroll	Lead Member for Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health.	31/07/2020	07/08/2020
Duncan Sharkey	Managing Director	22/07/2020	03/08/2020
Russell O'Keefe	Director of Place	22/07/2020	
Adele Taylor	Director of Resources/S151 Officer	22/07/2020	06/08/20
Kevin McDaniel	Director of Children's Services	22/07/2020	24/07/2020
Hilary Hall	Director Adults, Commissioning and Health	22/07/2020	23/07/2020
Andrew Vallance	Head of Finance	22/07/2020	
Elaine Browne	Head of Law	22/07/2020	27/07/2020
Mary Severin	Monitoring Officer	22/07/2020	
Nikki Craig	Head of HR, Corporate Projects and IT	22/07/2020	
Louisa Dean	Communications	22/07/2020	
Karen Shepherd	Head of Governance	22/07/2020	22/07/2020

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	To follow?
For information	No	No
Report Author: Ben Wright, School Places and Capital Team Leader, 01628 796572		

Appendix A: Summary of options identified in the school expansion feasibility programme

Ref	School	School Type	Area	Option	Description of option	Option changes school from three tier to two tier?	New school type (where changed)	Pupil Numbers				Nursery Numbers			Sixth Form			Requires additional land to fully implement?	Scores for elements of feasibility grading							Feasibility Grading	
								Current	Proposed	Increase	Increase (FE)	Current	Proposed	Increase	Current	Proposed	Increase		Cost	Planning & Highways	Site Potential	Teaching Value	Value for Money	Ease of Construction	Disruption	Total feasibility score	Grading
161	Alexander First School	First	Windsor	1	New Build 2 Storey Teaching Block and single storey extension on existing playing field	No	-	150	300	150	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.85	Highly Feasible
162	Alexander First School	First	Windsor	2	New Build 2 Storey Teaching Block and single storey extension on existing playing field	No	-	150	450	300	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.55	Highly Feasible
163	Alexander First School	First	Windsor	3	New Build 2 Storey Teaching Block and single storey extension on existing playing field	Yes	Primary	150	300	150	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.55	Highly Feasible
164	Alexander First School	First	Windsor	4	New Build 2-Storey Primary School on existing playing field	Yes	Primary	150	300	150	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	3	3	3	1	3	2	2.15	Feasible
47	All Saints Junior School	Junior	Maidenhead	1	New build 2 storey teaching block	No	-	360	480	120	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	2	0	1	3	2	2	1.95	Less feasible
48	All Saints Junior School	Junior	Maidenhead	2	New build 2 storey Junior School	No	-	360	480	120	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	3	0	3	2	3	3	2.15	Feasible
91	Altwood Church of England School	Secondary	Maidenhead	1	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block and 2-Storey Teaching Block infill on existing school site	No	-	750	900	150	1	0	0	0	173	207	34	No	3	2	3	1	3	2	2	2.4	Highly Feasible
92	Altwood Church of England School	Secondary	Maidenhead	2	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block on existing school site, 2-Storey Gap Infill (Science and Art Classrooms), internal	No	-	750	105	-645	2	0	0	0	173	242	69	No	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1.9	Less feasible
93	Altwood Church of England School	Secondary	Maidenhead	3	New Build 3-Storey Super Block on existing playing field	No	-	750	1200	450	3	0	0	0	173	277	104	No	1	2	2	3	1	2	2	1.75	Less feasible
41	Alwyn Infant School	Infant	Maidenhead	0	Internal remodelling of existing school with new build extensions	No	-	315	315	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	0	2	0	1	1	1.4	Unfeasible
42	Alwyn Infant School	Infant	Maidenhead	1	New build 2 storey block to be shared with Courthouse Junior School	No	-	315	360	45	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2.15	Feasible
21	Bisham C of E	Primary	Maidenhead	1	Primary School on existing site - New 2 Storey Block	No	-	116	210	94	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	2.55	Highly Feasible
45	Boyne Hill Infant School & Nursery	Infant	Maidenhead	1	New build nursery block	No	-	180	225	45	0.5	52	65	13	0	0	0	No	3	2	0	2	2	1	2	1.95	Less feasible
46	Boyne Hill Infant School & Nursery	Infant	Maidenhead	2	New build nursery block and new build hall & dining block	No	-	18	270	252	1	52	78	26	0	0	0	No	1	2	0	2	1	1	1	1.2	Unfeasible
84	Braywick Court School	Primary	Maidenhead	1	Existing Junior classrooms converted into Infant classrooms	No	Infant	210	180	-30	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - Junior provision at the Chiltern Road site	3	3	0	3	3	3	3	2.55	Highly Feasible
49	Braywood C of E First School	First	Windsor	1	Purchase of neighbouring residential property and construction of new build 2 storey extension	No	-	150	300	150	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - adjacent residential property and adjacent field	1	2	3	2	1	1	2	1.7	Less feasible
50	Braywood C of E First School	First	Windsor	2	New build 2 storey extension	No	-	150	300	150	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - adjacent field	2	0	3	2	2	1	1	1.65	Unfeasible
51	Braywood C of E First School	First	Windsor	3	Purchase of neighbouring residential property - no new build elements	No	-	150	300	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - adjacent residential property and adjacent field	1	2	1	1	1	2	3	1.35	Unfeasible
57	Burchetts Green C of E Infant School	Infant	Maidenhead	1	Infant School existing site - first floor added	No	-	66	90	24	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	1	3	1	1	1	1	1.6	Unfeasible
58	Burchetts Green C of E Infant School	Infant	Maidenhead	2	Infant School on existing site - new modular classroom on hard outdoor play area	No	-	66	90	24	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	1	3	1	3	3	3	2.3	Feasible
59	Burchetts Green C of E Infant School	Infant	Maidenhead	3	New Build Primary School build on BCA land	No	Primary	66	120	54	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes	1	3	3	3	2	3	3	2.3	Feasible
60	Burchetts Green C of E Infant School	Infant	Maidenhead	4	New Build Primary School build on BCA land	No	Primary	66	210	144	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes	1	3	3	3	2	3	3	2.3	Feasible

Appendix A: Summary of options identified in the school expansion feasibility programme

Ref	School	School Type	Area	Option	Description of option	Option changes school from three tier to two tier?	New school type (where changed)	Pupil Numbers				Nursery Numbers			Sixth Form			Requires additional land to fully implement?	Scores for elements of feasibility grading							Feasibility Grading	
								Current	Proposed	Increase	Increase (FE)	Current	Proposed	Increase	Current	Proposed	Increase		Cost	Planning & Highways	Site Potential	Teaching Value	Value for Money	Ease of Construction	Disruption	Total feasibility score	Grading
								30%	20%	15%	15%	10%	5%	5%													
118	Charters School	Secondary	Ascot	1	Expansion to 10FE Secondary School & Sixth Form with new Community Leisure Centre	No	-	1380	1500	120	0.8	0	0	0	380	456	76	No	3	1	3	2	3	2	3	2.4	Highly Feasible
119	Charters School	Secondary	Ascot	2	Expansion to 11FE Secondary School & Sixth Form with new Community Leisure Centre	No	-	1380	1650	270	1.8	0	0	0	380	502	122	No	2	1	3	3	2	2	2	2.1	Feasible
120	Charters School	Secondary	Ascot	3	Expansion to 10FE Secondary School & Sixth Form without new Community Leisure Centre	No	-	1380	1500	120	0.8	0	0	0	380	456	76	No	3	1	3	2	3	3	3	2.45	Highly Feasible
121	Charters School	Secondary	Ascot	4	Expansion to 11FE Secondary School & Sixth Form without new Community Leisure Centre	No	-	1380	1650	270	1.8	0	0	0	380	502	122	No	2	1	3	3	2	2	2	2.1	Feasible
108	Cheapside CE Primary School	Primary	Ascot	1	New Build 2-Storey school on existing school site	No	-	210	420	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0.5	Unfeasible
85	Chiltern Road Site	Special	Maidenhead	1	Refurbishment of existing school building, with 2 storey new build extension	No	Primary	0	210	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	2	1	2	3	3	1.95	Less feasible
86	Chiltern Road Site	Special	Maidenhead	2	New build 2 storey school	No	Primary	0	210	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	2	2	3	2	3	3	1.95	Less feasible
87	Chiltern Road Site	Special	Maidenhead	3	Refurbishment of existing school building, with 2 storey new build extension	No	Infant	0	270	270	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	3	1	2	3	3	2.1	Feasible
88	Chiltern Road Site	Special	Maidenhead	4	New build 2 storey school	No	Infant	0	270	270	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	2	3	3	2	3	3	2.1	Feasible
89	Chiltern Road Site	Special	Maidenhead	5	Refurbishment of existing school building, with 2 storey new build extension	No	Junior	0	240	240	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	1	1	2	3	3	1.8	Less feasible
90	Chiltern Road Site	Special	Maidenhead	6	New build 2 storey school	No	Junior	0	240	240	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	2	1	3	2	3	3	1.8	Less feasible
31	Churchmead School	Secondary	Datchet & Wraysbury	1	Addition of Sixth Form to school - new 3 storey block	No	-	700	750	50	0	0	0	0	180	180	No	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1.85	Less feasible	
32	Churchmead School	Secondary	Datchet & Wraysbury	2	Expanded Secondary School and addition of Sixth Form to school - new 3 storey block and new 2 storey block	No	-	700	900	200	1	0	0	0	210	210	No	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1.85	Less feasible	
33	Churchmead School	Secondary	Datchet & Wraysbury	3	Expanded Secondary School and addition of Sixth Form to school - large new 3 storey block	No	-	700	900	200	1	0	0	0	210	210	No	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1.5	Unfeasible	
34	Churchmead School	Secondary	Datchet & Wraysbury	4	Addition of Sixth Form to school - new build school (phased)	No	-	700	750	50	0	0	0	0	180	180	No	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2.3	Highly Feasible	
35	Churchmead School	Secondary	Datchet & Wraysbury	5	Expanded Secondary School and addition of Sixth Form to school - new build school (phased)	No	-	700	900	200	1	0	0	0	210	210	No	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2.25	Feasible	
141	Clewer Green C of E Aided First School	First	Windsor	1	Single storey infill extension to Teaching Block	No	-	300	420	120	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	2	1	2	3	2	2	2.25	Feasible
142	Clewer Green C of E Aided First School	First	Windsor	2	Extensive remodelling of Main School Block	Yes	Junior	300	240	-60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	3	1	2	3	3	3	2.55	Highly Feasible
143	Clewer Green C of E Aided First School	First	Windsor	2	Extensive remodelling of Main School Block	Yes	Primary	300	210	-90	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.85	Highly Feasible
67	Cookham Dean CE Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	1	New single storey small hall block - existing school to remain unchanged	No	-	189	210	21	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	2.65	Highly Feasible
68	Cookham Dean CE Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	2	New single storey main hall block - existing school to remain unchanged	No	-	189	210	21	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	2.65	Highly Feasible
69	Cookham Dean CE Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	3	New build 2 storey Primary School build on the northern portion of the site	No	-	189	420	231	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	1	1	3	1	2	2	1.4	Unfeasible

Appendix A: Summary of options identified in the school expansion feasibility programme

