

Report for: **ACTION**



<b>Contains Confidential or Exempt Information</b>	No
<b>Title</b>	<b>Expansion of Secondary School Provision</b>
<b>Responsible Officer(s)</b>	Alison Alexander, Managing Director and Strategic Director Adult, Children and Health Services
<b>Contact officer, job title and phone number</b>	Kevin McDaniel, Head of Schools and Educational Services
<b>Member reporting</b>	Cllr Natasha Airey, Lead Member for Children's Services Cllr David Evans, Deputy Lead Member School Improvement
<b>For Consideration By</b>	Cabinet
<b>Date to be Considered</b>	28 July 2016
<b>Implementation Date if Not Called In</b>	9 August 2016
<b>Affected Wards</b>	All

### REPORT SUMMARY

1. The Royal Borough's ambition for education is high – we want to support a high quality estate so that all parents can have access to high quality education and choice over the school their child attends.
2. In September 2015 Cabinet approved an expansion programme, costing approximately £20.5m, to increase the number of school places by 1,244 across six schools, Charters, Cox Green, Dedworth, Furze Platt, Windsor Boys and Windsor Girls. Delegated authority was given to the Lead Member for Education and Strategic Director of Children's Services to amend adjust and finalise the details of the expansion programme.
3. The revised costs of the whole programme are sufficiently different, between £6.1m - £9.1m, dependent on the final scheme chosen for each school, to the previous estimate that further Cabinet consideration is needed.
4. The Department for Education basic need funding for school growth in RBWM is insufficient to fund the expansion programme, consequently the programme is only affordable if RBWM invest capital of £11.3m to £14.3m which would include an Education dividend from the Maidenhead Golf Club.

### If recommendations are adopted, how will residents benefit?

Benefits to residents and reasons why they will benefit	Dates by which residents can expect to notice a difference
Sufficient, diverse, high quality school places in the	From September 2017

borough, providing parental choice.	
-------------------------------------	--

## **1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **RECOMMENDATION: That Cabinet:**

- i. To agree the proposed programme of school expansion and delegate responsibility to the Managing Director/Strategic Director, Adults, Children and Health to begin procurement, with the final proposals to be approved by full Council, at a cost of up to £29.6m, see point 2.18 for full details. The average price per place, if the schemes are approved, is £23,817 versus the £10k per place approved for Holyport College in 2015. Schemes:**
  - **Charters School: Option A2 scheme total £4.3m.**
  - **Cox Green School: Option B2 scheme total £4.7m.**
  - **Dedworth Middle School: Option C2 scheme total £4.7m.**
  - **Furze Platt Senior School: Option D2 scheme total £4.5m.**
  - **The Windsor Boys' School: Option E1 scheme total £1.8m.**
  - **Windsor Girls' School: Option F1 scheme total £2.3m.**
  - **30 places in Maidenhead: Option to be determined, based on a cost of approximately £3.5m.**
  - **Programme design and risk contingency of £3.7m.**
- ii. Approve the Managing Director/Strategic Director of Adults, Children and Health with the Lead Member for Children's Services to undertake negotiation with two schools, Cox Green and Furze Platt, to agree the location of the remaining 30 places by the end of September 2016**
- iii. Notes the continuing increase in demand for secondary, middle and upper schools in the Royal Borough from 2019, see Appendix D: Projected shortfall of secondary school places, and approves:**
  - **Discussion with all secondary schools in the Royal Borough over small increases in Published Admission Numbers to provide places for demographic growth in 2019.**
  - **Development work for addressing the growth from 2020 and requests a report to Cabinet in April 2017 with proposals for meeting this demand.**

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

### **Background**

- 1.1.** In September 2015 Cabinet approved two phases of the Royal Borough's secondary school expansion programme. The programme provides 1,244 new places, across all year groups, in six middle, upper and secondary schools. The first places will be available from September 2017. Appendix A sets out the decisions taken at previous Cabinet meetings in relation to the expansion programme.
- 1.2.** Over the last nine months development work has been taking place with the six schools to develop scheme options. The schemes described in this paper are all individual, because the current configuration of the school sites varies. The objective of each scheme is to add capacity to the existing school space to provide teaching and core facilities, such as: toilets, dining, hall, circulation space, so that schools has sufficient facilities to educate the expanded number

of pupils. It must be noted that all the schools in the programme have sites that are a mixture of buildings of varying numbers, ages and states of repair. It is not possible for this expansion programme to address all of these needs.

- 1.3. The new 1,244 places will result in the existing Published Admission Number (PAN)<sup>1</sup> changing at the six schools. *Table 1: Approved secondary expansion programme* sets out current and proposed PAN for the six schools.

**Table 1: Approved secondary expansion programme**

<i>a</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>f</i>
<b>Area</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Current PAN</b>	<b>Proposed PAN post expansion</b>	<b>Increase</b>	<b>First year of increase (Sept.)</b>
<b>Phase 1</b>					
Ascot	Charters School	240	270	+30	2017
Maidenhead	Cox Green School	176	206	+30	2017
	Furze Platt Senior School	193	223	+30	2017
Windsor	Dedworth Middle School	120	150	+30	2017
	The Windsor Boys' School	230	260	+30	2017
	Windsor Girls' School	178	208	+30	2017
<b>Phase 2</b>					
Maidenhead	To be determined	-	-	+30	2018
Windsor	Dedworth Middle School	150	180	+30	2018

- 1.4. In developing the schemes the following has been taken into account:
- **Building Bulletin 103:** Department for Education (DfE) guidance on the design of school accommodation.
  - **Net Capacity figures:** A figure, based on DfE formula, to indicate how many pupils can be taught in a school's existing accommodation.
  - **Curriculum and timetabling requirements:** These vary by school, depending on the curriculum offered and options selected by pupils.
  - **Site and accommodation limitations:** Assessment of whether the core infrastructure, such as dining facilities, halls and corridors are large enough to cope with additional pupil numbers.
  - **School priorities:** Stemming from the schools own infrastructure plan.
- 1.5. Through working in partnerships with the six schools options have been developed, summarised in *Table 2 – Schemes for the six schools*. Appendix B gives more details about the schemes, school priorities and likely costs for each school. Column C in the Appendix B table sets out the details of each scheme. In each case Option 1 is the minimum scheme for the proposed expansions to be agreed by the schools. Option 2 is the scheme schools prefer following discussions with officers. The other options listed could be implemented but are not acceptable for a number of reasons. The cost range for those options, and the size of the proposed increase, are set out in *Table 2 – Schemes for the six schools*.

<sup>1</sup> PAN – the number of places a school has in each year group.

**Table 2: Schemes for the six schools (see Appendix B for details)**

	School	No. of schemes*	Cost range £m	No. of places**	
				Year Group	Total
1	Charters	2	3.9 - 4.3	30	211
2	Cox Green	2	4.4 - 4.7	30	170
3	Dedworth	2	4.1 - 4.7	60	240
4	Furze Platt	3	2.6 - 4.5	30	190
5	Windsor Boys	1	1.9	30	121
6	Windsor Girls	1	2.3	30	123
7	Maidenhead	Undetermined	3.5	30	189

\*No. of schemes under consideration. \*\*Taking into account current staying-on rates into sixth form.

- 1.6. The schemes for The Windsor Boys' and Windsor Girls' School are well advanced and are now out to tender. The other four schools are at design work stage, with options still being considered. Once decisions are made about the level of available funding, design of the appropriate options can proceed, followed by tenders for Design and Build contractors in late 2016.
- 1.7. The seventh scheme is for 30 places in Maidenhead, in Phase 2 (2018), at a school that has not yet been determined. Following the development work for two Phase 1 schemes at Cox Green and Furze Platt schools, and the resulting cost estimates, it is proposed that these Phase 2 places are provided by creating more places at either Cox Green or Furze Platt School. The reasons for this are:
- Economies of scale.
  - Infrastructure required for 30 places would also enable 60 places.
  - More cost effective to build 60 places now, rather than 30 places now, and returning to the school later for another 30 places.
- 1.8. Due to changes in statute the local authority can not require an academy school to expand. This is because, for academies, it is the academy trust that applies to the Secretary of State for final approval to expand, once planning permission has been obtained. An academy can decide not to apply to the Secretary of State for permission to expand. All expansions are therefore dependent on an agreement between the school and the Local Authority. This affects all of the schools in the expansion programme, with the exception of Dedworth Middle School, which completed the formal expansion approval process prior to becoming an academy on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2016.