Ref	School	School Type	Area	Option	Description of option	Option changes school from three tier to two tier?	New school type (where changed)	Pupil Numbers				Nursery Numbers			Sixth Form			Requires additional land to fully implement?	Scores for elements of feasibility grading							Feasibility Grading				
								Current	Proposed	Increase	Increase (FE)	Current	Proposed	Increase	Current	Proposed	Increase		Cost	Planning & Highways	Site Potential	Teaching Value	Value for Money	Ease of Construction	Disruption	Total feasibility score	Grading			
																												30%	20%	15%
70	Cookham Rise Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	1	Community library remodelled into classrooms, partial demolition and rebuilding of school	No	-	210	420	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - into Alfred Major Park	1	0	2	2	2	1	1	1.2	Unfeasible
71	Cookham Rise Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	2	Partial demolition and rebuilding of school (community library retained on site)	No	-	210	420	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - into Alfred Major Park	1	0	2	2	2	1	1	1.2	Unfeasible
72	Cookham Rise Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	3	New build 2 storey school, community library partially housed within original historic school building	No	-	210	420	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - into Alfred Major Park	1	0	2	3	1	1	1	1.25	Unfeasible
43	Courthouse Junior School	Junior	Maidenhead	1	New build 2 storey block to be shared with Alwyn Infant School	No	-	420	480	60	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	1.9	Less feasible	
44	Courthouse Junior School	Junior	Maidenhead	2	New build two storey Primary School	No	Primary	420	1050	630	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	1	3	1	2	2	1.9	Less feasible	
94	Cox Green School	Secondary	Maidenhead	1	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block on former Tennis Courts with some internal remodelling of existing buildings	No	-	1050	1200	150	1	0	0	0	144	277	133	No	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	2.65	Highly Feasible		
95	Cox Green School	Secondary	Maidenhead	2	Three New Build Teaching Blocks (two 2-Storey and one 3-Storey) on the existing school site	No	-	1050	1350	300	2	0	0	0	144	311	167	No	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	Feasible
96	Cox Green School	Secondary	Maidenhead	3	New Build 3-Storey Super Block, New Build 2-Storey Art / DT / Music Block on existing school site	No	-	1050	1500	450	3	0	0	0	144	346	202	No	1	2	2	3	1	1	1	1	1.65	Unfeasible		
97	Cox Green School	Secondary	Maidenhead	4	New Build school with 3-Storey Teaching Block and 2-Storey Sports Block on existing school site	No	-	1050	1500	450	3	0	0	0	144	346	202	No	1	2	2	3	1	1	1	1	1.65	Unfeasible		
26	Datchet St Mary's Primary C of E Academy	Primary	Datchet & Wraysbury	1	Primary School and Nursery on existing site - partial demolition with new 2 storey extension	No	-	210	420	210	1	26	52	26	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	1	0	2	1	1	1	1.3	Unfeasible	
27	Datchet St Mary's Primary C of E Academy	Primary	Datchet & Wraysbury	2	Infant School and Nursery on existing site - no changes to building	No	-	210	420	210	1	26	52	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - adjacent to Churchmead School	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.7	Highly Feasible
28	Datchet St Mary's Primary C of E Academy	Primary	Datchet & Wraysbury	3	Infant School and Nursery on existing site - new build nursery block and small infill extensions to main building	No	-	210	630	420	2	26	78	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - Junior school on land adjacent to Churchmead School	2	1	3	3	2	2	2	2.1	Feasible
29	Datchet St Mary's Primary C of E Academy	Primary	Datchet & Wraysbury	4	School for years Nursery to Year 4 on existing site - new build nursery block and infill extensions to main building	No	-	210	420	210	1	26	52	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - Junior school on land adjacent to Churchmead School	2	1	1	3	2	1	2	1.75	Less feasible
30	Datchet St Mary's Primary C of E Academy	Primary	Datchet & Wraysbury	5	New build Primary School and Nursery built on development land around Churchmead School	No	-	210	420	210	1	26	52	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - adjacent to Churchmead School	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2.6	Highly Feasible
132	Dedworth Green First School	First	Windsor	1	Phased expansion, Single Storey Extension to Teaching Wing and Nursery Wing of Main School Block	No	-	150	352	202	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	3	3	2	3	1	2	2.7	Highly Feasible	
133	Dedworth Green First School	First	Windsor	2	Phased expansion, 2-Storey Extension to teaching wing and Single Storey Extension to Nursery Wing of Main School	No	-	150	502	352	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	1	3	2	3	1	2	2	Feasible	
134	Dedworth Green First School	First	Windsor	3	Phased expansion, 2-Storey Extension to teaching wing and Single Storey Extension to Nursery Wing of Main School Block	Yes	Primary	150	472	322	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	1	3	2	3	1	2	2	Feasible	
135	Dedworth Green First School	First	Windsor	4	New Build 3-Storey Primary School Block	Yes	Primary	150	682	532	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	1	1	3	1	3	2	1.45	Unfeasible	

Appendix A: Summary of options identified in the school expansion feasibility programme

Ref	School	School Type	Area	Option	Description of option	Option changes school from three tier to two tier?	New school type (where changed)	Pupil Numbers				Nursery Numbers			Sixth Form			Requires additional land to fully implement?	Scores for elements of feasibility grading							Feasibility Grading	
								Current	Proposed	Increase	Increase (FE)	Current	Proposed	Increase	Current	Proposed	Increase		Cost 30%	Planning & Highways 20%	Site Potential 15%	Teaching Value 15%	Value for Money 10%	Ease of Construction 5%	Disruption 5%	Total feasibility score	Grading
136	Dedworth Middle School	Middle	Windsor		1 New Build Single Storey extension to Main School Building and Science / Technology Block (Modular)	No	-	720	840	120	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	3	3	1	3	2	2	2.6	Highly Feasible
137	Dedworth Middle School	Middle	Windsor		2 New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block (Junior) with New Build Single Storey Extension to Main School Building and Science / Technology Block (Modular)	No	-	720	960	240	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	1.95	Less feasible
138	Dedworth Middle School	Middle	Windsor		3 New Build 3-Storey Teaching Block (Music, Science, Art & DT)	Yes	Secondary	720	900	180	0	0	0	0	0	207	207	No	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	1.95	Less feasible
139	Dedworth Middle School	Middle	Windsor		4 New Build 3-Storey Super Block	Yes	Secondary	720	900	180	0	0	0	0	0	207	207	No	1	1	3	3	2	3	3	1.9	Less feasible
140	Dedworth Middle School	Middle	Windsor		5 New Build 3-Storey Finger Block	Yes	Secondary	720	1350	630	2	0	0	0	0	311	311	No	1	2	2	3	1	3	3	1.85	Less feasible
98	Desborough College	Secondary	Maidenhead		1 Phased expansion, 2 no. New Build 3-Storey Teaching Block, Music, Art, Sixth Form	No	-	1050	1200	150	1	0	0	0	242	277	35	No	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1.65	Unfeasible
99	Desborough College	Secondary	Maidenhead		2 Phased expansion, New Build 3-Storey Teaching Block, 3-Storey Music, Art, Sixth Form Teaching Block	No	-	1050	1350	300	2	0	0	0	242	311	69	No	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1.65	Unfeasible
100	Desborough College	Secondary	Maidenhead		3 Phased expansion, majority new build school	No	-	1050	1500	450	3	0	0	0	242	346	104	No	1	2	1	3	1	1	1	1.5	Unfeasible
101	Desborough College	Secondary	Maidenhead		4 New Build 3-Storey Super Block on existing school site	No	-	1050	1500	450	3	0	0	0	242	346	104	No	1	2	1	3	1	2	2	1.6	Unfeasible
192	Eton Porny CofE First School	First	Windsor		1 New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block and single storey extension to Existing Building	No	-	150	300	150	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	0	0	2	2	1	0	0.85	Unfeasible
193	Eton Porny CofE First School	First	Windsor		2 New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block and single storey extension to Existing Building, with junior year groups at Eton Wick	Yes	Infant	150	180	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	0	0	2	2	1	0	0.85	Unfeasible
194	Eton Porny CofE First School	First	Windsor		3 Extensive remodelling to Main Building, split site with some year groups at Eton Wick	Yes	Primary	150	210	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	2	1	1	3	3	3	2.2	Feasible
187	Eton Wick First School	First	Windsor		1 New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block on existing school site	No	-	150	300	150	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	1	2	1	3	2	3	2.1	Feasible
188	Eton Wick First School	First	Windsor		2 Extensive remodelling to Main Building	Yes	Junior	150	240	90	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	3	2	1	3	2	3	2.5	Highly Feasible
189	Eton Wick First School	First	Windsor		3 New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block on existing school site	Yes	Primary	150	300	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	Feasible
190	Eton Wick First School	First	Windsor		4 Extensive remodelling to Main Building	Yes	Primary	150	236	86	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	3	3	1	3	2	3	2.65	Highly Feasible
191	Eton Wick First School	First	Windsor		5 New Build 2-Storey Primary School on existing school site	Yes	Primary	150	446	296	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	2	2	3	1	2	2	1.75	Less feasible
36	Furze Platt Infant School	Infant	Maidenhead		1 Single storey extensions to existing school	No	-	270	360	90	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.3	Unfeasible
37	Furze Platt Infant School	Infant	Maidenhead		2 New build Infant School and Nursery built on the southern end of Furze Platt Senior School land	No	-	270	360	90	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - partial land swap with Furze Platt Senior School	2	1	3	3	2	3	3	2.2	Feasible
38	Furze Platt Junior School	Junior	Maidenhead		1 Two single storey new build blocks at northern end of site	No	-	360	480	120	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	1	1	2	2	2	1	1.9	Less feasible
39	Furze Platt Junior School	Junior	Maidenhead		2 New build 4FE Junior School built on the southern end of Furze Platt Senior School land	No	-	360	480	120	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes	2	1	3	3	1	3	3	2.1	Feasible
40	Furze Platt Junior School	Junior	Maidenhead		3 New build 4FE Primary School built on the southern end of Furze Platt Senior School land	No	Primary	360	840	480	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes	2	1	3	3	1	3	3	2.1	Feasible

Appendix A: Summary of options identified in the school expansion feasibility programme

Ref	School	School Type	Area	Option	Description of option	Option changes school from three tier to two tier?	New school type (where changed)	Pupil Numbers				Nursery Numbers			Sixth Form			Requires additional land to fully implement?	Scores for elements of feasibility grading							Feasibility Grading		
								Current	Proposed	Increase	Increase (FE)	Current	Proposed	Increase	Current	Proposed	Increase		Cost	Planning & Highways	Site Potential	Teaching Value	Value for Money	Ease of Construction	Disruption	Total feasibility score	Grading	
																												30%
102	Furze Platt Senior School	Secondary	Maidenhead		1 New Build 2-Storey DT, Art & Teaching Block on existing school site	No	-	1265	1350	85	0.6	0	0	0	360	3838	3478	No	3	2	2	1	3	3	3	2.35	Highly Feasible	
103	Furze Platt Senior School	Secondary	Maidenhead		2 New Build 3-Storey Science and Art Block, 2no. New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block	No	-	1265	1500	235	1.6	0	0	0	360	426	66	No	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	Feasible
104	Furze Platt Senior School	Secondary	Maidenhead		3 Two New Build 3-Storey Teaching Blocks and one New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block	No	-	1265	1500	235	1.6	0	0	0	360	426	66	No	1	2	2	3	1	1	1	1.65	Unfeasible	
105	Furze Platt Senior School	Secondary	Maidenhead		4 New build 3-Storey Super Block and single storey Teaching Block	No	-	1265	1500	235	1.6	0	0	0	360	426	66	No	1	2	2	3	0	2	1	1.6	Unfeasible	
148	Hilltop First School	First	Windsor		1 Single storey extensions to southwest wing and northeast wing of Main School Building	No	-	225	326	101	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	3	2	2	3	1	2	2.25	Feasible	
149	Hilltop First School	First	Windsor		2 Internal remodelling	No	Primary	225	236	11	-0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2.85	Highly Feasible	
150	Hilltop First School	First	Windsor		3 2no. New Build 2-Storey Teaching Blocks to accommodate teaching spaces, studio and library on existing school site	No	Primary	225	446	221	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	3	1	3	1	1	1	1.7	Less feasible	
22	Holy Trinity C of E Primary School, Cookham	Primary	Maidenhead		1 Primary School on existing site - New Single Storey Block	No	-	210	420	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - farmland to south east	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2.35	Highly Feasible	
23	Holy Trinity C of E Primary School, Cookham	Primary	Maidenhead		2 Primary School on existing site - New 2 Storey Block	No	-	210	420	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - farmland to south east	1	3	3	3	2	3	3	2.3	Feasible	
105	Holy Trinity C of E Primary School, Sunningdale	Primary	Ascot		1 New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block to accommodate teaching spaces, studio and library on existing school site	No	-	210	420	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	2.5	Highly Feasible	
73	Holyport C of E Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead		1 New build 2 storey school	No	-	420	630	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	2	0	3	1	2	2	1.45	Unfeasible	
106	Holyport College	Secondary	Maidenhead		1 Single new block on existing playing field	No	-	352	528	176	1.6	0	0	0	196	293	97	No	2	1	1	3	3	2	3	1.95	Less feasible	
107	Holyport College	Secondary	Maidenhead		2 Two new blocks on existing playing field	No	-	352	704	352	3.2	0	0	0	196	391	195	No	2	1	0	3	3	2	3	1.8	Less feasible	
165	Homer First School	First	Windsor		1 Infill extensions to Existing Building	No	-	225	300	75	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	3	2	2	3	1	3	2.6	Highly Feasible	
166	Homer First School	First	Windsor		2 Double height Infill extension to Existing Building	Yes	Primary	225	420	195	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2.8	Highly Feasible	
167	Homer First School	First	Windsor		3 New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block on existing playground and Double height Infill extension to Existing Building	Yes	Primary	225	420	195	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	2.1	Feasible	
168	King's Court First School	First	Windsor		1 2-Storey Extension and double height extension to Existing Building	No	-	225	300	75	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	Feasible	
169	King's Court First School	First	Windsor		2 Double height extension to Existing Building	Yes	Primary	225	210	-15	-0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	2.7	Highly Feasible	
170	King's Court First School	First	Windsor		3 2-Storey Extension to Existing Building	Yes	Primary	225	315	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	1.85	Less feasible	
171	King's Court First School	First	Windsor		4 Single Storey Extension and double height extension to Existing Building	Yes	Infant	225	270	45	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	2.7	Highly Feasible	

Appendix A: Summary of options identified in the school expansion feasibility programme

Ref	School	School Type	Area	Option	Description of option	Option changes school from three tier to two tier?	New school type (where changed)	Pupil Numbers				Nursery Numbers			Sixth Form			Requires additional land to fully implement?	Scores for elements of feasibility grading							Feasibility Grading					
								Current	Proposed	Increase	Increase (FE)	Current	Proposed	Increase	Current	Proposed	Increase		Cost	Planning & Highways	Site Potential	Teaching Value	Value for Money	Ease of Construction	Disruption	Total feasibility score	Grading				
																												30%	20%	15%	15%
18	Knowl Hill C of E Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	1	Primary School on existing site - New Single Storey Block	No	-	84	210	126	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - adjacent fields	1	2	2	3	1	3	2	1.8	Less feasible	
19	Knowl Hill C of E Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	2	Primary School on existing site - New 2 Storey Block	No	-	84	210	126	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - adjacent fields	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	1.6	Unfeasible	
20	Knowl Hill C of E Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	3	Primary School on existing site - New Single Storey Block	No	-	84	210	126	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - adjacent fields	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	Feasible	
63	Larchfield Primary and Nursery School	Primary	Maidenhead	1	New build 2 storey Primary School on existing school playing field (Little Pioneers nursery unaffected)	No	-	210	420	210	1	20	26	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	1	1	3	2	2	2	1.8	Less feasible	
64	Larchfield Primary and Nursery School	Primary	Maidenhead	2	New build 2 storey Primary School on existing school playing field (Little Pioneers nursery removed from site)	No	-	210	420	210	1	20	26	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	Feasible	
65	Larchfield Primary and Nursery School	Primary	Maidenhead	3	New build 2 storey Primary School on existing school playing field (Little Pioneers nursery and Children's Centre	No	-	210	420	210	1	20	26	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	Feasible	
66	Larchfield Primary and Nursery School	Primary	Maidenhead	4	New build 2 storey Primary School on existing school playing field (Children's Centre rehoused within same building,	No	-	210	420	210	1	20	26	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	Feasible	
24	Lowbrook Academy	Primary	Maidenhead	1	Primary School on existing site - New 2 Storey Block	No	-	330	420	90	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	2.15	Feasible	
25	Lowbrook Academy	Primary	Maidenhead	2	Primary School on existing site - New 2 Storey Block	No	-	330	420	90	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	2.45	Highly Feasible	
52	Newland Girls' School	Secondary	Maidenhead	1	Small extension and small new build single storey block	No	-	960	1050	90	0.6	0	0	0	215	240	25	0	0	0	No	3	0	1	0	2	2	2	1.45	Unfeasible	
53	Newland Girls' School	Secondary	Maidenhead	2	New build 3 storey block	No	-	960	1050	90	0.6	0	0	0	215	240	25	0	0	0	No	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1.6	Unfeasible	
54	Newland Girls' School	Secondary	Maidenhead	3	New build 3 storey secondary school	No	-	960	1050	90	0.6	0	0	0	215	240	25	0	0	0	No	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	Feasible	
55	Newland Girls' School	Secondary	Maidenhead	4	New build 3 storey block and 2 storey block	No	-	960	1200	240	1.6	0	0	0	215	270	55	0	0	0	No	1	2	0	1	2	1	1	1.15	Unfeasible	
56	Newland Girls' School	Secondary	Maidenhead	5	New build 3 storey secondary school	No	-	960	1200	240	1.6	0	0	0	215	270	55	0	0	0	No	2	3	0	3	2	3	3	2.15	Feasible	
144	Oakfield First School	First	Windsor	1	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block on Hard Outdoor (PE). Minimal internal remodelling	No	-	300	450	150	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2.4	Highly Feasible	
145	Oakfield First School	First	Windsor	2	Extensive remodelling of Main School Block including Children's Centre and Private Nursery	No	-	300	450	150	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.85	Highly Feasible	
146	Oakfield First School	First	Windsor	3	Extensive remodelling of Main School Block including Children's Centre and Private Nursery	Yes	Primary	300	420	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.55	Highly Feasible	
147	Oakfield First School	First	Windsor	4	New Build 2-Storey school on existing school site	Yes	Primary	300	420	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	3	2	3	1	2	1	1.9	Less feasible	
82	Oldfield Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	1	New wing added to existing school	No	-	420	630	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	1	3	3	3	3	2.2	Feasible	
83	Oldfield Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	2	Existing Infant classrooms converted into Junior classrooms	No	Junior	420	360	-60	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - Infant provision at the Chiltern Road site	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	Highly Feasible

Appendix A: Summary of options identified in the school expansion feasibility programme

Ref	School	School Type	Area	Option	Description of option	Option changes school from three tier to two tier?	New school type (where changed)	Pupil Numbers				Nursery Numbers			Sixth Form			Requires additional land to fully implement?	Scores for elements of feasibility grading							Feasibility Grading	
								Current	Proposed	Increase	Increase (FE)	Current	Proposed	Increase	Current	Proposed	Increase		Cost 30%	Planning & Highways 20%	Site Potential 15%	Teaching Value 15%	Value for Money 10%	Ease of Construction 5%	Disruption 5%	Total feasibility score	Grading
1	Riverside Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead		1 Primary School and Nursery on existing site - New 2 Storey Block	No	-	420	630	210	1	52	52	0	0	0	0	No	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	2.65	Highly Feasible
2	Riverside Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead		2 Primary School and Nursery on existing site - partial demolition and New 2 Storey Block	No	-	420	630	210	1	52	52	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2.4	Highly Feasible
3	Riverside Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead		3 Primary School and Nursery on existing site - partial demolition and New 2 Storey Block	No	-	420	840	420	2	52	52	0	0	0	0	No	2	1	2	3	3	2	2	2.05	Feasible
4	Riverside Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead		4 Primary School and Nursery on existing site - partial demolition and New 2 Storey Block	No	-	420	840	420	2	52	52	0	0	0	0	No	1	1	3	3	2	2	2	1.8	Less feasible
115	South Ascot Village Primary School	Primary	Ascot		1 New Build 2-Storey Extension (Junior Block)	No	-	210	420	210	1	22	52	30	0	0	0	No	2	1	3	2	3	1	2	2	Feasible
116	South Ascot Village Primary School	Primary	Ascot		2 Existing Infant classrooms converted into Junior classrooms & New Build single storey Infant block & Nursery	No	-	210	420	210	1	22	52	30	0	0	0	No	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	2.25	Feasible
117	South Ascot Village Primary School	Primary	Ascot		3 New Build 2-storey Primary School & Nursery	No	-	210	420	210	1	22	52	30	0	0	0	No	1	2	3	3	1	3	3	2	Feasible
157	Spencers Farm	None	Maidenhead		1 New Build 2-Storey Primary School Block	No	Primary	0	420	420	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - part of the development site	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2.8	Highly Feasible
158	Spencers Farm	None	Maidenhead		1 New Build 2-Storey Primary School Block	No	Primary	0	630	630	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - part of the development site	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	Highly Feasible
61	St Edmund Campion Catholic Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead		1 Expansion of existing school - new 2 storey block, single storey block & foundation block extension	No	-	420	630	210	1	45	45	0	0	0	0	Yes	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	1.95	Less feasible
62	St Edmund Campion Catholic Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead		2 New build 2 storey Primary School on existing school playing field	No	-	420	630	210	1	45	45	0	0	0	0	Yes	1	2	1	3	1	2	2	1.6	Unfeasible
176	St Edward's Catholic First School	First	Windsor		1 New Build 2 Storey Teaching Block on existing playing field	No	-	300	450	150	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	0	3	3	2	3	2	Feasible
177	St Edward's Catholic First School	First	Windsor		2 New Build 2 Storey Teaching Block on existing playing field	No	-	300	450	150	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	0	3	3	2	3	2	Feasible
178	St Edward's Catholic First School	First	Windsor		3 New Build 2 Storey Teaching Block on existing playing field	Yes	Primary	300	420	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - adjacent first school site	2	2	0	3	3	2	3	2	Feasible
179	St Edward's Catholic First School	First	Windsor		4 Single storey extension to Existing Building	Yes	Primary	300	840	540	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - adjacent middle school site	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	1.95	Less feasible
180	St Edward's Royal Free Ecumenical Middle School	Middle	Windsor		1 Single storey extensions to Existing Buildings	No	-	480	600	120	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - shared block with the adjacent first school	3	2	1	1	3	3	2	2.15	Feasible
181	St Edward's Royal Free Ecumenical Middle School	Middle	Windsor		2 New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block on existing playing field and single storey extension to Existing Building	Yes	Secondary	480	600	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	1	2	3	2	1	1.9	Less feasible
182	St Edward's Royal Free Ecumenical Middle School	Middle	Windsor		3 New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block on existing playing field and single storey extension to Existing Building	Yes	Secondary	480	600	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - adjacent first school site	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1.85	Less feasible
183	St Edward's Royal Free Ecumenical Middle School	Middle	Windsor		4 Single storey extension to Primary School Building	Yes	Primary	480	840	360	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - adjacent first school site	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	1.95	Less feasible
184	St Edward's Royal Free Ecumenical Middle School	Middle	Windsor		5 New Build 2-Storey school on existing school site	Yes	Secondary	480	600	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - adjacent first school site	1	2	2	3	1	2	2	1.75	Less feasible
110	St Francis Catholic Primary School	Primary	Ascot		1 New Build single storey Teaching Block and Main Hall Block on existing school site	No	-	210	420	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	1	2	2	3	2	1.9	Less feasible
111	St Francis Catholic Primary School	Primary	Ascot		2 New Build 2-Storey Primary School Block on existing school site	No	-	210	420	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	2	1	3	1	3	2	1.65	Unfeasible

Appendix A: Summary of options identified in the school expansion feasibility programme