#### **Comments on the costings of each of the schemes**

- 1.9. *Table 3: Secondary expansion programme estimated costs* summarises the estimated costs for the whole programme. The costs include the estimated sum of £3.5m for the additional 30 places in Maidenhead, Phase 2, and the programme contingency fund.

**Table 3: Secondary expansion programme estimated costs**

<sup>a</sup>	<sup>b</sup>	<sup>c</sup>	<sup>d</sup>	<sup>e</sup>
Area	School	Minimum schemes – est. cost (£m)	School preferred – est. costs (£m)	Total new Places
<b>Phase 1</b>				
Ascot	Charters	3.9 (A.1)	4.3 (A.2)	211
Maidenhead	Cox Green	4.4 (B.1)	4.7 (B.2)	170
	Furze Platt Senior	3.5 (C.1)	4.5 (B.2)	190
Windsor	Dedworth Middle	4.1 (D.1)	4.7 (D.2)	240
	The Windsor Boys'	1.8 (E.1)	1.8 (E.1)	121
	Windsor Girls'	2.3 (F.1)	2.3 (F.1)	123
<b>Phase 2</b>				
Maidenhead	Proposed Cox Green/Furze Platt	3.5	3.5 (estimate)	189
Windsor	Dedworth Middle	Included above (D.1).	Included above (D.2).	Included above.
<b>Subtotal</b>				
Phase 1 and Phase 2		<b>23.6</b>	<b>25.9</b>	-
<b>Contingency</b>				
Phase 1 and Phase 2 contingency		3.0	3.7	-
<b>Total</b>				
<b>Total Phase 1 and Phase 2</b>		<b>26.6</b>	<b>29.6</b>	-

- 1.10. Table 3 shows a wide difference in the cost of the various schemes, although there are differences in the number of new places being added. The cost differences also reflect the differing needs of each school and site specific elements. A single storey classroom block or a sports hall are relatively easy to build and cheap on a per m<sup>2</sup> basis, on a clear site. The costs increase if for example, an existing structure needs to be demolished, or a second storey is required, e.g. accessibility and evacuation considerations. There are also parking needs and external areas to consider at each site, as well as individual school priorities.
- 1.11. Table 3 shows that the cost of building the recommended schemes, column d, is estimated at £29.6m. This figure includes sums of:
- £3.5m for Phase 2 in Maidenhead.
  - £3.7m programme contingency fund. This figure is based on a cumulative percentage for risk allowance and design development. It is highly likely that some of this will be spent, as designs are developed for the specific site and if unknown factors arise as the programme develops.
- 1.12. If the minimum acceptable options, column c in Table 3, are selected then the comparable costs are estimated at £26.6m.
- 1.13. The costs of the recommended schemes £29.6m is £9.1m higher than the estimate of £20.5m reported to Cabinet in September 2015. The reasons for this cost increase include:
- Previous costs were based on desk-top assessments. The new costs are based on schemes devised after much discussion with the schools, reflecting their key priorities and assessments of requirements to support excellent education.
  - Building costs have risen since the last year's estimates.

- The procurement of Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) compliant projects, and delays in decisions about which schemes to progress, have resulted in higher cost estimates than would have been the case if schemes had been agreed at the same timeframe as the Windsor schools were.

1.14. The costs in Table 3 do not include furniture and IT costs. The schools would be expected to fund these items from their own budgets.

### **Benchmarking of the scheme costs**

1.15. A National School Delivery Cost Benchmarking exercise, carried out by a number of local authorities working in partnership with the Department for Education and the Education Funding Agency, has looked at the cost of secondary school projects across 63 contributing local authorities. Based on 44 schemes, the 2015 cost of providing a secondary school place was, on average, £14,102 per additional pupil place. Appendix C compares this average, adjusted for local cost and inflation to £18,554 per additional pupil place, to the estimated costs of each of the proposed schemes.

1.16. Applying the £18,544 per place cost to the 1,244 additional places being created, including the as yet undetermined Maidenhead Phase 2, results in a nominal programme cost of £23.1m. See section 4 of this report for full details.

1.17. There are options for decreasing the overall programme costs, see *Table 5 – Options for the secondary school expansions programme*, which could bring costs in line with the nominal amount of £23.1m. This report recommends, however, that funding is made available to enable the option 2 schemes for each school. This means the overall programme costs of £29.6m would be £6.5m over the national average with an average per cost per place is **£23,817**, based on implementation of schemes A.2, B.2, C.2, D.2, E1, F1 and Maidenhead Phase 2 and programme contingency, compared to the £10k per place at Holyport College approved in 2015. Table 4 sets out the average cost per place of the constituent elements

**Table 4: Estimated cost per place**

	<b>Programme element</b>	<b>Minimum schemes</b>	<b>Recommended schemes</b>	<b>Alternative schemes</b>
1	Charters	(A.1) £18,485	(A.2) £20,380	(A.3) £11,850
2	Coxs Green	(B.1) £25,880	(B.2) £27,645	
3	Dedworth Middle	(C.1) £17,085	(C.2) £19,585	
4	Furze Platt	(D.1) £18,420	(D.2) £23,685	(D.6) £13,685
5	Windsor Boys		(E.1) £15,700	
6	Windsor Girls		(F.1) £18,700	
7	Maidenhead		£18,520	
8	Contingency	£2,410	£2,975	

**Table 5: Options for the secondary school expansions programme**

	Option and recommendation	Comments			
		On school reaction	On school places	On finance	On timing
1	<p>To approve the recommended options for phase 1 (A.2, B.2, C.2, D.2, E.1 and F1) and phase 2 of the secondary expansions programme and the funding for their delivery.</p> <p><b>Recommended</b></p>	<p>Will have the support of schools, providing the facilities that they need to raise standards further.</p>	<p>The Royal Borough will meet its legal duty to ensure that there are sufficient school places to meet demand and will provide a 5-10% surplus over 2017 and 2018 in most parts of the borough.</p>	<p>Will require additional capital of £9.1m which will need to be funded by the Royal Borough.</p>	<p>Will enable Phases 1 and 2 to go ahead as planned.</p>
2	<p>To approve the minimum acceptable options for phase 1 (A.1, B.1, C.1 and D.1) along with E.1 and F1, and phase 2 of the secondary expansions programme and the funding for their delivery.</p> <p><b>Not recommended</b></p>	<p>Will have the support of schools, providing the minimum level of facilities they require.</p>	<p>The Royal Borough will meet its legal duty to ensure that there are sufficient school places to meet demand and will provide a 5-10% surplus over 2017 and 2018 in most parts of the borough.</p>	<p>Will require additional capital of £6.1m, which will need to be funded by the Royal Borough.</p>	<p>Will enable Phases 1 and 2 to go ahead as planned.</p>
3	<p>To make either the Cox Green or Furze Platt scheme into a 60 place per year group project (rather than 30 places) for 2017. The other school would still be expanded for 2017, with 30 places per year group.</p> <p><b>Recommended</b></p>	<p>Previous public consultation has made clear that either school could be expanded by 60 places per year group, and the initial plan was that Furze Platt would be expanded by 60. Reprioritisation of the programme resulted in two schools expanding by 30 instead.</p> <p>Both schools have indicated a willingness to consider this, providing that their</p>	<p>The Royal Borough will meet its legal duty to ensure that there are sufficient school places to meet demand and will provide a 5-10% surplus over 2017 and 2018 in most parts of the borough.</p>	<p>Could lead to lower programme costs for Phases 1 and 2, if sufficient economies of scale are found.</p> <p>Desktop assessments indicate that projects to add 60 (rather than 30) places per year group could cost an additional £3.5m.</p> <p>Costs could escalate once the schools begin to consider their needs for a</p>	<p>Some concept work has been carried out on 60 place expansions at both schools, but no detailed discussions have taken place with schools to confirm requirements.</p> <p>There would be some delay, therefore, whilst further discussions take place. It is recommended that a deadline is set for end of September for the conclusion of these discussions.</p>



		accommodation needs are met.		further increase in size. There may also be a need for temporary accommodation in September 2017, as the selected school would be taking pupils although the scheme may be delayed..	This will minimise delay, and should still allow sufficient time for the new accommodation to be in places for September 2018.  The schools might also feel that they need to consult parents again.
4	To seek to reduce the programme costs by reducing the scale of the expansion programme, providing fewer new places.  <b>Not recommended.</b>	n/a.	Current information suggests that the expansions planned for Phase 1 and Phase 2 are still needed to provide enough places and a 5-10% surplus on demand.	This could lead to a lower programme cost for Phases 1 and 2, but increases the risk that expensive temporary solutions might be required at short notice.	Will enable Phases 1 and 2 to go ahead as planned, though reduced in scale.
5	To seek to reduce programme costs by selecting the lowest cost options at each school.  <b>Not recommended.</b>	Could lead to two schools (Charters and Furze Platt Senior) refusing to expand. The Cox Green option is already the cheapest, and Dedworth Middle School are legally committed to the expansion.	In turn, this could threaten the ability of the Royal Borough to meet its legal duty to ensure that there are sufficient school places to meet demand.	Will lead to a reduced shortfall, on the cheapest options, but this will still need to be funded by the Royal Borough.	If the schools refuse to expand, then other options would need to be examined, and it is unlikely that these could be implemented for September 2017.

	Option and recommendation	Comments			
		On school reaction	On school places	On finance	On timing
6	To only provide funding for each scheme at a level comparable to the adjusted national average benchmark figure of £18,544 per new place.  <b>Not recommended.</b>	Could lead to two schools (Cox Green and Furze Platt Senior) refusing to expand.	In turn, this could threaten the ability of the Royal Borough to meet its legal duty to ensure that there are sufficient school places to meet demand.	Will lead to a reduced shortfall, on the cheapest options, but this will still need to be funded by the Royal Borough.	If the schools refuse to expand, then other options would need to be examined, and it is highly unlikely that these could now be implemented for September 2017.
7	To seek to reduce the cost of Phase 2 in Maidenhead by seeking small (temporary or permanent) increases in the Published Admission Numbers at the other four secondary schools in the town.  <b>Recommended</b>	This has not been discussed yet with schools.	The Royal Borough will meet its legal duty to ensure that there are sufficient school places to meet demand and will provide a 5-10% surplus over 2017 and 2018 in most parts of the borough. This could result in some schools increasing that do not meet the criteria.	Doesn't impact on Phase 1, and it may be possible to link S106 monies from forthcoming developments to specific schemes at these other schools, in line with the borough's Interim Education S106 Methodology. To be prioritised for funding, these schemes have to be agreed as Priority 1 schemes by Cabinet.	Phase 1 and 2 will still go ahead as planned.

### **Demand for secondary, middle and upper school places**

- 1.18. An annual projection of demand for middle, upper and secondary, schools is completed by the Royal Borough and submitted to the Department for Education as part of the yearly School Capacity (SCAP) survey. The 2016 projections are due to be completed and submitted by late July 2016, and so have not been available during the development of this report. The information here is based, therefore, on the 2015 projections, however it is not expected that the new projections will be significantly different.
- 1.19. The 2015 projections were reported to Cabinet in September 2015, and are re-provided and re-examined in Appendix D. The conclusion is that there is not thought to be any necessity to change the scale or timing of the already agreed Phase 1 and Phase 2 school expansion schemes for September 2017 and 2018.
- 1.20. Delivering the programme in this timeframe ensures a surplus of places in the 6-7% range. Surplus at this level is at the mid to lower end of the 5-10% range.

This means there is limited scope for reducing the places made available by reducing the surplus places targets. In addition, analysis of out-borough numbers suggests that there is only limited scope for scaling back the expansion programme by actively reducing the number of extra places taken by out-borough children.

### Secondary schools expansion criteria and ranking

1.21. In September 2015, Cabinet approved a set of criteria allowing for the prioritisation of expansion at schools that are:

- Good/Outstanding as rated by Ofsted.
- At or above national attainment at:
  - Key Stage 2 for middle schools.
  - Key Stage 4 for secondary/upper schools.
- Consistently oversubscribed on 1<sup>st</sup> preferences.
- Has sufficient capacity on site to accommodate expansion.
- Provides value for money per place provided.

1.22. The latest data, on each school, has been put into this model, including the available value for money information and is summarised in *Table 6 – RBWM schools assessed against the revised criteria (June 2016)*. The prioritisation model now includes, therefore:

- The latest Ofsted grades.
- The 2015 school attainment data.
- The 2016 school preference data.
- The value for money data.

1.23. The value for money prioritisation compares the per place cost for the recommended schemes to the adjusted national per pupil place cost of £18,544.

**Table 6: RBWM schools assessed against the revised criteria (June 2016)**

	Criteria Points					Total	% score	Rank
	Ofsted	Attainment	Popularity	Site	Value for Money			
	25 points available	20 points available	15 points available	10 points available	10 points available			
<b>Ascot Year 7</b>								
Charters	25 / 25	19 / 20	12 / 15	8 / 10	5 / 10	65.0 / 80	81.3	1
<b>Datchet Year 7</b>								
Churchmead	18.75 / 25	13 / 20	1.5 / 15	10 / 10	n/a	43.3 / 70	61.8	1
<b>Maidenhead Year 7</b>								
Altwood	12.5 / 25	2 / 20	1.5 / 15	10 / 10	n/a	26.0 / 70	37.1	6
Cox Green	18.75 / 25	14 / 20	3 / 15	10 / 10	1 / 10	46.8 / 80	58.4	4
Desborough	18.75 / 25	13.5 / 20	3 / 15	1 / 10	n/a	36.6 / 70	51.8	5
Furze Platt	12.5 / 25	19 / 20	12 / 15	10 / 10	1 / 10	54.5 / 80	68.1	2
Holyport College	n/a	n/a	15 / 15	1 / 10	n/a	16.0 / 25	64.0	3

<b>Newlands</b>	<b>18.75</b> 25	<b>17.5</b> 20	<b>12</b> 15	<b>0</b> 10	n/a	<b>48.3</b> 70	<b>68.9</b>	1
-----------------	--------------------	-------------------	-----------------	----------------	-----	-------------------	-------------	---

**Windsor Year 5**

<b>Dedworth</b>	<b>18.75</b> 25	<b>3</b> 20	<b>8</b> 15	<b>12</b> 10	<b>3</b> 10	<b>46.8</b> 80	<b>58.4</b>	2
<b>St Edward's</b>	<b>18.75</b> 25	<b>13</b> 20	<b>8</b> 15	<b>12</b> 10	n/a	<b>43.8</b> 70	<b>62.5</b>	1
<b>St Peter's</b>	<b>0</b> 25	<b>8</b> 20	<b>8</b> 15	<b>12</b> 10	n/a	<b>25.0</b> 70	<b>35.7</b>	4
<b>Trevelyan</b>	<b>12.5</b> 25	<b>10</b> 20	<b>1</b> 15	<b>3</b> 10	n/a	<b>30.5</b> 70	<b>43.6</b>	3

**Windsor Year 9**

<b>Holyport College</b>	n/a	n/a	<b>12</b> 15	<b>1</b> 10	n/a	<b>13.0</b> 25	<b>52.0</b>	3
<b>Windsor Boys'</b>	<b>12.5</b> 25	<b>19.0</b> 20	<b>3</b> 15	<b>8</b> 10	<b>10</b> 10	<b>52.5</b> 80	<b>65.6</b>	1
<b>Windsor Girls'</b>	<b>25.0</b> 25	<b>14.0</b> 20	<b>3</b> 15	<b>1</b> 10	<b>5</b> 10	<b>48.0</b> 80	<b>60.0</b>	2

Ofsted rating: 1 Outstanding, 2 Good, 3 Requirements Improvement and 4 special measures.

- 1.24. The value for money prioritisation model for future expansions should be further extended to include the success of disadvantaged children to further align with this key priority.

### 3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

Defined Outcomes	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date they should be delivered by
Delivery of the programme within approved budget	>£29.6m	<£29.6m	<£26.6m	<£23.1m	September 2018
That there are sufficient places in middle, upper and secondary schools	<5% surplus of places	5 - 7% surplus of places	7 - 10% surplus places	n/a	September 2017 and September 2018

### 4. FINANCIAL DETAILS

#### Financial impact on the budget

- 3.1. *Table 7 – Financial Summary* sets out the funding currently available for the secondary expansion programme; the estimated cost of the programme, based on the recommended options, and the resulting shortfall in funding.