Ref	School	School Type	Area	Option	Description of option	Option changes school from three tier to two tier?	New school type (where changed)	Pupil Numbers				Nursery Numbers			Sixth Form			Requires additional land to fully implement?	Scores for elements of feasibility grading							Feasibility Grading	
								Current	Proposed	Increase	Increase (FE)	Current	Proposed	Increase	Current	Proposed	Increase		Cost	Planning & Highways	Site Potential	Teaching Value	Value for Money	Ease of Construction	Disruption	Total feasibility score	Grading
5	St Luke's C of E Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	1	Primary School and Nursery on existing site - New 2 Storey Block	No	-	315	420	105	0.5	26	52	26	0	0	0	No	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	1.7	Less feasible
6	St Luke's C of E Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	2	Primary School and Nursery on existing site - New 2 Storey Block	No	-	315	420	105	0.5	26	52	26	0	0	0	No	2	2	0	2	1	1	1	1.5	Unfeasible
7	St Luke's C of E Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	3	Primary School and Nursery on existing site - New 2 Storey School Building	No	-	315	420	105	0.5	26	52	26	0	0	0	No	1	2	0	2	1	1	1	1.2	Unfeasible
8	St Mary's Catholic Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	1	Primary School and Nursery on existing site - New Single Storey Block	No	-	315	420	105	0.5	0	26	26	0	0	0	No	1	2	2	1	1	0	1	1.3	Unfeasible
9	St Mary's Catholic Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	2	Primary School and Nursery on existing site - New 2 Storey Block	No	-	315	420	105	0.5	0	26	26	0	0	0	No	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	Feasible
112	St Michael's C of E Primary School	Primary	Ascot	1	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block and Main Hall extension on existing school site	No	-	210	420	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	0	1	2	2	2	1	1.4	Unfeasible
113	St Michael's C of E Primary School	Primary	Ascot	2	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block and Main Hall extension on existing school site	No	-	210	420	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	0	0	1	3	2	2	1.55	Unfeasible
114	St Michael's C of E Primary School	Primary	Ascot	3	New Build 2FE Infant department located on off site playing field	No	-	210	420	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	1	3	3	2	3	3	1.9	Less feasible
172	St Peter's Church of England Middle School	Middle	Windsor	1	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block on existing playground and single storey extension to Main Building	No	-	360	480	120	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	1	1	2	3	3	2	1.8	Less feasible
173	St Peter's Church of England Middle School	Middle	Windsor	2	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block on existing playground and double height extension to Main Building	Yes	Secondary	360	450	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	1	2	2	2	3	2	1.85	Less feasible
174	St Peter's Church of England Middle School	Middle	Windsor	3	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block on existing playground and double height extension to Main Building	Yes	Primary	360	630	270	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	1	3	2	3	3	3	2.45	Highly Feasible
175	St Peter's Church of England Middle School	Middle	Windsor	4	Extensive remodelling to Main Building	Yes	Junior	360	360	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	Highly Feasible
154	The Queen Anne Royal Free CE First School	First	Windsor	1	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block and Main Hall extension on existing school site	No	-	150	300	150	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - adjacent public open space	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	1.95	Less feasible
155	The Queen Anne Royal Free CE First School	First	Windsor	2	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block and Main Hall extension on existing school site	Yes	Primary	150	210	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - adjacent public open space	2	1	3	2	1	2	2	1.85	Less feasible
156	The Queen Anne Royal Free CE First School	First	Windsor	3	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block and Main Hall extension on existing school site	Yes	Primary	150	420	270	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - adjacent public open space	2	1	0	2	2	2	2	1.5	Unfeasible
185	The Royal First School	First	Windsor	1	Single storey extension to Main Building	No	-	100	150	50	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	1	3	2	2	3	2	2.3	Highly Feasible
186	The Royal First School	First	Windsor	2	Extensive remodelling to Main Building	Yes	Primary	100	105	5	-0.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.85	Highly Feasible
127	The Windsor Boys' School	Upper	Windsor	1	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block on former Tennis Courts with some internal remodelling of existing buildings	No	-	810	900	90	1	0	0	0	311	360	49	No	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	2.5	Highly Feasible
128	The Windsor Boys' School	Upper	Windsor	2	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block on former Block A/B Wing with some internal remodelling of existing buildings	No	-	810	990	180	2	0	0	0	311	396	85	No	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2.3	Highly Feasible
129	The Windsor Boys' School	Upper	Windsor	3	New Build 3-Storey Teaching Block on existing playing field with internal remodelling of existing buildings	Yes	Secondary	810	1050	240	-2	0	0	0	311	0	-311	No	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	Feasible
130	The Windsor Boys' School	Upper	Windsor	4	New Build 3-Storey Teaching Block on existing playing field with internal remodelling of existing buildings	Yes	Secondary	810	1350	540	0	0	0	0	311	324	13	No	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2.1	Feasible
131	The Windsor Boys' School	Upper	Windsor	5	New Build 4-Storey Super Block on existing school site	Yes	Secondary	810	1350	540	0	0	0	0	311	324	13	No	1	2	2	3	1	3	3	1.85	Less feasible

42

Appendix A: Summary of options identified in the school expansion feasibility programme

Ref	School	School Type	Area	Option	Description of option	Option changes school from three tier to two tier?	New school type (where changed)	Pupil Numbers				Nursery Numbers			Sixth Form			Requires additional land to fully implement?	Scores for elements of feasibility grading							Feasibility Grading	
								Current	Proposed	Increase	Increase (FE)	Current	Proposed	Increase	Current	Proposed	Increase		Cost	Planning & Highways	Site Potential	Teaching Value	Value for Money	Ease of Construction	Disruption	Total feasibility score	Grading
								30%	20%	15%	15%	10%	5%	5%													
195	Trevelyan Middle School	Middle	Windsor	1	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block and double height extension to Existing Building	No	-	600	720	120	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2.65	Highly Feasible
196	Trevelyan Middle School	Middle	Windsor	2	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block and double height extension to Existing Building	Yes	Secondary	600	750	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	2.3	Feasible
197	Trevelyan Middle School	Middle	Windsor	3	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block and single storey extension to Existing Building	Yes	Primary	600	1050	450	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	1	3	2	3	3	2	2.1	Feasible
198	Trevelyan Middle School	Middle	Windsor	4	New Build 2-Storey Secondary School Block	Yes	Secondary	600	900	300	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	1.45	Unfeasible
199	Trevelyan Middle School	Middle	Windsor	5	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block and double height extension to Existing Building	Yes	Secondary	600	600	0	-1	0	0	0	0	148	148	No	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	2.3	Feasible
200	Trevelyan Middle School	Middle	Windsor	6	New Build Sixth Form College	Yes	Sixth Form College	600	0	-600	13	0	0	0	0	637	637	No	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	1.45	Unfeasible
151	Trinity St Stephen's Church of England First School	First	Windsor	1	New Build 2-Storey Teaching Block and Single storey extension to Main School Building	No	-	150	300	150	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	0	0	2	3	1	1	1	Unfeasible
152	Trinity St Stephen's Church of England First School	First	Windsor	2	Single storey extensions to southeast wing and north wing of Main School Building	Yes	Infant	150	18	-132	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	1.5	Unfeasible
153	Trinity St Stephen's Church of England First School	First	Windsor	3	New Build Single Storey Teaching Block and Single storey extension to Main School Building	Yes	Primary	150	210	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - shared use of playing field at The Windsor Boys' School	2	0	1	1	3	1	1	1.3	Unfeasible
74	Waltham St Lawrence Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	1	New build single storey Infant block	No	-	154	210	56	0.37	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	3	1	3	2	3	3	2	2.4	Highly Feasible
75	Waltham St Lawrence Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	2	Extension to main school block in location of existing modular dining block	No	-	154	210	56	0.37	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	3	2	2	1	1	2.05	Feasible
76	Waltham St Lawrence Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	3	Extension to main school block in north and south of site	No	-	154	210	56	0.37	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	1.45	Unfeasible
77	Waltham St Lawrence Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	4	New build 2 storey school on existing site	No	-	154	210	56	0.37	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	1	3	3	0	1	1	1.5	Unfeasible
10	Wessex Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	1	Primary School and Nursery on existing site - New 2 Storey Block	No	-	420	630	210	1	26	26	0	0	0	0	No	3	1	3	2	3	2	2	2.35	Highly Feasible
11	Wessex Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	2	Primary School and Nursery on existing site - New 2 Storey Block	No	-	420	630	210	1	26	26	0	0	0	0	No	1	2	2	3	2	3	2	1.9	Less feasible
12	Wessex Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	3	Primary School and Nursery on existing site - New 2 Storey School	No	-	420	840	420	2	26	26	0	0	0	0	No	1	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	Feasible
13	Wessex Primary School	Primary	Maidenhead	4	Primary School and Nursery on existing site - New 2 Storey School	No	-	420	840	420	2	26	26	0	0	0	0	No	1	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	Feasible
14	White Waltham C of E Academy	Primary	Maidenhead	1	Primary School on existing site - New 2 Storey Block	No	-	210	420	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - field to the west of school	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	2.1	Feasible
15	White Waltham C of E Academy	Primary	Maidenhead	2	Primary School on existing site - New 2 Storey Block	No	-	210	420	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - field to the west of school	2	1	2	3	2	3	3	2.05	Feasible
16	White Waltham C of E Academy	Primary	Maidenhead	3	Primary School on existing site - New 2 Storey Block	No	-	210	420	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - field to the west of school	2	1	2	1	3	3	3	1.85	Less feasible
17	White Waltham C of E Academy	Primary	Maidenhead	4	Primary School on existing site - New 2 Storey Block	No	-	210	420	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes - field to the west of school and adjacent garage site	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	1.7	Less feasible

Appendix A: Summary of options identified in the school expansion feasibility programme

Ref	School	School Type	Area	Option	Description of option	Option changes school from three tier to two tier?	New school type (where changed)	Pupil Numbers				Nursery Numbers			Sixth Form			Requires additional land to fully implement?	Scores for elements of feasibility grading							Feasibility Grading		
								Current	Proposed	Increase	Increase (FE)	Current	Proposed	Increase	Current	Proposed	Increase		Cost 30%	Planning & Highways 20%	Site Potential 15%	Teaching Value 15%	Value for Money 10%	Ease of Construction 5%	Disruption 5%	Total feasibility score	Grading	
122	Windsor Girls' School	Upper	Windsor	1	New Build 2 Storey Teaching Block on existing school site	No	-	630	720	90	1	0	0	0	254	277	23	No	2	3	2	1	3	2	2	2.15	Feasible	
123	Windsor Girls' School	Upper	Windsor	2	New Build 2 Storey Teaching Block on existing school site	No	-	630	810	180	2	0	0	0	254	311	57	No	2	3	2	1	3	2	2	2.15	Feasible	
124	Windsor Girls' School	Upper	Windsor	3	New Build 2 Storey Teaching Block on existing carpark	Yes	Secondary	630	1200	570	0	0	0	0	254	0	-254	No	2	2	1	1	3	2	2	1.8	Less feasible	
125	Windsor Girls' School	Upper	Windsor	4	New Build 3 Storey Teaching Block on existing carpark	Yes	Secondary	630	1050	420	0	0	0	0	254	242	-12	No	2	2	1	1	3	2	2	1.8	Less feasible	
126	Windsor Girls' School	Upper	Windsor	5	New Build 3-Storey Super Block on existing playing field	Yes	Secondary	630	1200	570	1	0	0	0	254	277	23	No	1	1	1	3	1	3	3	1.5	Unfeasible	
78	Woodlands Park Primary and Nursery School	Primary	Maidenhead	1	Extension of existing school and internal remodelling of junior block	No	-	210	315	105	0.5	26	26	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	Feasible
79	Woodlands Park Primary and Nursery School	Primary	Maidenhead	2	New build 2 storey Primary School with expansion of school site into neighbouring agricultural land	No	-	210	420	210	0.5	26	26	0	0	0	0	Yes - into agricultural land to the south	1	2	3	3	1	2	3	1.95	Less feasible	
80	Wraysbury Primary School	Primary	Datchet & Wraysbury	1	2 storey extension to existing school buildings & first floor added to main block	No	-	420	630	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	1.85	Less feasible	
81	Wraysbury Primary School	Primary	Datchet & Wraysbury	2	New build 3 storey Primary School	No	-	420	630	210	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	1	1	1	3	1	2	1	1.35	Unfeasible	

Report Title:	NEW PROVISION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information?	Yes – Part II Appendix C is not for publication by virtue of paragraph 8 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972
Member reporting:	Councillor Stuart Carroll, Lead Member for Adult Social Care, Children’s Services, Health and Mental Health
Meeting and Date:	Cabinet – 27 August 2020
Responsible Officer(s):	Kevin McDaniel, Director of Children’s Services
Wards affected:	All

www.rbwm.gov.uk



Royal Borough
of Windsor &
Maidenhead

REPORT SUMMARY

1. This report summarises the outcome of ‘informal’ public consultation on options for new Resource Bases attached to schools at six sites in the Royal Borough. These sites were Dedworth Green First School/Dedworth Middle School; the Furze Platt Primary Federation; Hilltop First School; Homer First School; South Ascot Village Primary School and Wraysbury Primary School. The report also summarises the feasibility and cost (in Part 2) of providing the new accommodation needed at each site. The option for a Resource Base at South Ascot Village Primary School was added into the consultation following a representation from the school received during the consultation period.
2. The report recommends in principle approval of four options, providing Resourced Provision at four locations across the borough. It also recommends that formal consultation on those options should now proceed.
3. Capital funding for any new buildings will come from the Department for Education’s £1.227m Special Provision Capital Fund grant to the local authority.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION: That Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) **Approves, in principle, proposals to open new Resource Bases for children with social communication difficulties and related behaviours as follows:**

Phase 1

- **Resourced Provision at the Furze Platt Primary Federation, from September 2021.**
- **Resourced Provision at Dedworth Green First School/Dedworth Middle School, from September 2021.**

Phase 2

- **Resourced Provision or a SEN Unit at South Ascot Village Primary School, from September 2022.**

- Resourced Provision at Wraysbury Primary School, from September 2022.
- ii) Requests that, subject to approval from the school governing bodies and academy trusts, formal consultation is carried on Phase 1 in Autumn 2020, and on Phase 2 in Summer 2021. The Windsor Learning Partnership is requested to submit an initial Business Case to the Regional Schools Commissioner, seeking the necessary approval of a significant change to an academy.
 - iii) Delegates authority to determine the proposals following formal consultation to the Director of Children Services, in conjunction with the Lead Member for Adult Social Care, Children’s Services, Health and Mental Health, subject to:
 - no substantive new issues being raised during the formal consultation period;
 - each school agreeing and signing a Memorandum of Understanding with the local authority setting out the scope of the accommodation works.
 - each school agreeing and signing a draft service level agreement setting out the expectations of both the school and the local authority in relation to the running of the Resource Base.
 - iv) Approves a budget estimate of £1.227m, and gives delegated authority to the Director of Children’s Services, in conjunction with the Lead Member for Adult Social Care, Children’s Services, Health and Mental Health, to undertake procurement and enter into contracts for the delivery of the new special educational needs detailed in this report.
 - v) Thanks the schools involved for their work on the Resource Bases, including Hilltop First School and Homer First School where proposals are not currently being taken forward.
 - vi) Approves a policy stating that there should be a presumption in favour of all new school sites in the borough having a Resource Base.

2. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Background

The Special Provision Capital Fund

- 2.1 In March 2017, the Department for Education (DfE) announced a new capital fund to:

“help local authorities create new school places and improve existing facilities for children and young people with SEN [Special Educational Needs] and disabilities, in consultation with parents and providers.”¹

¹ Page 3, [Special Provision Capital Fund Guidance](#), Department for Education, January 2019.

- 2.2 The grant to the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead is £1.227m.
- 2.3 In February 2020 Cabinet considered a report proposing public consultation on proposals to use the funding to open a number of Resource Bases for children with social communication difficulties and related behaviours. The report also approved feasibility work to provide costed options for the new accommodation.
- 2.4 This report provides an options appraisal based on the outcome of the consultation and feasibility works, and recommends a series of next steps.

Note on Resource Bases, Resourced Provision and SEN Units

- 2.5 Resource Base is a generic term for a facility attached to a school that provides additional support for children and young people with Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs). Resource Bases usually focus on a specific need or range of needs, and come in two types:
 - Resourced Provision. Children and young people attending this will be able to spend most of their time in mainstream classes at the school. They will spend some time receiving extra support in the provision itself.
 - SEN Unit. Children and young people attending a SEN Unit will spend more of their time in the unit, but will still attend some mainstream classes in the school.
- 2.6 In addition to two schools specifically for children with Special Educational Needs, the Royal Borough already has four schools with Resourced Provision, as set out in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Existing SEN provision in the Royal Borough

Provision	Type	SEND need	Age	Places
Manor Green School	School	Complex, profound multiple learning difficulties	2-19	300
Forest Bridge		Autistic Spectrum Disorder	4-16	96
Charters School	Resourced Provision	Physical Disability	11-19	10
Furze Platt Senior School		Autistic Spectrum Disorder	11-19	17
Riverside Primary School		Speech/Language	3-11	14
Wessex Primary School		Hearing Impaired	3-11	14

The proposals

- 2.7 The proposed Resource Bases are for children of primary, first and middle school age who have EHCPs and social communication difficulties and related behaviours. Their EHCPs are likely to be for Autism and/or Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH). The children will be capable of attending and benefiting from mainstream classes in schools, but will still need the support that can be provided by the Resource Base.
- 2.8 The report to Cabinet in February 2020 noted that there is no specific provision of this type and for this age group in the borough, despite it being an area of growing demand. Thus, the new Resource Bases would:

- help to meet the needs of a growing population;
- provide more provision for children with an ASD and/or SEMH EHCP who would benefit from attending a mainstream school at a location closer to their home; and
- reduce the number of ASD and SEMH children at Manor Green, freeing up places for the school's primary purpose, which is educating children and young people with more complex, profound multiple learning difficulties.

2.9 Five sites for the new Resource Bases were proposed, with the intention to open the new facilities in September 2021:

- The Dedworth campus in Windsor (for Resourced Provision).
- Furze Platt Primary Federation (for Resourced Provision)
- Hilltop First School in Windsor (for Resourced Provision or SEN Unit).
- Homer First School in Windsor (for Resourced Provision).
- Wraysbury Primary School in Wraysbury (for Resourced Provision).

2.10 A sixth site was proposed during the consultation period, for either Resourced Provision or a SEN Unit at South Ascot Village Primary School in Ascot.

Informal consultation

2.11 Paragraph 4.1 in Section 4 sets out the details of the consultation and decision making process required by legislation for this type of proposal. The first step is 'informal consultation'. Although approval to carry this out was given by Cabinet in February, it was significantly delayed by the Covid-19 crisis, and did not start until June. More details about the consultation process is given in Section 8; the consultation document is provided at Appendix A; and the full details of the consultation outcome are given in Appendix B.

2.12 The consultation was amended in early July to include the new option for a Resource Base at South Ascot Village Primary School, with an extended deadline for submitting responses.

2.13 In summary, the outcome of the consultation is extremely positive, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Consultation response – principle of new Resource Bases

Do you agree that the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead should open new Resourced Provision and/or SEN Units for children with social communication difficulties and related behaviours?		
Answer	Responses (No.)	Responses (%)
Yes	377	94
No	11	3
Don't know	7	2
No view	5	1
Total	400	100

2.14 Responses were received from 125 parents/carers of children with EHCPs. 117 (94%) were in favour of new Resource Bases being opened in the borough.

- 2.15 Respondents were given the opportunity to comment on their answers, with the following main points being raised. The numbers in brackets indicate the number of respondents who made this point in their comments:
- proposals will improve provision on offer for children locally, and increase choice (28).
 - the borough needs to improve on current poor support for children with special educational needs (25).
 - Resource Bases will improve educational outcomes for SEN children (19).
 - Resource Bases will promote better inclusion of SEN children (16).
 - the proposals will benefit the respondents own child or children, or would have done if it had been available in the past (15).
 - agree there is a growing demand for this type of provision (12).
 - too many of the options are for Resource Bases in Windsor (7).
 - staff at a school with an Resource Base will need proper training (6).
 - all schools should have a Resource Base (5).
 - The remit of the Resource Bases needs to be widened to cover other special educational needs (5).
- 2.16 Many more comments were made in relation to this question, and these are summarised of page 2 of Appendix B, and available to view in full on pages 9 to 22 of Appendix B.
- 2.17 The consultation then asked respondents to give their views on the individual site proposals, as summarised in Table 3. Note that Hilltop First School and South Ascot Village Primary School appear in the table twice, as they were both open to considering Resourced Provision or an SEN Unit. There are fewer overall responses in relation to the South Ascot Village Primary School, as this option was added in late.

Table 3: Consultation response – views on specific options

Do you agree that the Royal Borough should open new Resource Bases at the following schools?					
Site	Yes	No	Don't know	No view	Did not complete this question
Dedworth Campus Resourced Provision	184 46%	36 9%	54 14%	106 26%	20 5%
Furze Platt Primary Federation Resourced Provision	202 50%	36 9%	54 14%	88 22%	20 5%
Hilltop First School Resourced Provision	148 37%	44 11%	74 18%	114 28%	20 5%
Hilltop First School SEN Unit	178 44%	30 8%	68 17%	104 26%	20 5%
Homer First School Resourced Provision	131 33%	44 11%	81 20%	124 31%	20 5%
South Ascot Village Primary Resourced Provision	86 22%	14 4%	21 5%	48 11%	234 58%
South Ascot Village Primary SEN Unit	89 22%	11 3%	21 5%	45 11%	234 58%
Wraysbury Primary School Resourced Provision	158 40%	33 8%	74 18%	115 29%	20 5%

- 2.18 The inclusion of the sixth option partway through this consultation has meant that many respondents have not submitted their opinion on all six options. These are shown in the 'did not complete this question' column.
- 2.19 There is a high level of uncertainty in relation to the specific proposals, with many respondents unable or unwilling to comment on schools that they may have no direct experience of. The level of responses against each specific proposal is, however, very low. Table 4 sets out the percentages for and against each option, with 'Don't know', 'No view' and 'Did not complete' removed.

Table 4: Consultation response – % specifically for/against each option

Do you agree that the Royal Borough should open new Resource Bases at the following schools?		
Site	Yes	No
Dedworth Campus Resourced Provision	84%	16%
Furze Platt Primary Federation Resourced Provision	85%	15%
Hilltop First School Resourced Provision	77%	23%
Hilltop First School SEN Unit	86%	14%
Homer First School Resourced Provision	75%	25%
South Ascot Village Primary Resourced Provision	86%	14%
South Ascot Village Primary SEN Unit	89%	11%
Wraysbury Primary School Resourced Provision	83%	17%

- 2.20 Excluding 'Don't know' and 'No view', there is a very high level of support for all the options.
- 2.21 Appendix B also gives a breakdown of the responses from each of the school communities (parents, staff and governors) at which a new Resource Base is proposed. Although relatively few responses have been received from each school, in most cases the large majority of those who did respond were in favour of Resource Bases at their school. The exception is Homer First School, where there was only slightly more for the proposal (5) than against (4).
- 2.22 Respondents were given the opportunity to comment on their answers in relation to the specific proposals. The numbers in brackets indicate the number of respondents who made this point in their comments:
- important to have a good geographical spread of Resource Bases (21).
 - Ascot should have a Resource Base (12).
 - having new Resource Bases will reduce home to school travel times (10).
 - all schools should have a Resource Base (8).
 - Wraysbury Primary School has a good track record in meeting the needs of SEN children (5).