**Table 7 – Financial summary**

<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>d</i>
Budget line	Detail £m	Totals £m	As reported to Cabinet in September 2015
<b>FUNDING</b>			
<b>Grant and S106 Funding</b>			
Basic Need Grant (up to & including 2018-19 allocations)	13.331		
Section 106 available for schemes	2.006	<b>15.337</b>	14.000
<b>Additional RBWM approved funding</b>			
2017-18 capital programme	4.084		
2018-19 capital programme	2.416	<b>6.500</b>	6.500
<b>TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE (A)</b>		<b>21.837</b>	20.500
Note: the difference between the £20.5m available funding reported to Cabinet in 2015 and the £21.8m now available is due to savings on existing schemes and additional S106 receipts.			
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>			
<b>Estimated costs of schemes</b>			
Secondary programme (Phases 1 and 2)	<b>Minimum options</b>	<b>Recommended options</b>	
	26.6	29.6	20.500
<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED COST (B)</b>	<b>26.6</b>	<b>29.6</b>	20.500

<b>FUNDING BALANCE (A) – (B)</b>			
	<b>Minimum options</b>	<b>Recommended options</b>	
Total Balance	<b>(4.797)</b>	<b>(7.781)</b>	0.000

- 3.2. The recently signed contract to buy back the Maidenhead Golf Club lease, which will open up the opportunity for the site to be brought forward for development and help to make a town for everyone, will enable the Council to invest in high priority areas. The council will create an Education dividend which will be used to contribute towards the increased funding need to deliver a high quality education estate.
- 3.3. Resources available for funding this level of capital expenditure could be supplemented by borrowing at an approximate cost of £60k per £1m borrowed. Under existing school funding arrangements, these financing costs would be classed as 'new commitments' and would not therefore be eligible for charging to the Dedicated Schools Grant. Additional funding may also be available when the Community Infrastructure Levy starts to operate in the borough.
- 3.4. Any delays in the decision-making process, including appointment of the design team and the contractor, will result in additional costs. The current delivery model and costings are based on completion by Summer 2018 – if the delivery programme is extended beyond this period, further design and contractor costs could be incurred.
- 3.5. Note: there are also commitments in the capital programme to new primary school provision in Ascot (options out to consultation) and Maidenhead (Lowbrook Academy). These will also need to be funded.

## **5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 4.1 Local authorities are under a statutory duty to ensure that there are sufficient school places in their area, Education Act 1996, Section 14, subsections 1 and 2 and is retained under the government's March 2016 white paper, Excellent Education Everywhere.

### **Changes to academies**

- 4.2 Most of the schools in the expansion programme, Charters, Cox Green, Furze Platt Senior, The Windsor Boys' and Windsor Girls, were academies in September 2015, when the expansion programme was approved. The final decision on expansion of these schools lies, therefore, with the Secretary of State, delegated to the Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC).
- 4.3 In March 2016 the Department for Education published new guidance on Making Significant Changes to an Open Academy. If an expansion of a school provides space at least 30 additional pupils, it counts as a significant change. It is the expectation of the Department for Education that only academies rated 'good' or 'outstanding' by Ofsted will expand, except in very limited circumstances. The RSC will consider approval of an expansion from a school in another category where, for example:
- The academy is in an area of critical basic need;

- All other options for providing additional places have been fully explored; and
  - The academy has a robust improvement plan in place.
- 4.4 Significant changes can be considered either through the ‘fast track’ or full business case route. A school expansion would normally be considered as a ‘fast track’ application, except where:
- The proposed change sets a precedent or is potentially contentious.
  - The proposal results in an increase of more than 50% in the school’s capacity.
  - The proposal increases the pupil numbers to 2,000 pupils or more.
- 4.5 These criteria do not apply to the proposed expansions, so they can all be considered as ‘fast track’ applications. The Royal Borough will be working with the schools to help complete these applications, which will then be considered by the RSC, advised by their Head Teacher Board (HTB).
- 4.6 It is expected that RSCs will approve the majority of fast track requested from ‘good’ and ‘outstanding’ academies where it can be demonstrated that:
- A fair and open consultation has taken place, including any relating to the school admissions arrangements.
  - Funding has been secured for capital costs, and there are no issues with revenue budgets/finance.
  - The change is aligned with local pupil plans and is unlikely to have a negative impact on educational standards at the academy or other local schools.
  - That appropriate planning permissions and other consents required have been secured.
- 4.7 The requirement to have planning permission means that final approval of the expansions comes relatively late in the process. The academies must contact the EFA no less than three months prior to the proposed change coming into effect, to give time for the funding agreement and, if necessary, the articles of governance, to be varied.

#### **Changes to Dedworth Middle School**

- 4.8 Dedworth Middle School was not an academy when the expansion programme was approved, and only became an academy on 1 May 2015. As part of the academy conversion process, the Education Funding Agency requested that the Royal Borough formally approve the proposed expansion prior to conversion. Accordingly, the Royal Borough published a proposal to expand the school, which was formally agreed on 29 February 2016.

#### **Procurement**

- 4.9 The expansion programme must be procured within OJEU regulations, so for all except Windsor Boys’ and Windsor Girls’ schools which are already underway, RBWM has used the SCAPE framework which is OJEU compliant. Project management for the mini programme is led by Faithful and Gould.

### **6. VALUE FOR MONEY**

- 4.10 Tendering for the capital works should ensure that schemes are value for money. Officers have worked closely with schools to achieve a scheme that balances value for money with educational benefits. Options are presented that range

from providing sufficient space to accommodate and educate the extra pupils, to providing a generous amount of space to enable schools to deliver an enriched learning environment for all pupils.

## 7. SUSTAINABILITY IMPACT APPRAISAL

- 4.11 The design and construction will comply with the sustainability aspirations as set out by the Council particularly in terms of energy efficiency and use of recycled and naturally sourced materials wherever practicable. In addition, emphasis will be placed on sourcing resources and materials locally, as far as possible, to enhance carbon reduction principles through the works in accordance with the principles and policies as set out by the Council.

## 8. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 8.1 Table 8 captures the risk.

**Table 8 - Risks**

<b>Risks</b>	<b>Uncontrolled Risk</b>	<b>Controls</b>	<b>Controlled Risk</b>
That scheme costs rise higher than the estimates reported here, either due to unforeseen elements, or due to high tender results.	High	A considerable contingency allowance has already been made in the overall budget estimate.	Medium
That some or the entire programme is delayed, causing cost increases possible shortages of places.	High	That early decisions are taken to approve the schemes to enable the projects to move forward.	Medium
That one or more schools refuse to proceed with expansion if the governors and the council do not agree on a scheme and funding level.	Medium	Much discussion has taken place with schools, and the costs represented show schemes that are acceptable to the school.	Low - if sufficient funding is agreed by the council.

## 9. LINKS TO STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

- 4.12 Residents First, Delivering Together, Equipping Ourselves for the future.

## 10. EQUALITIES, HUMAN RIGHTS AND COMMUNITY COHESION

- 4.13 No equalities impact assessment has been carried out at this stage.



## **11. STAFFING/WORKFORCE AND ACCOMMODATION IMPLICATIONS**

- 4.14 There are no staffing/workforce or accommodation implications apart from within each individual school.

## **12. PROPERTY AND ASSETS**

- 4.15 Expansions will increase the asset base of each school, although each is leased to the relevant Academy Trust for 125 years.

## **13. ANY OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

- 4.16 Other implications are included in the body of the report.

## **14. CONSULTATION**

- 4.17 The borough consulted local residents on the future of secondary school provision in the borough, in autumn 2014. The outcome of this consultation was reported to Cabinet in December 2014 and subsequent reports during 2015 see Appendix 1. The borough has had regular meetings with middle, upper and secondary school Heads and the principals of East Berkshire College and Berkshire College of Agriculture concerning the secondary sector expansion programme.

- 4.18 Schools involved in the expansions programme have been consulted in depth regarding the amount of accommodation required at their school, and on the ensuing options for expansion at their school.

## **15. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

- 4.19 No changes to the timetable for implementation of the formal expansion of numbers are proposed, although the completion of each scheme will depend on construction timeframes. The delivery programme depends on approval to proceed with agreed schemes, and on planning permission. Assuming neither is delayed, the likely programme for Charters, Cox Green, Dedworth Middle and Furze Platt Senior group of schools is set out in Table 9:

**Table 9 – Timetable**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Formal commissioning of consultants to proceed with an agreed expansion programme.	July 2016
Development of design and employer's requirements documentation	July to Jan 2017
Submission of planning applications	Dec 2016
Confirmation of cost estimates	Jan 2017
Tender for contractors	Jan – May 2017
Appointment of contractors	May 2017
Start on site	Aug 2017
Completion	Aug 2018

- 4.20 The timetable is tight and assumes approval of this report's recommended schemes by Cabinet in July 2016. Any delays will push completion(s) back and could incur further costs.
- 4.21 All schools are aware that the completion dates, August 2018, are later than the planned increases in numbers, September 2017, and they will manage additional students in the first year through using their existing accommodation. The Windsor Girls and Boys school scheme tenders are due back 1 August 2016. Work starting on site in the autumn, with completion due by August 2017.

## 16. APPENDICES

- Appendix A: Previous secondary expansion reports and recommendations.  
 Appendix B: Detail of scheme options in secondary expansion programme.  
 Appendix C: Comparative Capital Costs  
 Appendix D: Projected shortfall of secondary school places.

## 17. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### Government guidance

- *Making significant changes to an Open Academy*, DfE Guidance, March 2016.
- *Building Bulletin 103*.

### Previous Cabinet reports

- *10 Year School Expansion Programme*, Cabinet Report, 21<sup>st</sup> March 2013.
- *Expansion of Secondary Sector Provision*, Cabinet Report, 28<sup>th</sup> November 2013.
- *Expansion of Secondary Sector Provision*, Cabinet Report, 27<sup>th</sup> March 2014.
- *Expansion of Secondary Sector Provision*, Cabinet Report, 24<sup>th</sup> July 2014.
- *Expansion of Secondary Sector Provision*, Cabinet Report, 17<sup>th</sup> December 2014.
- *Expansion of Secondary Sector Provision*, Cabinet Report, 24<sup>th</sup> September 2015.
- *Satellite Grammar School Provision in RBWM*, Cabinet Report, 29<sup>th</sup> October 2015.

### Other documents

- *National School Delivery Cost Benchmarking*, Hampshire County Council/East Riding of Yorkshire Council/Education Funding Agency, February 2016.

## 18. CONSULTATION (MANDATORY)

Name of consultee	Post held and Department	Date sent	Date received	See comments in paragraph:
<b>Internal</b>				
Cllr Airey	Lead Member for Children's Services	26/6/16	30/6/16	
Cllr D Evans	Deputy Leader for Children's Services	23/6/16	23 & 28 June 2106 and 2/7/16	
Russell O'Keefe	Strategic Director Corporate and Community Services			

<b>Name of consultee</b>	<b>Post held and Department</b>	<b>Date sent</b>	<b>Date received</b>	<b>See comments in paragraph:</b>
Alison Alexander	Managing Director/ Strategic Director Adults, Children and Health	26/6/16	1/7/16	Throughout
Simon Fletcher	Strategic Director Operations and Customer Services			
Edmund Bradley	Finance Partner			Finance table contribution
Michaela Rizou	Cabinet Policy Officer			
Legal	Shared Legal Services			
Arnab Mukherjee	Shared Building Services			Cost estimates contribution
<b>External</b>				

## REPORT HISTORY

<b>Decision type:</b>	<b>Urgency item?</b>
Non-key decision	No

<b>Full name of report author</b>	<b>Job title</b>	<b>Full contact no:</b>
Ann Pfeiffer	Education Officer, School Accommodation	01628 796364

## Appendix A - Previous Cabinet report recommendations

### 1. PURPOSE OF APPENDIX

1.1 This appendix:

- Contains links to earlier cabinet reports about expanding RBWM secondary sector provision.
- List the recommendation's from the seven Cabinet reports.
- Confirms actions delivered to implement the recommendations.

### 2. PREVIOUS CABINET REPORTS

**Table A1: Previous Cabinet Reports**

	<b>Table 1: Name of report</b>	<b>Date of report</b>	<b>Internet link</b>
1	<i>10 Year School Expansion Programme</i>	21 March 2013	<a href="#">Link to meeting agenda</a>
2	<i>Expansion of Secondary Sector Provision</i>	28 November 2013	<a href="#">Link to meeting agenda</a>
3	<i>Expansion of Secondary Sector Provision</i>	27 March 2014	<a href="#">Link to meeting agenda</a>
4	<i>Expansion of Secondary Sector Provision</i>	29 March 2014	<a href="#">Link to meeting agenda</a>
5	<i>Expansion of Secondary Sector Provision</i>	17 December 2014	<a href="#">Link to meeting agenda</a>
6	<i>Expansion of Secondary Sector Provision</i>	24 Sept. 2015	<a href="#">Link to meeting agenda</a>
7	<i>Satellite Grammar School Provision</i>	29 October 2015	<a href="#">Link to meeting agenda</a>

### 3. REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

**Table A2: Recommendations from the five reports**

		<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Actions</b>
<b>March 2013: 10 Year School Expansion Programme</b>				
Report 1: March 2013	1	Officers begin the process of planning for secondary, middle and upper school expansion, in partnership with schools.	Complete	Working group established.
	2	Officers report back to Cabinet on progress in November 2013.	Complete	Report developed and presented to Cabinet.
	3	Officers continue to investigate options for further free school provision in the borough as a way of providing more primary, secondary and special school places and choice for parents.	Complete	Meetings with free school network; supported free school application – Forest Bridge.
	4	Officers investigate the use of non-traditional school building options for future school use.	Complete	
<b>November 2013: Expansion of Secondary Sector Provision</b>				
Report 2: November 2013	5	Officers carry out initial, open-ended consultation with the public on ideas/views about how to provide extra places for year groups 5, 7 and 9 and upwards, using innovative solutions that offer choice and variety to residents.	Complete	
<b>March 2014: Expansion of Secondary Sector Provision</b>				

		<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Actions</b>
Report 3: March 2014	6	Officers carry out further work on options for meeting rising demand for secondary sector provision in the borough. The options are to:	Complete	Investigative work carried out and presented to Cabinet.
		Option A: Open a new school in Windsor and/or Maidenhead	Complete	
		Option B: Open a sixth form college in Windsor and/or Maidenhead	Complete	
		Option C: Develop the Alliance Technical Academy and other collaborative plans	Complete	
		Option D: Expand existing schools	Complete	
		Option E: Provide grammar places locally by establishing a satellite to an existing grammar school	Complete	
		Option F: Establish all-through schools	Complete	
		Option G: Explore opportunities for multi-academy trusts	Complete	
	7	Officers provide a further report, in August 2014, giving detailed assessments of those options that Members want explored further.	Complete	Paper prepared and presented to Cabinet.
<b>July 2014: Expansion of Secondary Sector Provision</b>				
Report 4: July 2014	8	Carry out public consultation on five proposals to increase secondary sector education places across the borough. The five proposals to be consulted on are:	Complete	Complete. Public consultation carried out in Autumn 2014 on these options.
		Proposal 1: Support the development of post-16 provision through: East Berkshire College and Berkshire College of Agriculture, to deliver technical qualifications for 14-16 year olds, leading to apprenticeships at 18, and A-level for provision for 16-19 year olds. Windsor Girls' and The Windsor Boys' School formal collaboration on delivery of A-level provision.		
		Proposal 2: Support, where requested, opportunities for schools to become all-through schools, teaching children of primary and		

		<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Actions</b>
		secondary school age.		
		Proposal 3: Support, where requested, the development of localised Multi-Academy Trusts (MATs).		
		Proposal 4: Invite public views on expanding existing schools and or another idea.		
		Proposal 5: Invite public views on expanding two or three of the existing fourteen schools by four forms of entry (4 FE), in 2015/16 and 2017/18.		
	9	Present a report for Cabinet in December 2014 on the outcome of the public consultation, with recommendations for the first phase of a new secondary sector places programme, to be implemented in 2015/16 and 2016/17.	Complete	Cabinet considered a report in December 2014 on secondary sector provision.
	10	Agrees the creation of a new capital budget to start the feasibility, design and development works arising from the approval of the above recommendations to a value of £100k from the Basic Need Grant.	Complete	Capital budget created.
	11	Request a report for Cabinet in September 2015 on the second phase of a new secondary sector places programme, with further work undertaken on the options for new schools, collaborative sixth form provision, a satellite grammar school, further expansion at existing schools and other ways of providing more capacity.	Complete	This report.
	12	Request a report on sixth form provision in November 2014.	Complete	Cabinet considered a report on secondary school attainment in January 2015.