- Maidenhead should have a Resource Base (5).
- Hilltop First School has a good track record in meeting the needs of SEN children (5).
- there should be more Resource Bases for secondary and upper schools (4).
- what happens when a child moves on from a Resource Base at a first school? (4).
- a Resource Base at the Furze Platt Primary Federation will complement the provision already available at SHINE, at Furze Platt Senior School (4).

2.23 Many more comments were made in relation to this question, and these are summarised on page 2 of Appendix B, and available to view in full on pages 23 to 33 of Appendix B.

Feasibility works on new accommodation

2.24 Resource Bases have their own accommodation, where children and young people attending the facility can receive additional support. The needs of Resourced Provision and SEN Units are different, as set out in government guidance Building Bulletin 104 and summarised below:

SEN Unit

- 55m² teaching space (equivalent to one full sized classroom).
- 12m² dining, social and learning resource.
- 4m² admin and storage.
- 19m² float (space to be allocated as per the specific needs of that unit).
- 35m² toilets and circulation.
- 125m² in total.

Resourced Provision

- 16m² dining, social and learning resource.
- 4m² admin and storage.
- 16m² float (space to be allocated as per the specific needs of that provision).
- 14m² toilets and circulation.
- 50m² in total.

2.25 Feasibility works were carried out by the borough, in partnership with HLM Architects, to explore and cost options for providing the new accommodation, whilst also taking account of any future school place expansions required. These options have been developed in partnership with the schools.

2.26 In summary, deliverable options have been identified at all six sites. In most cases the options involve remodelling of existing accommodation, sometimes with small extensions. A number of the options involve new standalone blocks, although not as preferred options. Appendix C provides a summary of these options. As this includes estimated costings, Appendix C is a Part 2 item. It is important to note that, once tendered, the costs may change.

Options appraisal

2.27 Appendix D provides an options appraisal of the proposals at the six sites, considering consultation outcome, Ofsted ratings, location and local need, capital cost and practicality of deliverability. There are no concerns about the ability of any of the schools to deliver and run a Resource Base. Affordability

in both capital and revenue terms means that four options can currently be taken forward at this time. In short, these options provide the best mix of:

- geographical distribution across the borough, improving accessibility for local residents and reducing home to school transport times and costs.
- minimised transition points for children attending the bases. This was particularly a concern in relation to the two first school sites, Hilltop and Homer, where pupils would move on from the Resource Base at a particularly young age (at the end of Year 4). These children would still be too young to attend SHINE in Maidenhead and would not necessarily be ready to move into mainstream school without the support of a Resource Base.

2.28 This report recommends that, due to issues around the transition at the end of Year 4, the two first school options are not taken forward at this point. The need for further Resource Bases, potentially serving other special educational needs, will be kept under review.

2.29 The four remaining schemes are, on the basis of the estimated costs provided in Appendix C, affordable within the £1.227m Special Provision Capital Grant.

Recommending a phased programme

2.30 This report recommends that four options are approved in principle, creating a programme with two phases. Resourced Provision at the Dedworth Campus and the Furze Platt Primary Federation would form part of Phase 1, with an intended opening date of September 2021. Phase 2, opening in September 2022, would consist of Resourced Provision at Wraysbury Primary School and either a SEN Unit or Resourced Provision at South Ascot Village Primary School.

2.31 This phasing will ensure that there is capacity to develop and deliver the new Resource Bases over two years. It will reduce the risks to the revenue budget, by allowing the borough to adjust the proposals if uptake for the Resource Bases is less than expected (see paragraphs 3.13 to 3.20 in Section 3 for more detail). Finally, it will provide time to consider whether the Resource Base at South Ascot Village Primary School should be Resourced Provision or a SEN Unit.

Next steps

2.32 The Governing Bodies and the Academy Trusts involved have not had the opportunity to fully consider the outcome of the consultation or the feasibility studies, given that both were only completed on 31st July 2020. This report proposes, therefore, that Cabinet approval of these schemes is subject to approval by the relevant Governing Bodies and Academy Trusts.

2.33 This will allow formal consultation on the Phase 1 proposals to proceed in Autumn 2020, in line with government legislation. The Royal Borough will then need to formally consider whether the proposals should go ahead. It is proposed that this decision is delegated to the Director for Children's Services, in conjunction with the Lead Member for Adult Social Care, Children Services, Health and Mental Health. This will be subject to:

- No substantive new issues being raised during the formal consultation period. If any are, then the proposals will need to come back to Cabinet for approval.
- All parties at each school agreeing and signing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) setting out the scope of the new accommodation to be provided for the Resource Base.
- All parties agreeing to draft service level agreement setting out the expectations of both the school and the local authority in relation to the running of the Resource Base.

2.34 For the Dedworth Campus proposal, the process is slightly different as both schools are academies, and part of the Windsor Learning Partnership (WLP). The WLP will need to submit a Business Case to the Regional Schools Commissioner to get final approval. As, however, the Royal Borough controls the funding, the WLP will still need to agree the MOU and draft service level agreement before the budget is committed to the scheme.

2.35 In Autumn 2020, the Royal Borough will start working with schools on setting up the new Resource Bases.

2.36 The process will then be repeated, starting in Summer 2021, for the Phase 2 proposals.

Additional proposals if needed

2.37 It is proposed that £50k from the Special Provision Capital Fund is set aside for minor works to assist with the delivery of early assessment places in schools, if changes to school revenue are agreed by the Schools Forum. This will still leave enough funding for the four proposed Resource Bases.

Resource Bases at new school

2.38 Officers have had discussions about Resource Bases in other local authority areas and at least one authority has a policy of requiring all new schools to have an attached Resource Base. Given the relatively low impact on space requirements, and the advantages of Resource Bases at a time of growing EHCP numbers, this report proposes that there should be a presumption in favour of all new schools in the borough having such a facility. The draft Borough Local Plan currently identifies four sites for new mainstream schools.

Options

Table 5: Options arising from this report.

Option	Comments
<p>Approves, in principle, proposals to open new Resource Bases for children with social communication difficulties and related behaviours as follows:</p> <p><u>Phase 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resourced Provision at the Furze Platt Primary Federation, from Sept. 2021. 	<p>The selected proposals are in line with the outcome of the options appraisal. These are considered to be the best options for Resource Bases, which in turn will improve the provision locally for children with EHCPs and social communication difficulties and related behaviours.</p> <p>The phasing of the programme will be more manageable, and reduce</p>

Option	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resourced Provision at Dedworth Green First School/Dedworth Middle School, from Sept. 2021. <u>Phase 2</u> • Resourced Provision at South Ascot Village Primary School, from Sept. 2022. • Resourced Provision at Wraysbury Primary School, from Sept. 2022. <p>Recommended.</p>	<p>any risks around impact on the revenue budget.</p>
<p>Requests that, subject to approval from the school governing bodies and academy trusts, formal consultation is carried on Phase 1 in Autumn 2020, and on Phase 2 in Summer 2021. The Windsor Learning Partnership is requested to submit an initial Business Case to the Regional Schools Commissioner, seeking the necessary approval of a significant change to an academy.</p> <p>Recommended.</p>	<p>These steps, formal consultation and, in the case of the proposals at Dedworth Green and Dedworth Middle School, submission of a Business Case to the Regional Schools Commissioner are legally required to enable the proposals to move proceed. If this recommendation is not approved, no Resources Bases can be opened.</p>
<p>Delegates authority to determine the proposals following formal consultation to the Director of Children’s Services, in conjunction with the Lead Member for Adult Social Care, Children’s Services, Health and Mental Health, subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no substantive new issues being raised during the formal consultation period; • each school agreeing and signing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the local authority setting out the scope of the accommodation works. • each school agreeing and signing a draft service level agreement setting out the expectations of both the school and the local authority in relation to the running of the Resource Base. <p>Recommended.</p>	<p>Delegation to the Director, in conjunction with the Lead Member, allows the proposals to be approved (or otherwise) without returning to Cabinet after the formal consultation period. If substantive new objections are received during this period then the issue will be returned to Cabinet for consideration.</p> <p>Requiring an MOU to be signed by all parties in relation to the accommodation to be provided ensures that there is agreement on the scope of each project, before they are finally approved. Similarly, the service level agreement provides an agreement in relation to the running of the Resource Bases.</p>
<p>Approves a budget estimate of £1.227m, and gives delegated authority to the Director of Children’s Services, in conjunction with the Lead Member for Adult Social Care, Children’s Services, Health and Mental Health, to undertake</p>	<p>This will allow the procurement of the new buildings to proceed.</p>

Option	Comments
procurement and enter into contracts for the delivery of the new special educational needs detailed in this report. Recommended.	
Thanks the schools involved for their work on the Resource Bases, including Hilltop First School and Homer First School where proposals are not currently being taken forward. Recommended	All of the schools involved have worked hard on these proposals, and we are very grateful for their support.
Approves a policy stating that there should be a presumption in favour of all new school sites in the borough having a Resource Base. Recommended.	Creating a presumption in favour of Resource Bases at new schools will ensure that these facilities are considered and planned for when new schools are built. A presumption in favour will still enable a Resource Base to be rejected if there is sufficient reason.
Do nothing Not recommended.	This would mean that the £1.227m grant would not be spent, and no improvements to special educational needs education would be made.

vii) KEY IMPLICATIONS

Table 6: Key Implications

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
More children with EHCPs have their needs met in local provision.	<20 local resident children attend two Resourced Provisions	20 local resident children attend two Resourced Provisions	n/a	n/a	1 st April 2022
	<40 local resident children attend four Resourced Provisions	40 local resident children attend four Resourced Provisions	n/a	n/a	1 st April 2023

3. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

Table 6: Financial Impact of report's recommendations on:

(a) 'LA block' revenue

REVENUE COSTS	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Additional total	£0	£0	£0
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net Impact	£0	£0	£0

(b) 'High Needs' block

REVENUE COSTS	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Additional total	£0	£133,000	£373,000
Reduction	£0	£133,000	£373,000
Net Impact	£0	£0	£0

- 3.1 There is more detail about the revenue costs in paragraphs 3.13 to 3.20. Resource Bases do have implications for revenue funding but, if correctly managed these should not have a negative impact. All revenue costs will be met from within the High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant, and not from with the LA Block.

CAPITAL COSTS	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Additional total	£500,000	£727,000	£0
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net Impact	£0	£0	£0

Capital funding

- 3.2 The Royal Borough's original Special Provision Capital Fund allocation was for £722,722, in three equal instalments of £240,924 in the 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21 financial years. That has since been topped up with an additional £504,259, paid in summer 2019, bringing the total to £1.227m.
- 3.3 The DfE required local authorities to publish their plans for spending the grant, with the following stipulations:
- they should demonstrate how the full allocation will be spent;
 - local authorities will have consulted with parents and providers;
 - the DfE template (which requires costed proposals) must be used; and
 - it must be published on the borough's Local Offer pages.
- 3.4 The Royal Borough's draft plan has been published², and the 2019/20 funding released. The requirement to update the plan for 2020 has been dropped as part of the government response to the Covid-19 crisis.
- 3.5 Appendix C sets out the estimated costs of the proposed options and shows that these are expected to be affordable within the £1.227m grant.
- 3.6 It is proposed that a further £50k from the Special Provision Capital Fund is set aside for minor works to assist with the delivery of early assessment places in schools.

² Capital Strategy, [Local Area SEND Policies and Plans](#), AfC, May 2019.

- 3.7 The capital costs identified in Table 6 will be profiled this Autumn, probably across the three financial years 2020/21, 2021/22 and 2022/23, as the borough moves to procure the schemes.