December 2014: Expansion of Secondary Sector Provision				
Report 5: December 2014	1	Notes the outcome of the consultation on the expansion of secondary sector provision in the Royal Borough.	Complete	
	2	Approves, in principle, the expansion of secondary school places at the following schools, subject to recommendations iv, v and vi as follows:	In progress	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to 60 extra places per year group at Furze Platt Senior School, starting with Year 7 from September 2016. This would increase the Published Admission Number (PAN) from 193 to 253.</li> </ul>	Superseded	Superseded by recommendations in September 2015 report.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to 100 extra places per year group across the Windsor Learning Partnership (The Windsor Boys' School and Windsor Girls' School) and Holyport College, starting with Year 9 from September 2016. This would increase the number of available Year 9 places from 408 to 508.</li> </ul>	In progress	Feasibility and design works well underway at the Windsor Learning Partnership to provide 60 additional Year 9 places. An additional 8 Year 9 places have also been agreed at Holyport College.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to 30 extra places per year group at Charters School, starting with Year 7 from September 2017. This would increase the PAN from 240 to 270. This is subject to a review of the likely impact of changes to the school's admissions policy, recently proposed by the school.</li> </ul>	In progress	
Report 5: December 2014		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to 50 further extra places per year group across the Maidenhead secondary schools (Altwood Church of England Secondary School, Cox Green School, Desborough College, Holyport College and/or Newlands Girls' School), starting with Year 7 from September 2017. This (together with the Furze Platt expansion) would increase the number of available Year 7 places from 894 to 1,004.</li> </ul>	In progress	Feasibility work is already underway in relation to a potential S106 funded scheme at Newlands. All schools are being reprioritised for expansion under new criteria. An additional 4 Year 7 places have also been agreed at Holyport College.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to 60 extra places per year group at Dedworth Middle School, starting with Year 5 from September 2017. This would increase the PAN from 120 to 180.</li> </ul>	Not yet started	The later start date of 2017 means that feasibility has not yet started on this scheme.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves the publication of proposals in relation to Dedworth Middle School, and delegates authority to the Lead Member for Children's Service and the Director of Children's Services to agree the proposal after the end of the four week statutory notice period, having considered the outcome of the consultation.</li> </ul>	Not yet started	Dedworth Middle School is now likely to be an academy before expansion takes place, which means that the borough will no longer need to publish proposals. The school will instead need to seek permission from the

				Secretary of State.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests that officers agree affordable schemes with each school approved for expansion, with individual scheme budgets to be approved via the borough's capital programme.</li> </ul>	In progress	Feasibility works underway at various schools will result in budgets, which will need approval via the capital programme.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests that the Director of Children's Services writes to the academy schools in the programme to ask them to seek approval for their expansion from the Secretary of State for Education.</li> </ul>	Not yet started	This will happen once planning permission has been obtained for new buildings.
September 2015: Expansion of Secondary Sector Provision				
Report 6: September 2015	1	Notes the updated pupil forecasts for secondary sector provision in the Royal Borough.	No further action	
	2	Approves the new secondary school expansions criteria and ranking model for school expansion.	No further action	(An updated version is attached to this report).
	3	Approves changes to the expansion plan and timetable as follows:		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Charters School – 30 places be created for September 2017 as previously agreed.</li> </ul>	In progress	(Addressed in this report).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cox Green School – 30 places and Furze Platt Senior School 30 places for 2017, instead of 60 places at Furze Platt in 2016.</li> </ul>	In progress	(Addressed in this report).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dedworth Middle School – 30 places in September 2017 and a further 30 places in 2018 instead of 60 places in 2017.</li> </ul>	In progress	(Addressed in this report).
Report 6: September 2015 continued		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Windsor Learning Partnership 60 (Windsor Boys' School 30 places and Windsor Girls' School 30) places in September 2017 instead of September 2016.</li> </ul>	In progress	(Addressed in this report).
		Delegates to the Lead Member for Education and the Strategic Director of Children's Services to amend, adjust and finalise the details of the re-phased works up until September 2019 including:		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amending the timetable in response to change in demand on places.</li> </ul>	No current action needed.	(Addressed in this report).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seeking tenders, where required, to deliver the agreed programme</li> </ul>	No current action needed.	(Addressed in this report).
		Officers share with Cabinet the Department for Education's conclusion on satellite grammar schools when available.	Completed	Completed in the subsequent October 2015 report.



October 2015: Satellite Grammar School Provision in RBWM				
Report 7: October 2015	1	Approves up to £200K, from the Development Fund, to be available, and delegates authority to the Lead Member for Education and the Managing Director/Strategic Director of Children's Services to:	In progress	Relevant code being set up in 2016/17 financial year.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support due diligence work by Sir William Borlase's Grammar School in respect to a school expansion via a satellite site within the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.</li> </ul>	In progress	Due diligence statement from Sir William Borlase's Grammar School to be reported to July 2016 Cabinet.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree a programme of public consultation for 2016, in partnership with Sir William Borlase's Grammar School.</li> </ul>	In progress	Further clarity on sites needed ahead of any public consultation.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Undertake further work in relation to costings and the detail of acquisition of a satellite site.</li> </ul>	In progress	Work on potential sites is continuing.
		Legal challenges to the Secretary of State's decision regarding grammar school provision in Kent permitting.	In progress	No legal challenge launched yet.
	2	Requests a progress report to Cabinet in April 2016	In progress	Now expected to go to July 2016 Cabinet.

**Appendix B: Detail of scheme options in secondary expansion programme**

<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>e</i>
<b>School</b>	<b>Each school's key expansion priorities (as well as classrooms)</b>	<b>Main elements of schemes</b>	<b>Cost (£m)</b>	<b>Commentary</b>
<b>Charters</b> +30 places per year group. 7 year groups	To create a single teaching block for maths and science. This will enhance curriculum delivery and improve the school's ability to attract and retain high quality staff. This requires the maths block to be demolished, so the school has compromised on the numbers of additional classrooms required.	Option A.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New block of 11 classrooms, including 2 science labs - adjacent to existing science block.</li> <li>Demolition of old modular maths block.</li> <li>Extension to the dining room.</li> </ul>	3.9	The co-headteachers have indicated that they would accept Options A.1 and A.2 (preferred). They will not accept option A.3, and could refuse to expand if this option is chosen.  The co-headteachers' preference was for 14 classrooms, but after considerable negotiation, they agreed to just 11. 13 could fit into the proposed location.
		<b>Option A.2 Recommended</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two additional classrooms (13 instead of 11) in the new classroom block.</li> </ul>	4.3	
		Option A.3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New block of 6 classrooms only, not adjacent to existing science block.</li> <li>Old modular maths block retained.</li> <li>Costed for benchmarking purposes.</li> </ul>	2.5	
<b>Cox Green</b> +30 places per year group. 7 year groups	Expansion of the very small dining room. The school currently has to cope by using an external covered area. Additional pupils would make the dining facilities unacceptable.  Sufficient classrooms to enable their new curriculum model.	Option B.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extension of the dining room to include:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New block of 10 classrooms.</li> <li>Demolition and rebuild of the drama block.</li> <li>Enlargement of 2 classrooms to create science labs.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	4.4	The Headteacher has indicated strongly that option B.2 is preferred.  In practice Option B.2 (rebuilding the dining room) would probably carry less risk and would produce a better building solution, but at this concept stage, is estimated to be slightly more expensive than B.1 (extending the dining room.)  Both schemes are expensive because the need includes a bigger dining and kitchen space as well as classrooms. It also includes demolition and re-provision of either the drama or the dining room.  An alternative option (not listed) involves moving the undersized dining room & kitchen to the current gym. The gym is, however, part of the Cox Green Leisure facility, leased to Parkwood, and would need to be replaced. This negates any savings arising from not having to rebuild the dining hall.  Cox Green could accommodate a +60 places per year group expansion if necessary, possibly making a better value scheme. This has not been explored with the school in detail.
		<b>Option B.2 Recommended</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar to Option B.1, but demolishes and rebuilds the dining room, rather than the drama block, to make way for the new block.</li> </ul>	4.7	
<b>Cox Green</b> +60 places per year group. 7 year groups	This has not been discussed in detail with the school.	Alternative Proposal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This would require the accommodation set out in B.1/B.2 plus further infrastructure and teaching spaces.</li> </ul>	7.5 (initial estimate)	Cox Green could accommodate a +60 places per year group expansion if necessary, possibly making a better value scheme. This has not been explored with the school in detail.
<b>Dedworth Middle</b> +60 places per year group. 4 year groups	Construction of a new sports hall.	Option C.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New, 2 court, sports hall.</li> <li>New block of 8 classrooms.</li> <li>Increased dining space.</li> <li>Conversion of 1 classroom into a science lab</li> <li>Levelling of floor in school hall to make single large space.</li> </ul>	4.1	The Headteacher has indicated that the school preference is for Option C.2, although Option C.1 may be acceptable.  The Headteacher favours the new, larger, sports hall, rather than the adaptation of existing spaces to provide a similar facility.
		<b>Option C.2 Recommended</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As Option C.1, but larger, 3 court, sports hall.</li> <li>No levelling of floor in school hall.</li> </ul>	4.7	

<b>Furze Platt Senior</b> +30 places per year group. 7 year groups	Extension of the hall to provide more dining space, and to improve circulation around the site, relieving pressure at break times. Safer circulation around the site. Would like to replace 4 modular classrooms.	Option D.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New hall on site of demolished gym/netball court.</li> <li>New block of 5 classrooms, with 3 science labs and 2 general teaching classrooms.</li> <li>Demolition of one poor science lab.</li> </ul>	3.5	<p><i>The Headteacher strongly prefers Option D.2. Option D.1 may be acceptable, but Option D.3 is probably not. If this option is chosen the school could refuse to expand.</i></p> <p><i>The Headteacher favours an option that expands their main hall, although professional advice is that this would be more expensive and difficult to achieve. The new hall would go where the current gym is, and would extend into either the netball court or the modular classroom block area.</i></p> <p><i>Government guidance, in Building Bulletin 103, suggests that Furze Platt already has sufficient hall/dining space, but it remains a top priority for the school. In particular it will give them increased space for the 6<sup>th</sup> form, dining and school events, especially where public use of the sports hall/leisure centre conflicts with exams.</i></p> <p><i>Furze Platt could accommodate a +60 places per year group expansion if necessary, possibly making a better value scheme. This has not been explored with the school in detail.</i></p>
		<b>Option D.2 Recommended</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New hall on site of demolished gym.</li> <li>New block of 9 classrooms, with 3 science labs and 6 general teaching classrooms.</li> <li>Demolition of modular block of 4 classrooms.</li> <li>Demolition of one poor science lab.</li> </ul>	4.5	
		Option D.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As Option D.2, but with no new hall or demolition of the gym.</li> </ul>	2.6	
<b>Furze Platt</b> +60 places per year group. 7 year groups	This has not been discussed in detail with the school.	Alternative Proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This would require the accommodation set out in D.1/D.2/D.3 plus further infrastructure and teaching spaces.</li> </ul>	7.0 (initial estimate)	<p><i>Furze Platt Senior could accommodate a +60 places per year group expansion if necessary, possibly making a better value scheme. This has not been explored with the school in detail.</i></p>
<b>The Windsor Learning Partnership</b> +30 places per year group at each site. 5 year groups	<b>The Windsor Boys' School</b> Making better use of existing space.	<b>Option E.1 Agreed</b> (from Cabinet September 2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal remodelling to create larger teaching spaces and more efficient administration space.</li> <li>Small extensions to enlarge dining and changing rooms.</li> </ul>	1.8	<p><i>Out to tender – tenders due back 1<sup>st</sup> August, start on site Sept / Oct 2016.</i></p>
	<b>Windsor Girls' School</b> Dining extension.	<b>Option F.1 Agreed</b> (from Cabinet September 2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extension of kitchen/dining.</li> <li>.New two storey block of five classrooms.</li> </ul>	2.3	



## Appendix D: Projected shortfall of secondary school places

### 1. PURPOSE OF APPENDIX

- 1.1 This appendix revisits the 2015 projections for school place demand, as submitted to Cabinet in September 2015.
- 1.2 An annual projection of demand for secondary, middle and upper schools is completed by the Royal Borough and submitted to the Department for Education as part of the yearly School Capacity (SCAP) survey. The 2016 forecasts are due to be completed and submitted by late July 2016, and so are not currently available. The information here is based, therefore, on the 2015 forecasts.
- 1.3 A form of entry (FE) is equivalent to a class of 30 children in each year group. Two FE means 60 children in each year group, and so on.

### 2. 2015 BASED PROJECTIONS

- 2.1 Table B1 provides the number of extra school places needed for children starting school in Year 5 (middle schools), Year 7 (secondary schools) and Year 9 (upper schools) between now and September 2022. The number of extra places needed is based on the difference between the number of places available, and the expected demand for those places, assuming that no extra school places are provided. Each area of the borough is shown separately, because of the distance between them.
- 2.2 Table B1 also shows the number of extra places needed to provide a 10% surplus in the school intakes, and the current agreed proposals (from Cabinet in September 2015) to provide extra places.
- 2.3 Two sets of amendments have been made to the projected shortfalls as reported to Cabinet in September 2015, ahead of the release of the 2016 projections. These are:
  - Newlands Girls' School has increased its Published Admission Number from 186 to 192, making 6 additional places available each year. The surplus/deficit calculations have been amended to reflect this.
  - For the Windsor Year 9 intake, a mistake was made in the way in which Holyport College numbers were counted in the demand for Windsor Year 9 places (the school has a Year 9 intake and admits many children from Windsor). This has the effect of reducing the number of extra places needed by around 0.6 FE in each year.
- 2.4 In brief, the figures in Table B1 show that:
  - **Ascot** – is already under pressure. Cabinet has approved a 1 FE increase for September 2017.
  - **Datchet** - no extra places are currently needed. It should be noted that Slough Borough Council believe that they will need the spare places at Churchmead Secondary School as demand rises in the part of Slough that the school serves.
  - **Maidenhead** - no spare places projected in Maidenhead in September 2017. Cabinet has approved a 2 FE increase for September 2017, which will provide a 7% surplus. Demand will rise in subsequent years, necessitating further increases in places in 2019 and beyond.
  - **Windsor Middles** – is already under pressure. Cabinet has approved a 1 FE increase for September 2017, followed by a further 1 FE increase for September 2018. This should provide a surplus of 6-9% up to September 2019.
  - **Windsor Uppers** – no spare places projected in September 2017. Cabinet has approved a 2 FE increase for September 2017. Under the revised figures, this should provide a surplus of 5-14% up to 2021.

**Table B1: Projected number of extra places needed at intake, by area (2015 forecasts)**

		Intake Year (September)							
<b>Ascot Secondary (Yr 7)</b>		<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	
a	<b>Extra places needed to give every child a place in Year 7:</b> (no spare places)	+8	+3	+14	+16	+33	+20	+20	
b	<b>Extra places needed to provide a 10% surplus in Year 7:</b>	+33	+27	+39	+42	+60	+46	+46	
c	<b>Extra places approved by Cabinet</b> (cumulative):	None	None	+30	+30	+30	+30	+30	
d	<b>Resulting surplus/deficit:</b>	-8	-3	+16	+14	-3	+10	+10	
e	<b>Resulting surplus/deficit (%):</b>	-3.8	-1.4	+6.7	+5.8	-1.3	+4.2	+4.2	
<b>Datchet Secondary (Yr 7)</b>		<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	
f	<b>Extra places needed to give every child a place in Year 7:</b> (no spare places)	None (-69)	None (-71)	None (-38)	None (-34)	None (-29)	None (-25)	None (-17)	
g	<b>Extra places needed to provide a 10% surplus in Year 7:</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<b>Maidenhead Secondary (Yr 7)</b>		<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	
h	<b>Extra places needed to give every child a place in Year 7:</b> (no spare places)	None (-98)	None (-72)	None (-6)	+22	+74	+86	+105	
i	<b>Extra places needed to provide a 10% surplus in Year 7:</b>	-	+15	+88	+119	+176	+189	+210	
j	<b>Extra places approved by Cabinet</b> (cumulative):	None	None	+60	+60	+60	+60	+60	
k	<b>Resulting surplus/deficit:</b>	+98	+72	+66	+38	-14	-26	-45	
l	<b>Resulting surplus/deficit (%):</b>	+10.4	+7.6	+6.6	+3.8	-1.4	-2.6	-4.5	
<b>Windsor Middle (Yr 5)</b>		<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>			
m	<b>Extra places needed to give every child a place in Year 5:</b> (no spare places)	None (-22)	None (-8)	None (-1)	+17	+24			
n	<b>Extra places needed to provide a 10% surplus in Year 5:</b>	+21	+36	+33	+64	+71			
o	<b>Extra places approved by Cabinet</b> (cumulative):	None	None	+30	+60	+60			
p	<b>Resulting surplus/deficit:</b>	+22	+8	+31	+43	+36			
q	<b>Resulting surplus/deficit (%):</b>	+4.9	+1.8	+6.5	+8.4	+7.1			
<b>Windsor Upper (Yr 9)</b>		<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>
r	<b>Extra places needed to give every child a place in Year 9:</b> (no spare places)	None (-65)	None (-50)	+11	None (-15)	+21	+32	+35	+64
s	<b>Extra places needed to provide a 10% surplus in Year 9:</b>	-	-	+60	+32	+71	+83	+86	+119
t	<b>Extra places approved by Cabinet</b> (cumulative):	None	None	+60	+60	+60	+60	+60	+60
u	<b>Resulting surplus/deficit:</b>	+65	+50	+49	+75	+39	+28	+25	-4
v	<b>Resulting surplus/deficit (%):</b>	+13.6	+10.5	+9.1	+13.9	+7.2	+5.2	+4.6	-0.7

2.5 The current planned places do not provide a 10% surplus in each area in September 2017. The surplus provided is mainly around 6%-7% range, with a 9.1% in Windsor Year 9.

2.6 Table B2 shows the borough totals of the expected shortfalls without any extra places added.

**Table B2: Projected number of extra places needed at intake, total (2015 forecasts)**

RBWM	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
a Total of all shortfalls on available places at intake (Note: sum of deficits only. Surplus figures excluded).	+8	+3	+25	+55	+152	+138 (excl. middles)	+160 (excl. middles)	+64 (uppers only)
b Extra places needed to provide 10% surplus at intake	+54	+78	+220	+257	+378	-318 (excl. middles)	-342 (excl. middles)	-119 (uppers only)
c Extra places approved by Cabinet (cumulative):	None	None	+180	+210	+210	+210	+210	+210
d Further places needed to provide 10% surplus at intake	None	None	+40	+47	+168	+108 (excl. middles)	+132 (excl. middles)	None (uppers only)

### 3. OUT-BOROUGH DEMAND

3.1 Table B3 shows the number of out-borough children on roll in RBWM school intakes.

**Table B3: Number of out-borough children on roll in RBWM schools**

Area	Intake Year	Year of intake (September)					% of pupils on roll (2015)	Average 2011-2015	
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015		No.	FE
Ascot	7	94	75	75	78	65	25.9	75	2.5
Datchet/Wraysbury	7	95	93	71	40	31	64.5	66	2.2
Maidenhead	7	172	140	140	150 <sup>1</sup>	173	20.6	155	5.2
Windsor Middle	5	42	38	46	32	35	8.1	39	1.3
Windsor Upper	9	59	47	60	84 <sup>1</sup>	80	17.8	66	2.2
RBWM	-	462	393	392	384	384	19.0	403	13.4

<sup>1</sup>Holyport College opens.

3.2 Over the past five years out-borough children have occupied around 13 of the 64 FE available in the secondary, middle and upper school intakes in the borough.

3.3 An extensive analysis of the out-borough demand for borough schools was reported as *Appendix 4 – Out-borough children in RBWM schools* to the September 2015 Cabinet report on secondary school places. This followed suggestions from headteachers that some of the places needed to meet growing demand from within the borough could be met by reducing the number of out-borough children on roll.

3.4 The analysis considered what opportunities there are for the reduction in demand by reducing the number of out-borough children on roll. It concluded that it would be difficult to reduce demand in this way because the 1989 'Greenwich Judgement' makes it illegal for an admission authority to prioritise children on the basis that they live in the local authority

area.

- 3.5 In addition, many applicants are children that we might reasonably expect to attend a borough school, because:
- They live in the school's designated area, which covers an out-borough area.
  - They live just across the border in villages that, in practice, are closely linked to the borough.
  - They have siblings at borough school.
  - They have Statements of Special Educational Needs naming a borough school.
  - They have been admitted to a borough school as a Looked After child.
  - They have been admitted to a borough school because of specific medical or social needs.
  - They have a boarding place at Holyport College.
  - They have attended a borough primary school and are moving up with their peers.
- 3.6 The attendance of out-borough children in borough schools is also an outcome of parental choice, which has been the aim of successive governments and is a local priority. Many Royal Borough children do, of course, attend secondary (and particularly grammar) schools in other local authority areas.
- 3.7 Finally, many borough residents continue to only express one preference for a school at secondary transfer. If we are not able to offer them a place at that preferred school, then they have less priority for a place at an alternative school than an out-borough child who has indicated a preference for that alternative school.
- 3.8 Taking this demand into account, the analysis introduced the concept of 'Base demand', which is the underlying demand from borough residents, plus the out-borough demand from children falling into the above categories. The base demand can be compared against existing and planned capacity in the system. This then allows a 10% surplus capacity to be calculated on that base demand, rather than the overall demand. The number of children projected to take up places in schools isn't changed, but theoretically less capacity is then needed in order to provide a 10% surplus.
- 3.9 A minimum of 5% surplus places on the overall demand needs to be applied, to ensure that there are still places available for families moving into the area after secondary transfer.
- 3.10 Having applied this methodology to each part of the borough, the conclusion is that there are no realistic opportunities for meeting growing demand by admitting fewer out-borough children, except in Maidenhead.



**Table B3: Amended number of extra places needed at intake, Maidenhead (2015 forecasts)**

		Intake Year (September)							
Maidenhead Secondary (Yr 7)		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	
a	<b>Extra places needed to give every child a place in Year 7: (no spare places)(from Table B2)</b>	None (-98)	None (-72)	None (-6)	+22	+74	+86	+105	
b	<b>Extra places needed to meet the projected <u>base demand</u> in Year 7: (no spare places)</b>	None (-171)	None (-147)	None (-81)	None (-53)	None (-1)	+11	+30	
c	<b>Extra places needed to provide a 10% surplus in Year 7: (from Table B2)</b>	-	+15	+88	+119	+176	+189	+210	
d	<b>Extra places needed to provide a 10% surplus on <u>base demand</u> and minimum 5% surplus on all demand:</b>	-	-	+41	+70	+125	+138	+157	
e	<b>Extra places approved by Cabinet (cumulative):</b>	None	None	+60	+60	+60	+60	+60	
f	<b>Further places needed to then meet 10% surplus on all demand:</b>	-	+15	+28	+59	+116	+129	+150	
g	<b>Further places needed to then meet 10% surplus on <u>base demand</u> and minimum 5% surplus on all demand:</b>	None	None	None (-19)	+10	+65	+78	+97	

3.11 Having applied this methodology to each part of the borough, the conclusion is that there are no realistic opportunities for meeting growing demand by admitting fewer out-borough children, except in Maidenhead.

3.12 Table B3 applies the base demand methodology to Maidenhead, where around half (2.5 FE) of the out-borough children on roll are applicants who are not in the categories listed above. The table shows that:

- To provide places for base demand only (row 'b'), no new places are needed before 2020. This is not recommended because all the spare places would be taken by out-borough children, leaving us with no spare capacity for families moving into the area. This would becoming increasingly difficult to manage as families move into the significant number of new dwellings being built in the town.
- To provide places for the overall demand +10% (row 'f') This would mean that the number of secondary school places in Maidenhead increases by 7 FE by September 2021, including the 2 FE that the borough has already approved. This would result in a significant amount of spare capacity in the town - equivalent to a whole secondary school.
- To provide places for the base demand + 10% (row 'g') Under this scenario, the number of secondary school places would increase by 5.2 FE by September 2021, including the 2 FE that the borough has already approved. This will still provide a good surplus of places (around 5%). It might be possible to delay one form of entry from September 2017 to September 2018, which would mean a low surplus of just 3.7% on all demand, but 11.4% on base demand in 2017. The surplus of 3.7% on overall demand of 3.7% is 36 places, which may be tight as families move into the significant number of new dwellings being built in the town.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

- 4.1 The 2016 forecasts are not yet available but, on current information there is not thought to be any necessity to change the scale or timing of the already agreed Phase 1 school expansion schemes, for September 2017. The resulting surpluses of places are mainly in the 6-7% range, and so at the mid to lower end of the 5-10% range. This means there is limited scope for reducing the places made available by reducing the surplus places targets.
- 4.2 In addition, analysis of out-borough numbers suggests that there is only limited scope for scaling back the expansion programme by actively reducing the number of extra places taken by out-borough children. In Maidenhead, by pursuing a 10% surplus of places on the base demand instead of the overall demand, the number of extra places needed by September 2021 falls from 7 FE to 5.2 FE. There is some scope for delaying 1 FE of the expansion programme, from September 2017 to 2018, although this could leave a low surplus of just 3.7%. This may not be high enough to allow for families subsequently moving into the area.