Revenue funding for new SEN Units and/or Resourced Provision

Impact of the revenue funding of a school

- 3.8 Schools with a SEN Unit or Resourced Provision receive additional revenue funding to reflect the higher costs of educating children and young people with EHCPs. The funding for pupils attending a unit or provision is, therefore, comprised of a number of elements (the figures relate to one financial year):
- Element 1: This is the AWPU (Age Weighted Pupil Unit). All schools get funding for each pupil at the school as part of the school's delegated funding. This is currently £3,017.36 for a primary school and £4,243.53 for the KS3 years in a middle school. Schools also receive other pupil led elements in the formula (e.g. funding for pupils with free school meals, deprivation, English as an Additional Language).
 - Element 2: £6,000 for each pupil in the unit or provision, or £10,000 for each unfilled place in the unit or provision.
 - Element 3: Since September 2019, top-up funding for all new EHCP children at any academy, aided, community, or controlled school in the borough has been based on a matrix that considers the child's individual needs³. The top-up funding is between £2k and £25k per child, and will be reviewed annually as part of the child's annual EHCP review. It is assumed that, on average, the top-up for a child in Resourced Provision will be around £6,000. For a child in an SEN Unit, the average top-up may be closer to £8,000.
- 3.9 It is important to note that some of the pupils attending the unit or provision may be included within the usual number of children educated at the school. This is because the School Admissions Code does not allow for places to be set aside specifically for pupils in the unit or provision. At first entry to school (e.g. for a Reception school place), children with an EHCP naming a school are given places ahead of all other applicants. For admissions outside the normal intake year, a child whose EHCP names the school will be admitted, even if the school is full in that specific year group. If the year group is an infant year group, the child is treated as an 'excepted' child for the purposes of the infant class size legislation, so that the limit of 30 children per teacher is not breached.
- 3.10 A (full) one form entry primary school with 210 pupils, therefore, could expect to have somewhere between 210 and 220 pupils after opening a Resource Base. Up to ten of these would be attending the new facility. Some year groups might have additional pupils, where a child with an EHCP naming the school has been admitted.
- 3.11 The £10,000 funding for unfilled places in the unit or provision reflects the need to maintain the staffing of the facility even when it is not full. Place

³ Note, this change does not affect EHCP children *currently* attending Resourced Units, who will continue to be funded as per the existing top-up arrangements.

funding levels are agreed annually for each financial year, for each unit or provision.

- 3.12 The children attending a SEN Unit or Resourced Provision are excluded from the Targeted SEN in-year funding for schools.

Impact on the borough's revenue funding

- 3.13 Funding for pupils with EHCPs comes from the government via the High Needs Block (HNB). Providing new school places for children and young people with EHCPs does not, in itself, lead to additional funding from the government via the HNB. This is because the HNB is allocated on a formulaic basis, taking account of the 2-18 population and the historic number of agreed places for children with EHCPs, as well as data on deprivation, health and other measures.

- 3.14 Revenue for the new units or provision would, therefore, need to come from within the existing HNB, which is already under pressure. The cost to the HNB of running a Resource Base will come from Elements 2 and 3 referred to in paragraph 3.8 above, as set out in Tables 7 (Resourced Provision) and 8 (SEN Unit).

Table 7: revenue costs to be funded by High Needs Block (per annum)

Resourced Provision		
Pupil costs	Per full place	Per empty place
Element 2:	£6,000	£10,000
Element 3 (top-up):	(expected average): £6,000	
Total per pupil:	£12,000	£10,000

Estimated cost of Resourced Provision with ten places to HNB:		
Number of:		Cost
full places	empty places	
10	0	£120,000
5	5	£110,000
0	10	£100,000

Table 8: revenue costs to be funded by High Needs Block (per annum)

SEN Unit		
Pupil costs	Per full place	Per empty place
Element 2:	£6,000	£10,000
Element 3 (top-up):	(expected average): £8,000	
Total per pupil:	£14,000	£10,000

Estimated cost of SEN Unit with ten places to HNB:		
Number of:		Cost
full places	empty places	
10	0	£140,000
5	5	£120,000
0	10	£100,000

- 3.15 Based on the recommendations to proceed with four new Resourced Provisions, phased over two years, the nominal cost to the High Needs Budget would be as set out in Table 9. In the first year of opening, the revenue costs of any new Resource Base will be 7/12ths of the annual cost, assuming an

opening in September. These figures assume each new facility is only partially full in its first year of opening (three empty places).

- 3.16 If a decision is taken to open a SEN Unit at South Ascot Village Primary School instead of Resourced Provision, these costs will be £20,000 higher in 2023/24.

Table 9: Gross (HNB) revenue costs of Resource Bases by financial year

Proposal	2020/21	Phase 1 2021/22	Phase 2 2022/23	2023/24
Furze Platt Federation Resourced Provision	£0	£66,500	£120,000	£120,000
Dedworth Campus Resourced Provision	£0	£66,500	£120,000	£120,000
South Ascot Village Primary Resourced Provision	£0	£0	£66,500	£120,000
Wraysbury Primary Resourced Provision	£0	£0	£66,500	£120,000
Total	£0	£133,000	£373,000	£480,000

- 3.17 Most, if not all, of the children attending the proposed Resource Bases will, however, either already be funded by, or be a future cost to, the High Needs Block. For the most part, therefore, the costs identified in Table 9 are ones the borough would already expect. Extra revenue costs will arise, however, if (i) places in Resource Bases are not filled; and/or (ii) places are filled by out-borough children.
- 3.18 To address these risks it is proposed that the opening of new Resource Bases is phased over two years. If take-up is less than projected, the second phase can then be delayed, reducing the risk of any empty places. In addition, the long lead-in period until opening means there is an opportunity to plan how the places will be used, further minimising the risk of empty places. If these proposals go forward, therefore, officers will need to work with families and schools to identify pupils who would benefit from the new provision as soon as possible. This approach will also help ensure that places are prioritised for local residents.
- 3.19 Over the longer term, it is also hoped that the proposals help manage future costs by:
- reducing the amount of top-up/element 3 funding paid, as, in future, borough residents who would otherwise attend more expensive placements (at Manor Green, Forest Bridge or at independent/out-borough places) could attend more appropriate local settings.
 - reducing the associated home to school transport costs.
 - freeing up future places at Manor Green and Forest Bridge for pupils with even more complex needs, who currently have to attend more expensive independent/out-borough schools (with the associated home to school transport costs).
 - reducing tribunal costs, as the borough would be able to provide appropriate places in local mainstream schools, which is more likely to be in line with parental wishes.

- 3.20 The candidates for spaces freed up at Manor Green and Forest Bridge will also need to be identified, in order to realise the maximum benefits for families (bringing pupils and young people closer to home) and for the revenue budget (less costly provision).

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Provision of new Resourced Provision

Community, Voluntary Controlled and Voluntary Aided schools

- 4.1 The creation of Resourced Provision at a community, controlled or aided school requires that the local authority follows a statutory process, as set out in regulations and guidance. This process involves:

- informal consultation. This has been carried out for the original options (see Section 8), with the consultation extended to include an additional option that arose during the consultation period. The informal consultation period is not statutory, although there is a strong expectation that it should be carried out.
- publication of proposals (the 'statutory notice').
- 4 week formal representation period, proposed to start in mid-September 2020.
- decision by the local authority, to be made within two months of the end of the representation period.
- implementation. This is currently proposed for 1st September 2021 for Phase 1, and 1st September 2022 for Phase 2.

Academy schools, including free schools

- 4.2 Adding Resourced Provision at an academy requires that the trust submits a full Business Case to the ESFA for approval. The process involves:

- notifying the ESFA at least three months before the proposed change.
- carrying out public consultation. This has been carried out as part of the borough consultation (see Section 8).
- completing the full Business Case and submitting it to the ESFA.
- decision by the Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC).

- 4.3 Submission of the Business Case to the ESFA requires that planning permission for the new build has been obtained. This introduces a potential delay into the process that will need to be managed. In addition, recent experience with school expansions suggests that RSC decisions can take eight to ten months. In the case of expansions, however, an academy can still raise its PAN, or admit above it, whilst waiting for RSC approval. It is not clear that this option is available in the case of a Resource Base, opening the potential for significant delay.

- 4.4 Planning Permission would be required for any extensions or new build.

5. RISK MANAGEMENT

Table 8: Risk Management

Risks	Uncontrolled Risk	Controls	Controlled Risk
RSC decision takes too long, delaying delivery of the Resource Base at Dedworth Green and Dedworth Middle Schools.	High	The Windsor Learning Partnership should submit a draft Business Case to the RSC, without the planning permission (if required), which may help speed up the process.	High
Construction of the Resourced Provision exceeds the available budget.	High	Estimated costs have been provided for each option, and an additional contingency identified. Phasing of the programme will also allow overall costs to be controlled by dropping a Phase 2 scheme if Phase 1 costs exceed the budget.	Low
Opening of the Resource Bases leads to additional revenue cost pressures on the High Needs Budget.	Medium	This risk arises if places at the Resource Bases are left unfilled or are taken by out-borough pupils. A phased approach to opening will allow the borough to delay parts of the programme if demand is too low. Early identification of pupils appropriate for the Resource Bases will ensure that borough residents are prioritised.	Low

6. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

- 6.1 **Equalities:** An Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) is attached at Appendix E.
- 6.2 **Climate change/sustainability:** The government is placing increasing importance on the sustainability of school buildings. The borough already meets high carbon reduction targets in its new school buildings, and officers will be looking at how to minimise environmental impact with these building schemes. Providing more local provision for children with social communication difficulties and related behaviours should also reduce home to school travel times and, therefore, transport related carbon emissions.

6.3 **Data protection/GDPR:** Any personal data received by the council as part of the formal consultations will be processed in accordance with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 2018.

7. CONSULTATION

- 7.1 Informal public consultation on the proposals for new Resource Bases in the borough was originally planned for March and April 2020, but was substantially delayed by the impact of the Covid-19 crisis.
- 7.2 The consultation eventually started on Thursday 4th June 2020, finishing on Friday 17th July, running for just over six weeks. A consultation document (Appendix A – New provision for children with special educational needs) was produced in consultation with the involved schools. This was distributed, largely electronically, to parents, staff, governors and other interested parties as set out in Table 8 below. All borough schools were asked to use their electronic parent messaging services to send the consultation weblink to their parents. A small number of printed copies of the document were sent to schools who had parents with no access to the internet. An email with the consultation link was also sent direct to 492 parents/carers of borough children with EHCPs.
- 7.3 The consultation was available on the Achieving for Children website, linked from the Royal Borough website, together with an online (SmartSurvey) response form. The consultation was also referred to in two Resident Newsletters.

Table 9: Summary of consultation document distribution

Who	Where	Number distributed
Parents/carers	All borough schools	15,202*
Staff and governors	All borough schools	Unknown
All Headteachers	All borough schools	66
All councillors	The Royal Borough	41
Local independent schools	All borough independent schools	20
Local authorities	Bracknell Forest, Buckinghamshire, Hillingdon, Reading, Slough, Surrey, Wokingham	7
Parish Councils	All borough parish councils	8
Representatives	Unions and Professional Associations	9
Local SEND groups	Autism Berkshire, Caring for Carers, PACIP, Parenting Special Children, SENDIASS, WAM Get Involved, Windsor Mencap	7
TOTAL		15,360

*Number of family units, i.e. counting siblings as one unit.

- 7.4 PACIP (Parents and Carers in Partnership) also arranged an hour long, online, question and answer session with some of their members, which was attended by one parent, in addition to PACIP members.
- 7.5 400 responses were received, mostly via the online survey form. This represents a response rate of 2.6%. This is a little below the 3% response rate sought, but still gives a robust indication of views on the proposals. Attempts were made to boost the response rate, e.g. by asking schools to

email reminders to parents and by ‘retweeting’ the consultation link on borough and councillor twitter feeds.

- 7.6 More details about the outcome of the consultation are given at *Appendix B: Summary of responses to consultation*.

8. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Table 10: Timetable for implementation

Date	Details
September 2020	Governing Bodies and academy trusts of approved schools formally confirm their wish to proceed.
October 2020	Schools and the local authority draw up Memorandums of Understanding and draft service level agreement for the Resource Bases
October 2020	Formal consultation on the approved Phase 1 proposals starts.
October 2020	Business Case for the Dedworth Campus proposal is submitted to the DfE on behalf of the Windsor Learning Partnership
October 2020	Design and procurement work on the proposals begins.
November 2020	Formal consultation on the approved Phase 1 proposals finishes, and the Royal Borough ‘determines’ the proposals.
May 2021	Formal consultation on the approved Phase 1 proposals starts.
June 2021	Formal consultation on the approved Phase 2 proposals finishes, and the Royal Borough ‘determines’ the proposals.
September 2021	Phase 1 Resource Bases open
September 2022	Phase 2 Resource Bases open

- 8.1 Implementation date if not called in: ‘Immediately’;

9. APPENDICES

Electronic only

- Appendix A: Consultation document, including supplementary pages.
- Appendix B: Consultation analysis and comments made.
- Appendix C: Resource Bases feasibility studies summary (Part 2)
- Appendix E: Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA)

Paper

- Appendix D: Options appraisal

10. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- [Special Provision Capital Fund Guidance](#), DfE, January 2019.
- [Special provision fund: Allocations for local authorities from 2018-19 to 2020-21](#), DfE, January 2019.

- [Making significant changes \('prescribed alterations'\) to maintained schools](#), DfE, October 2018.
- [Making significant changes to an open academy and closure by mutual agreement](#), DfE, October 2018.

11. CONSULTATION (MANDATORY)

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Commented & returned
Cllr S Carroll	Lead Member for Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health.	31/07/2020	07/08/2020
Duncan Sharkey	Managing Director	22/07/2020	03/08/2020
Russell O'Keefe	Director of Place	22/07/2020	
Adele Taylor	Director of Resources/S151 Officer	22/07/2020	
Kevin McDaniel	Director of Children's Services	22/07/2020	24/07/2020
Hilary Hall	Director Adults, Commissioning and Health	22/07/2020	27/07/2020
Andrew Vallance	Head of Finance	22/07/2020	
Elaine Browne	Head of Law	22/07/2020	27/07/2020
Mary Severin	Monitoring Officer	22/07/2020	
Nikki Craig	Head of HR, Corporate Projects and IT	22/07/2020	
Louisa Dean	Communications	22/07/2020	
Karen Shepherd	Head of Governance	22/07/2020	27/07/2020

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type: Key decision	Urgency item? No	To follow? No
Report Author: Ben Wright, School Places and Capital Team Leader, 01628 796572		

Proposal	% in favour	Ofsted	Location	Need as at April 2020	Transition	SEN Impact	Accommodation options	Cost	Conclusion
Dedworth Campus Resourced Provision	Overall: 84% From the schools: 86%	<u>Dedworth Green:</u> Good (November 2018 Short Inspection) <u>Dedworth Middle:</u> Requires Improvement (October 2018)	Located in Windsor, which currently has no specialised, state, special educational needs provision. Having a facility here would improve accessibility to borough residents.	Windsor had 59 first and middle school age children with an EHCP and ASD/SEMH needs, including 29 attending special, independent or out-borough provision.	The shared provision would serve children aged 4 to 13 across both schools, reducing the impact of transition at the end of first school education. At the end of Year 8, children may be ready to transfer into a local mainstream school without additional support or into the SHINE provision in Maidenhead. Otherwise, children still needing that support would then need to transfer into special, independent or out-borough provision.	18.7% of the pupils on roll at the two schools have special educational needs, including 2.2% who have an EHCP. This compares to an average of 14.3% and 1.9% respectively across all mainstream borough schools.	Two of the three options focus on making changes to the Jubilee Suite, as a central point between Dedworth Green and Middle schools. The third option provides a standalone block at the rear of the playground between the schools, but this is not preferred, and results in loss of playing field.	Resourced Provision can be provided here at relatively low cost.	This option provides Resourced Provision in Windsor up to the age of 13, in one place, reducing the impact of school transition for those children attending the unit. It provides the facility in a town that currently has no specialist state SEN provision and significant numbers of children with social communication difficulties and related behaviours. There is good public support for this option; the accommodation options are straightforward and relatively cheap. Recommended.
Furze Platt Primary Federation Resourced Provision	Overall: 85% From the schools: 83%	<u>Furze Platt Infant:</u> Good (May 2018 Short Inspection) <u>Furze Platt Junior:</u> Outstanding (December 2018)	Located in Maidenhead, which has two special schools and three Resourced Provisions, including the SHINE facility at Furze Platt Senior School, which serves children with similar needs to that proposed here for primary age children.	Maidenhead had 127 primary age children with an EHCP and ASD/SEMH needs including 61 attending special, independent or out-borough provision.	The shared provision would serve children aged 4 to 11 across both schools, reducing the impact of transition at the end of first school education. At the end of Year 6, children could transfer into SHINE at the adjacent Furze Platt Senior School. They may also be ready to transfer into a local mainstream school without needing additional support. Otherwise, children still needing that support would then need to transfer into special, independent or out-borough provision.	12.6% of the pupils on roll at the two schools have special educational needs, including 1.9% who have an EHCP. This compares to an average of 14.3% and 1.9% respectively across all mainstream borough schools. The school has a Charter Mark for Inclusion.	One option provides Resourced Provision integrated into the junior school building, with a separate space in the infant building. This is the preferred option. The other two options provide standalone blocks, with the loss of play space or environmental space. One of these would be quite isolated from the rest of the school.	Resourced Provision can be provided here at relatively high cost.	This option is currently the only option for providing primary Resourced Provision for this SEN need in Maidenhead. There are significant numbers of children with social communication difficulties and related behaviours in Maidenhead. The school has a Charter Mark for inclusion, and children attending the provision could transfer to the SHINE provision at the adjacent Furze Platt Senior school. There is good public support for the option; the accommodation options are relatively straightforward, though quite expensive. Recommended.
Hilltop First School Resourced Provision	Overall: 77% From the school: 85%	Outstanding (May 2010)	Located in Windsor, which currently has no specialised, state, special educational needs provision. Having a facility here would improve accessibility to borough residents.	Windsor had 29 first school age children with an EHCP and ASD/SEMH needs including 11 attending special, independent or out-borough provision.	The Resource Base would serve children aged 4 to 9. At the end of Year 4, children would be too young to transfer to SHINE at Furze Platt Senior School, but may be ready to transfer into a local mainstream school without needing additional support. Otherwise, children still needing that support would then need to transfer into special, independent or out-borough provision.	12.8% of the pupils on roll at the two schools have special educational needs, including 0.4% who have an EHCP. This compares to an average of 14.3% and 1.9% respectively across all mainstream borough schools.	Options at Hilltop involve internal remodelling and re-provision of either the nursery on the grass area at the front of the school or the general classroom to the rear. The final option involves a standalone Resource Base to the front of the school, although this would be quite isolated. This would involve the loss of external play space.	Resourced Provision can be provided here at relatively high cost.	This option provides a Resource Base in a town that currently has no specialist state SEN provision and significant numbers of children with social communication difficulties and related behaviours. However (unless the Dedworth Campus option also goes ahead) there is no local option for children leaving at the end of Year 4 to then remain in a mainstream school with the equivalent support. Accommodation options for both Resourced Provision and a SEN Unit are deliverable, with other benefits to the school, but not cheap. There is more public support for a SEN Unit here. Not recommended.
Hilltop First School SEN Unit	Overall: 86% From the school: 86%							A SEN Unit can be provided here, but at a high cost.	

Proposal	% in favour	Ofsted	Location	Need as at April 2020	Transition	SEN Impact	Accommodation options	Cost	Conclusion
Homer First School Resourced Provision	Overall: 75% From the school: 56%	Good (February 2017 Short Inspection)	Located in Windsor, which currently has no specialised, state, special educational needs provision. Having a facility here would improve accessibility to borough residents.	Windsor had 29 first school age children with an EHCP and ASD/SEMH needs including 11 attending special, independent or out-borough provision.	The Resourced Provision would serve children aged 4 to 9. At the end of Year 4, children would be too young to transfer to SHINE at Furze Platt Senior School, but may be ready to transfer into a local mainstream school without needing additional support. Otherwise, children still needing that support would then need to transfer into special, independent or out-borough provision.	7.7% of the pupils on roll at the two schools have special educational needs, including 0.4% who have an EHCP. This compares to an average of 14.3% and 1.9% respectively across all mainstream borough schools.	The school has a spare classroom that was built to accommodate a bulge in numbers that has now left the school. This could easily be converted into space for Resourced Provision. There would be no loss of external play space.	Resourced Provision can be provided here very cheaply.	This option provides Resourced Provision in a town that currently has no specialist state SEN provision and significant numbers of children with social communication difficulties and related behaviours. However (unless the Dedworth Campus option also goes ahead) there is no local option for children leaving at the end of Year 4 to then remain in a mainstream school with the equivalent support. Accommodation options are very straightforward and cheap. Public support for this option is, by a very small margin, the lowest, but still high (75%, excluding don't knows etc). Not recommended.
South Ascot Village School Resourced Provision	Overall: 86% From the school: 96%	Good (July 2019 Short Inspection)	Located in Ascot, which currently has Resourced Provision for secondary age children with Physical Disabilities. The site is close to the border with Bracknell, and care would be needed to ensure that places can be prioritised for local residents. Having a facility here would improve accessibility to borough residents.	Ascot had 16 primary age children with an EHCP and ASD/SEMH needs including 6 attending special, independent or out-borough provision.	The Resource Base would serve children aged 4 to 11. At the end of Year 8, children may be ready to transfer into a local mainstream school without additional support or into the SHINE provision in Maidenhead. Otherwise, children still needing that support would then need to transfer into special, independent or out-borough provision.	7.7% of the pupils on roll at the two schools have special educational needs, including 0.4% who have an EHCP. This compares to an average of 15.0% and 2.6% respectively across all mainstream borough schools.	Accommodation options here take advantage of a spare classroom that was built to accommodate a bulge in numbers that has now left the school. This means that Resourced Provision can be accommodated in the main school building, with some internal remodelling. A SEN Unit requires a bit more work, and might also need another year group to be moved down to the Foundation block at the southern end of the site. There would be no loss of external play space.	Resourced Provision can be provided here at relatively low cost.	This option is currently the only option for providing a primary Resource Base for this SEN need in Ascot. There are children with social communication difficulties and related behaviours in the Ascot area. Accommodation options are straightforward, and relatively low cost. The proposal has high public support. Recommended.
South Ascot Village School SEN Unit	Overall: 89% From the school: 100%							A SEN Unit can be provided here at relatively low cost.	
Wraysbury Primary School Resourced Provision	Overall: 83% From the school: 86%	Good (September 2017 Short Inspection)	Located in Wraysbury, which currently has no specialised, state, special educational needs provision. The site is close to the border with Slough, and care would be needed to ensure that can be prioritised for local residents. Having a facility here would improve accessibility to borough residents.	Datchet/Wraysbury had 12 primary age children with an EHCP and ASD/SEMH needs including 6 attending special, independent or out-borough provision.	The Resource Base would serve children aged 4 to 11. At the end of Year 8, children may be ready to transfer into a local mainstream school without additional support or into the SHINE provision in Maidenhead. Otherwise, children still needing that support would then need to transfer into special, independent or out-borough provision.	26.7% of the pupils on roll at the two schools have special educational needs, including 1% who have an EHCP. This compares to an average of 15.0% and 2.6% respectively across all mainstream borough schools.	The school is keen to combine a Resource Base into a building with a wider community focus, including nursery and potentially health services. Options to do that involve a standalone block adjacent to the main playground. This would involve the loss of some external play space. Other options involve either extensions to the front of the school, remodelling of accommodation on site or a first floor extension.	Resourced Provision can be provided here at a relatively high cost.	This option is currently the only option for providing primary Resourced Provision for this SEN need in Datchet/Wraysbury. There are children with social communication difficulties and related behaviours in the Datchet and Wraysbury area. There are achievable accommodation options, although the cheapest have difficulties arising from building in the flood zone and/or loss of trees. This is a relatively expensive option, but has good public support. Recommended.

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank