



**Executive**  
13th November 2006

**Report from the Director of  
Children and Families**

For Action

Wards Affected:  
ALL

**A Strategy for the Development of Primary and Secondary Schools  
– Options for Delivering Additional School Places**

Forward Plan Ref: C&F-06/07-009

## 1.0 Summary

- 1.1 The Council's Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP), published in April 2006, sets out, as one of its targets the creation of additional school places with effect from 2007/08 and in particular additional secondary school places from 2009 by setting up a new Academy. Secondary schools in Brent are effectively full now. Many primary schools are full and some parents have to seek school spare places at further than desirable distances. Children seeking school places are being placed in schools where there is a turnover of pupils or at projects across the Borough. As at 19 October 2006, 38 primary school children (61% of whom reside in and around Wembley area) and 40 secondary school children (most of whom also reside in or around Wembley) are waiting for a school place. These children are expected to be placed in projects or school places as vacancies arise. At the time of drafting the report the September census was not completed and information from schools was still flowing in.
- 1.2 This report measures the forecast demand for primary and secondary school places by a number of Forms of Entry (FE)" (see paragraph 3.1.3 below).
- 1.3 Overall, by 2016, referred to in this report as the long term, the Authority is projecting a shortfall of school places across both primary and secondary age ranges. In the secondary sector, the projected shortfall is of the order of 5.5 Forms of Entry by September 2009 rising to 16 Forms of Entry by 2016. In the Primary sector, the projections point to the need of an additional 13FE by 2016. The Projections incorporate a 5% margin to allow for fluctuation in demand (planning factor). This may be a tight margin (the Audit Commission in "Trading Places" (2002) recommended a planning factor of between 5% and 10%) in a highly dynamic environment.

- 1.4 This report sets out a summary review of the case for additional primary and secondary school places, and invites Members to agree to consult on a strategy for developing schools particularly with the aim of increasing the supply of school places in the longer term while recommending that for the short to medium term the negotiations with the DfES continue on the development and siting of a proposed second Academy in Brent. It also explores the place of the Building Schools for the Future programme, the Primary Capital Programme (longer term), options for a second Academy (available in the shorter term) and the financing of the development of schools using other DfES, Council and wider resources for example through partnering. While this report does not address the outcomes of the recent review of the Special Education Needs (SEN) sector, Members will be brought up-to-date with the SEN review and also opportunities will be sought for incorporating any needs for SEN in the development of primary and secondary school places.
- 1.5 In terms of secondary places the report concludes that there is a need for 6FE by 2009 and 16FE by 2016. This demand will need to be met by a combination of a new school and expansion of existing schools. The only available option to meet the demand by 2009 is by the provision of an academy because funding is not in place for expansion over this period. The only site for an Academy which is suitable, available and affordable to meet this need by 2009 is the Wembley Park (Bridge Road) site. This site also offers the additional provision of 2FE primary places which are urgently needed and for which no alternative funding is available. If a decision is not taken to develop the Wembley Park (Bridge Road) site for an Academy then in the absence of a viable alternative, the Council would be liable to the challenge of failing to pursue an available option to meet its statutory duty to provide school places. This would also conflict with the adopted Children and Young People's Plan.

## 2.0 Recommendations

The Executive is recommended to:

- 2.1 To note the findings set out in the report on the need for additional school places in the Borough;
- 2.2 Consider the order of investment level required, set out in this report in paragraph 3.2.3. and, along with other plans for capital investment across the Council, to recommend these proposals to Full Council as a priority in the Council's Investment Plan or Capital Programme pending the identification of external funding streams.
- 2.3 Note the advice in the report on the availability and appropriateness of sites, the affordability of purchasing the sites and the availability of resources in the short term (to 2009) to build new secondary (6FE) and primary (2FE) schools.
- 2.4 In the light of that advice, agree to proceed with the proposal to develop a second Academy on the site at Wembley Park (Bridge Road) in order to meet some of the demand for additional school places in the borough.
- 2.5 Agree to begin consultation with the Schools Forum and the wider schools community on the principles of, and a phased programme for, the further development of both primary and secondary schools (both community and foundation), for providing 16FE additional primary school places and 6FE

additional secondary places by 2009 rising to a total of 16FE additional secondary places by 2016.

- 2.6 Allocate as a priority, the £500,000 remaining in the Council's Capital Budget for CFD for the expansion of school places (further information is in paragraphs 3.5) as a preliminary resource for full feasibility studies to be carried out as part of an overall business case to produce delivery plan for the expansion of school places across the Borough necessary to meet the projected shortfall; this will be the subject of a further report.
- 2.7 Note that a renewed approach will be made to the DfES with a view to securing Capital allocation to fund the business case as it develops;
- 2.8 Note that a further report will be prepared for the Executive on proposals for an interim arrangement and, subject to resources being identified, for the provision of temporary classroom across a number of schools in order to increase the supply of school places in the short or immediate term particularly where demand is immediately acute;
- 2.9 Note that a further report on the matter of consultation with all appropriate stakeholders on the overall strategy for the development of schools with particular emphasis on the relevant school organisation implications contained in this report.
- 2.10 Agree to set up a Member/officer Project Board to oversee the development and, subsequently, the delivery of the Development Strategy.

### **3.0 Detail**

#### **3.1 The Need for School Places**

- 3.1.1 The pressure on school places – both primary and secondary has been reported previously to Council. This was also the subject of a Member level Task Group that reported to a Scrutiny Panel on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2006 and subsequently to an Executive on 10<sup>th</sup> April 2006;
- 3.1.2 Since then, the Council has continued to experience increased pressure on school places from both Brent residents and new arrivals to the Borough. The number of secondary aged pupils arriving in the Borough and seeking a school place has been running at 20 a week since early September.
- 3.1.3 The Authority is registering about 15 children a week seeking a primary school place. Arrangements have been made to continue to place these children through a combination of placements in projects or schools experiencing a turnover of pupils.
- 3.1.4 The longer term forecast of demand for school places points to an increase in the demand of school places [as measured by Forms of Entry (FE). A 1FE primary school will have 30 children in each of year group – Reception to Year 6 – with a total of 210 pupils in that school excluding a nursery class. A 6FE secondary school will have 180 children in each of the year groups for Year 7 to Year 11 with a total of 900 pupils excluding a 6<sup>th</sup> form];

- 3.1.5 The Pupil Census will reflect the latest inwards migration trends among other factors for an additional 16 FE in 2011 in the primary sector, stabilising to 13FE by 2016. . In the secondary sector, the projected shortfall is of 5.5 FE by September 2009, rising to 6FE by September 2011. This rises to a projected shortfall of 16FE by 2016. The projections will be re-run taking account of the latest Housing Capacity Study data. The pupil data will need to be further and more rigorously tested particularly in the light of September 2006 pupil census that was not completed at the time of drafting this report.
- 3.1.6 The trend in pupil numbers has been monitored against the forecasts. They show that medium range forecasts have underestimated demand both in the primary and secondary sectors. For example in 2000 the secondary Year 7 forecast for 2005 underestimated demand by 7%; in 2001 the forecast for 2006 underestimated demand by 7.9%. In primary for Year R underestimates were 4.3% and 2.7%. These figures will continue to be monitored carefully, and an annual report will be presented to the Executive with an assessment of the impact of any change in the trend to the Council's strategy for dealing with the growth in demand for school places.
- 3.1.7 A fuller report on the drivers for the growth in pupils numbers has been considered by the Scrutiny Panel and the Task Force on school places. In summary, the demand for school places is mainly driven by :
- Housing growth;
  - Increase density of use of existing housing stock;
  - Increased popularity of Brent schools (mainly due to the increasing quality of Brent's educational offer);
  - Inward economic and other migration;
  - Decreasing availability of places in neighbouring boroughs
- 3.1.8 Attachment 1 to this report sets out an analysis of current demand for school places and where the strongest pressure comes from. Housing growth trends point to continuing increase in demand for school places from North of the North Circular Road in Wembley, and Burnt Oak/Colindale and South of the North Circular Road in South Kilburn. Ongoing Stonebridge regeneration will also mean that the school population is likely further to increase locally (with a ripple effect across Harlesden and Neasden) after a period of decline. Further expected growth in population is expected for Church End and Alperton areas in accordance with the draft LDF Core Strategy recently agreed for public consultation.
- 3.1.9 It is therefore necessary that a strategy aimed at developing schools over the medium and long term will position new schools in local areas of demand for school places or alternatively enables local schools to expand whilst continuing to raise education standards across the Local Authority area. In the short term, the Authority will need to increase the supply of school places by positioning temporary accommodation in schools where both it is possible so to do and where those schools are in areas of greatest pressure for school places. Individual discussions will take place with those schools.

## 3.2 **Rationale for Prioritising Investment Across Schools**

- 3.2.1 The Asset Management Plan (AMP) framework sets out information about the Council's assets particularly in respect of Condition, Suitability and Sufficiency.
- 3.2.2 The AMP plays an important role in supporting the raising of educational standards and also at ensuring that the Authority is able to provide the number of quality school places where they are required.
- 3.2.3 Assessments of the resource level required to address the deficiencies in the AMP (condition, suitability and sufficiency needs) point to a need of in excess of £190m over a four year time span at 2006 prices (excluding the need to renew the stock of SEN schools, the delivery of Children's Centres in a future phase and investment needs in voluntary-aided schools). The Executive will note that the resources available and set out in Paragraph 4, alone are insufficient to address the full AMP requirements.
- 3.2.4 Investment will be determined both by the availability of sites and also the Council's capacity to acquire appropriate and relevant sites. Attachment 2 to this report sets out a profile of each of the sites considered as potential sites made for secondary schools. In addition, Officers from both Environment & Culture and Children Families the information on each of the sites open to scrutiny by Members of the Executive; in the process the constraints in the availability of sites for accommodating a secondary school with or without a co-located primary school, were reviewed (the summary of this is included in Attachment 2). Paragraphs 3.5.15 to 3.5.21 and Table 3 of this report set out a review of key issues in considering and assessing the sites which officers consider are able to accommodate new schools taking into account suitability, affordability and availability.
- 3.2.5 A schools development programme, or strategy, will need to be packaged in phases that can be considered to be affordable taking account of available funding streams and government programmes as well as available and affordable sites for new school provision.
- 3.2.6 At the time of drafting this report, there is immediate pressure on school places and the funding streams are not yet able to deliver the capital resources required to expand provision in the short to medium term. In the short term, temporary accommodation will need to be planned. Alternatively, the Authority may invest in the schools in which the main buildings have space that can be remodelled into classrooms providing benefits to schools in the longer term.

## 3.3 **Funding Programmes To Support an Investment Plan**

- 3.3.1 The Schools Development Strategy (for primary and secondary schools) will be a large and complex scheme that the Council will be unable to fund from its own resources. It is also unlikely that DfES funding programmes will be able fully to resource the investment level required.

- 3.3.2 It is therefore important that the Council carries out a comprehensive review of the funding and financing options for delivering the Strategy. The funding streams could include DfES Schools Capital funding [including Building Schools for the Future (BSF), Primary Capital Programme (PCP), Targeted Capital Funding (TCF), Successful and Popular Schools Policy – see below), prudential borrowing, capital receipts, Section 106 monies, sale of surplus land and other financing options for partnerships that the review may point to.
- 3.3.3 In 2003 the DfES prioritised secondary schools for investment through the Building Schools for the Future initiative. Investment was prioritised across Local Authority areas with the highest indices of deprivation and lowest educational standards as measured by the achievements in GCSE. Authorities were grouped into “waves”. Brent submitted an Expression of Interest (EoI). Support for Brent under BSF is likely to be announced in 2010/2011 (waves 7-9). There is no indicative allocation as yet for Brent under this programme. Since the submission of this EoI (at a time when the Local Authority’s Schools Organisation Plan pointed to a surplus in school places), the demographics point to the shortfall in school places. Therefore the Authority will need to revise its approach to BSF to take account of the latest information on demographics.
- 3.3.4 An equivalent (to BSF) DfES programme, for primary schools, is the Primary Capital Programme (PCP). This programme is aimed at further consolidating the aims of Every Child Matters (ECM) and in the process, aims to rebuild or take out of use the 5% worst condition school buildings nationally and to rebuild refurbish or remodel at least half of primary schools nationally. While at a national level the expectation is that the programme will encourage Authorities to address falling rolls, in the case of Brent the PCP will be seen as a funding stream to expand provision given the demographic trends. It is likely that Local Authorities (other than the ones in the pilot phase) will begin to benefit from resources with effect from 2009/10 with the allocation being driven by a simple formula relating to pupil numbers in the Authority’s school. There is no indicative allocation as yet for Brent under this programme.
- 3.3.5 Prudential borrowing (introduced in 2003 as part of the Prudential Framework) enables the Authority to make spending decisions based on local choice between priorities and financial judgements on affordability. The level of resources able to be identified under this funding stream would need to be established.
- 3.3.6 S106 resources are sourced from developers who secure planning consent on developments. This resource is mainly aimed at mitigating the impact of the development in local areas and can be used to expand school places.
- 3.3.7 Capital allocation from central government as supported borrowing, is essentially an allocation of capital expenditure levels based on an assessment (by Government) of need in a Local Authority area ( the 2007/08 allocation to the Authority is £16.1m). The overall level of resources made available by the Council for schools capital and development work is £50.5m from 2007/08 to 2009/10.
- 3.3.8 Government initiatives may result in specific grants being allocated to specific service initiatives.

- 3.3.9 The DfES encourage Authorities to submit applications for capital for additional school places under the Basic Need regime – where Authorities are experiencing exceptional growth in pupil numbers and the capital already allocated is deemed by the DfES to be insufficient to support expansion in pupil places. Where in-year growth is experienced, Authorities may resort to approaching the DfES for funds under the “Safety Value” mechanism. In 2005/06 The Authority was barred from bidding its allocations for capital (for the DfES) as seemed to be sufficient for new pupil places on the basis of the information known to the DfES at the time.
- 3.3.10 The Targeted Capital Fund (TCF) is a limited resource pot that provides an opportunity for a competitive bidding process from Local Authorities to submit requests for resources across priority areas announced by the DfES from time to time. It also includes an opportunity for bidding for funds for new school places. Its future has been under review. A successful TCF allocation is funded via a grant.
- 3.3.11 The Government’s “Successful and Popular Schools” policy enables schools that fit the criteria to bid for capital support to expand provision. The maximum support available is £500,000 with any balance of approved (by the DfES) costs to be funded by the Local Authority. This is a call on Council’s capital resources.
- 3.3.12 The Academies route for funding secondary schools is one the Government has favoured in recent years in the context of its policy programme to expand the availability of Academies in deprived Local Authority areas. Under this route the Authority has the duty to provide the site. Capital costs to build the Academy are allocated by way of a grant, via the Local Authority, to a Trust set up by a Sponsor of an Academy. The Sponsor’s contribution to the Academy is intended to be used for enhancing initiatives in the Academy aimed at raising standards.
- 3.3.13 There is an overwhelming case for procuring additional schools provision (a new School by September 2009) via the Academies programme. Attachment 3 sets out the changing role of the local Authority in the Academies programme. Underpinning the case for an Academy are the following factors:
- Capital cost (construction related) neutral to the Council
  - Available now (3 years development to completion) depending on site selection and agreement on site with a sponsor
  - Academies now offer a greater level of influence by the Local Authority
  - Depending on the selection of the site, the Academy would be positioned in the area where pressure is most felt and growing – at both primary and secondary levels.

## 3.4 **School Organisation Implications**

- 3.4.1 A strategy for developing schools will inevitably raise school organisation issues ranging from agreement on an education vision through to statutory processes to expand provision. Reports will be brought back to the Executive on these as the need arises.

3.4.2 In turn, where relevant and appropriate, reports will be submitted to the School Organisation Committee (SOC) for decision making. There is a proposal for the SOCs to be abolished with the local authorities assuming powers to decide on statutory proposals in the future. The Executive will be informed once these proposals are enacted, setting out any revised local arrangements.

### 3.5 **Measures to Increase Capacity**

3.5.1 Measures to increase capacity can be grouped into a number of strategic options over both the short to medium term and the longer term. They include a mix of the expansion of existing school sites and new-build provision.

3.5.2 In the short term, the Authority has sought to cope with the new arrivals, through a combination of measures involving the use of assessment centres, expansion of places via projects (short term measures to enable new arrivals to receive support that is assessed to be required for them – such as English as an Additional Language) , opportunities afforded by a turnover of pupils [although the Borough does not calculate the pupil turnover rate it will explore how relevant data may be collated for the future to enable the Authority to build this intelligence in when planning school places]. It is however clear that pupils currently paced on projects (200 secondary pupils are currently on projects and assessment centres) will need a permanent school place at the expiry of the project.

3.5.3 In the medium (to 2011) to longer term (to 2016) the Authority will need to take steps to increase capacity on a permanent basis. In the short term from September 2007 onwards (and resources allowing), the Authority will need to position temporary accommodation in areas of greatest need. Individual discussions will take place with relevant schools.

#### The Primary Sector

3.5.4 In the primary sector, plans are currently under way to expand Wembley Manor Schools (Wembley Primary School) by 1FE for September 2008. Funding of just over £10M is available from the Council's corporate resources. Discussions are taking place with five other primary schools (likely to rise to six, pending the outcome of an OFSTED process at the sixth school) to expand provision by 1FE at each of those schools; some of these schools have in the recent past, reduced their capacity.

3.5.5 Officers are currently actively exploring the expansion listed in Table 1. The expansion is dependent on the availability of resources. Assumptions are also made about the timing of the expansions.

#### **Table 1 : Proposals for Expanding Existing Primary Schools**

Elsley Primary School

The school was originally operating at just under 3FE. It is operating at 2FE. A preliminary study has been carried out to expand the school by an additional 1FE



by building an extension to the main building.

#### Chalkhill Primary

The school is established as a 2FE school. As a result of a decant of residents from the former Chalkhill estate, the school has been operating as a 1FE school. However, recently, numbers at the younger age range have been rising with the net effect that the school is beginning to admit to a 2FE capacity. A preliminary study has been carried out to expand from 2FE to 3FE. This would need to be achieved via a new build given the current Chalkhill site score a low suitability rating in the Council's Asset Management Plan.

#### Fryent Primary

The school was established as a 3FE School. In 2003, the school reduced capacity to 2FE owing to a combination of the then expected falling rolls and extremely poor accommodation. Instead another local school (Kingsbury Green) expanded by an additional 1FE in 2003. A master plan is being prepared for the expansion of Fryent back to a 3FE prior to the development of a Children's Centre proposed onsite. The masterplan would provide a context for the Children's Centre development due to come on stream in March 2008. It is anticipated that this expansion will be achieved by an extension to the existing buildings.

#### Kensal Rise Primary

The school is established as a 3FE school. It is currently operating as a 2FE school given the fall in demand for places in the late 1990s. Discussions are under way to expand capacity by 1FE – this may be achieved through a combination of remodelling existing accommodation and providing limited new spaces (such as a SEN room) through new build.

#### Wykeham

The school was established as a 3FE school. In September 2001 the school capacity reduced to 2FE. Accommodation has been remodelled (essentially creating bigger and more suitable classrooms) in order to shrink the physical capacity. Although no direct

and specific discussions have taken place as yet, CFD will look at the expansion of Wykeham by 1FE. It is anticipated this will involve a new build extension and limited remodelling of the existing school.

#### Stonebridge

The school is established as a 2FE school. It is currently operating as a 1FE school. The existing building could be refurbished so as to create suitable learning spaces for a 2FE school. In any event discussions have been under way with a local partner with the view to providing a newbuild 2FE replacement Stonebridge School elsewhere on the Stonebridge area.

- 3.5.6 In South Kilburn, and in partnership with the NDC, the Council is developing proposals for the creation of a net additional capacity by 1FE. Other schools have in the past operated at a higher capacity. They include Furness (at just over 3FE up to 2001, and since then reduced to 2FE), Park Lane at between 1.5FE and 2FE (now operating at 1FE), Princess Frederica (previously operating at just over 2FE, now operating at 2FE), St Joseph's RC Primary (previously operating at 3FE and now operating at 2FE), St Mary's RC (previously operating at 3FE, now operating at 2FE). A review of schools' physical capacity is under way. The results so far show that it may be possible to adjust Published Admission Numbers across a handful of schools. This will add a small number of school places.
- 3.5.7 Negotiations are under way with a developer with the view to securing a fully built 2FE primary school (in the North East part of the Borough – Kingsbury) at no net cost to the Council – however, although the site has been secured, there is currently a shortfall in the funding of the construction costs. This, if agreed, will not come on stream before 2010.
- 3.5.8 Pending a decision by Members, an all through Academy (see below) would provide an additional 2FE at no net cost to the Council, if sited at the Wembley Park site on Bridge Park Road. Other sites explored as potential sites for a second Academy would not provide opportunities for co-locating primary provision with secondary provision.
- 3.5.9 The Authority has considered removing huts in a number of schools (such as Mount Stewart and Byron Court schools) where either the huts are in poor condition or where a large proportion of young people are being educated in hatted accommodation or both. A review of these schools may provide opportunities for two more additional schools to be expanded.
- 3.5.10 There is no funding provision for the expansion of primary schools. It is expected that the Government's Primary Capital Programme will provide a source of funds for the scheme with effect from 2009/10. However, the programme is unlikely fully to fund Brent's needs.

## The Secondary Sector

- 3.5.11 In the secondary sector, and subject to resources being available, there are provisional plans to create an additional maximum potential capacity of 10FE across seven secondary schools in Brent. There is currently no capital provision to help meet the associated capital costs. A second Academy, as proposed in this report, would provide a further 6FE at no net construction cost to the Council. Provision will need to be made for site acquisition costs.
- 3.5.12 The Council has identified plans for expanding a number of existing schools in the Local Authority area. They are set out in the table below:

**Table 2: Proposals for Expanding Existing Secondary Schools**

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| John Kelly Girls' School      | <p>The school is currently a 5FE school. It is proposed to expand the school by 1FE. This requires additional site. The Council is in the process of the acquisition of additional land adjoining the school in order to expand the school.</p> <p>The condition of the school building is poor and its suitability low. The expansion can only be achieved via new build. This new build is a priority under the Government's programme of Building Schools for the Future (BSF).</p> |
| John Kelly Boys' School       | <p>The school is currently a 4FE school. It shares a cramped site with the Girls' school. The proposal is to achieve an expansion through new build at the same time as rebuilding the Girls' school, under the BSF programme.</p>   |
| Queen's Park Community School | <p>The school is currently a 7FE school. It is proposed to expand the school by 2FE under the BSF programme. Other funding streams will be explored in the interim.</p>  |
| Wembley High School           | <p>The school is currently a 7FE school. It is proposed to expand the school by 1FE under the BSF programme. Other funding streams will be explored in the interim.</p>  |
| Copland School                | <p>The school is in the process of being rebuilt with the scheme being funded out of a land swap deal with a developer. Discussions have opened with Copland with the view to expanding the school by an additional 1FE. There is provision of £1.5m in the CFD Capital budget to</p>  |

support the cost of this expansion. More recently Copland has indicated that they are prepared to expand by a further 1FE thus expanding the school, overall, by 2FE.

Preston Manor School

This school is a 7FE school. The school is in the process of expanding by 1 FE under the Government's policy of expansion of "Successful and Popular Schools".

Capital City Academy

Capital City Academy, a 6FE school, have indicated that they would consider contributing to the Council's strategy by expanding by 2FE in the longer term (say 2011/12).

- 3.5.13 The Council has made provision for £4.0m for the expansion of secondary school places. £2M is earmarked as a contribution to the Preston Manor scheme with £1.5m allocated towards the expansion of Copland School. It is proposed that the remainder of £0.5M, not hitherto earmarked for this purpose, be provisionally allocated (to be cashflowed across 2006/07 and 2007/08) to establish Brent's business case for the expansion and development of schools with the twin aim of enabling standards to be raised and expanding the provision of school places across local areas in the Borough. Procurement options will be explored to deliver a schools development programme. These will include the conventional procurement of individual schools; the procurement of additional secondary schools (over and above the second proposed Academy) via the Academies programme; a packaging new build and improvement and remodelling schemes through the PFI route; longer term partnership working through framework agreements; and setting up joint venture arrangements such as Local Education Partnerships (LEPs) – the core procurement route for the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme.
- 3.5.14 Notwithstanding the current short to medium term plans to expand existing schools (resources allowing), which will provide ten additional Forms of Entry, it is clear that additional new schools (equivalent to 2 new schools) will be required leading upto 2016. Failure to address the shortfall would put the Local Authority at risk of not meeting its duty to provide sufficient school places. At its meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2005, the Executive approved an Expression of Interest for a second academy in Brent and, in order for it to be sited on the site adjacent to Wembley Park tube station (along Bridge Park Road) it also approved in principle the acquisition of the site (known as Wembley Park Sports Ground) from Transport for London (TfL). Progress has been made in negotiating with TfL. Site options have been explored.
- 3.5.15 The medium to longer term plans are dependent on appropriate sites becoming available for use as school sites – either single phase school sites (separate primary and secondary schools) or all-through ( or co-located primary and secondary schools) schools.

## Site Considerations

- 3.5.16 The DfES issue area guidelines for secondary and primary schools. The guidelines offer advice now also for urban contexts where sites are confined. The likely site area requirement for a site accommodating both a 6FE secondary and a 2FE primary school, in confined sites ranges from 13,100m<sup>2</sup> through to 15,920m<sup>2</sup>, the absolute minimum being 12,000m<sup>2</sup>. The assumption in such cases is that pitches are provided off-site. However, "...school grounds are a valuable resource and will have a significant effect on the ethos of the school and the quality of the education pupils receive." (DfES Area Guidelines). Whilst not essential for confined sites, it is nevertheless prudent to allow the site, where possible, to have adequate informal and social spaces (both soft and hard), habitat areas and on site games courts, this bringing the site space requirements to nearer 30,000m<sup>2</sup>. For non confined sites the likely area ranges from 68,980m<sup>2</sup> through to 78,520m<sup>2</sup>.
- 3.5.17 In the case of single phase provision (either primary or secondary provision rather than combined provision), the minimum site range area for a 2FE primary school on a confined urban environment is in the range of between 4,600m<sup>2</sup> through to 6,340m<sup>2</sup> depending on the extent of community usage. For a single phase 6FE secondary school, the minimum site area, for a confined inner urban setting, is at between 6,400m<sup>2</sup> and 7,400m<sup>2</sup> depending on community usage and assuming all pitches are off site. Again, in order to improve the quality of learning experiences for young people, it is important that opportunities are created where possible, for adequate informal and social spaces (both soft and hard), habitat areas and on site games courts; this would bring the site space requirements to nearer 17,400m<sup>2</sup> for a single phase secondary school.
- 3.5.18 Attachment 2 sets out a summary of the site options explored together with a brief analysis of implications with regards to transportation, ease of access, size and overall suitability. At the request of Members, a more detailed analysis has been carried out for the sites at Wembley Park Recreational Ground, Chalkhill Centre, Gwenneth Rickus Building and the Palace of Arts and Industry in the Wembley regeneration area. The following factors were further considered:
- Public Transport and Transport/traffic issues. Impact of Travel Plans on traffic ;
  - Land Valuation (range forecast of values) to inform judgements on affordability.
  - Planning Constraints - Site and UDP
  - Site Availability
  - Sufficiency of land
- Table 3, below, sets out a summary review of sites against these, and other considerations.

- 3.5.19 Taking the benchmark of 30,000 m<sup>2</sup>, for an all through school provision, it is clear that of those sites described in Paragraph 3.5.18 above, only two sites fit the criteria : The Palace of Arts and Industry (56,000m<sup>2</sup>) and the Wembley Park (Bridge Road) site (43,000m<sup>2</sup>). The Chalkhill Centre site (at 13,000m<sup>2</sup>) may be deemed to fit the size criterion if the adjacent open space (at 20,000m<sup>2</sup>) is incorporated providing an overall site area of 33,000m<sup>2</sup>. Given the pressure on places in the Wembley area, the site of the Health Centre in Chalkhill was also examined. The site at 14,000m<sup>2</sup> is inferior to some of the others considered and officers consider that the constraints render this site either unsuitable or unavailable for a new school in 2009/10 or both. Since drafting this report, the Authority has had further discussions with a local partner over the prospect of reviewing the masterplan for the Stonebridge HAT, in respect of the areas of Stonebridge and Our Lady of Lourdes schools. It is clear at the onset that there are serious obstacles to overcome in order for that zone to yield a site for a rebuilt (new) Our Lady of Lourdes, an expanded Stonebridge School (to 2FE) and also to provide a site for a secondary school. There are planning constraints (the land in front of the two existing primary schools is public open space) and resource constraints (the local partner's business case – to provide at least a rebuilt Our Lady of Lourdes and partly rebuild an expanded Stonebridge school - is unlikely to be viable if there is insufficient land on which to build homes that generate cash for the schools). Negotiations are continuing with the local partner; however it is unlikely that this Stonebridge zone will provide a site in the medium term. The longer term prospects are also tenuous, but are being further considered.
- 3.5.20 All the sites explored above would fit the area range (4,600m<sup>2</sup> through to 6,340m<sup>2</sup>) for a primary school only on a confined site. They would also fit the area range (between 6,400m<sup>2</sup> and 7,400m<sup>2</sup> depending on community usage and assuming all pitches are off site) for a secondary school only on a confined site.
- 3.5.21 Reviewing Attachment 2, and assessing the sites against the criteria rehearsed in 3.5.18, Members may wish to develop a ranking order of priorities for developing the sites for new school provision. Taking account of the availability of resources, planning considerations, site size, the ease of availability of the sites for immediate start up development work, considering other options currently being considered for the respective sites, rank priority order is as set out in the analysis in Table 3 below:

**TABLE 3**

**SITE ANALYSIS – FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED**  
 (Sites named in descending order of officers’ “preferred status”)

| <b>Site</b>                           | <b>Area<br/>(000m<sup>2</sup>)</b> | <b>Status in UDP</b>   | <b>Physical<br/>Constraints</b>                | <b>Council<br/>Ownership</b> | <b>Affordability<br/>&amp; Availability</b>   | <b>Public<br/>Transport &amp;<br/>Access**</b> | <b>Location<br/>Relating to<br/>Demand</b> | <b>Other<br/>Considerations</b>   |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Wembley Park<br>(Bridge Road)<br>Site | 43                                 | Area of Open<br>Character / corner of<br>Nature Conservation<br>Importance / Bridge<br>Rd frontage is in<br>National Stadium<br>Policy Area where<br>mixed use<br>development is<br>appropriate. | Some loss of<br>private O S and<br>open aspect | No                           | Likely to be<br>affordable<br>pending<br>negotiations<br>under progress<br>Likely to be<br>available<br>immediately | <b>Good (5)</b>                                | Within an area of<br>greatest demand       | The site can<br>accommodate an<br>all through all<br>phase provision<br>whilst retaining a<br>substantial<br>proportion (c80%+)<br>for community<br>usage and as an<br>amenity for local<br>residents. It can<br>therefore deliver a<br>6FE secondary<br>school and a 2FE<br>primary school on<br>site. |

| Site             | Area (000m2)                     | Status in UDP  | Physical Constraints   | Council Ownership | Affordability* & Availability  | Public Transport & Access** | Location Relating to Demand                    | Other Considerations |
|------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Chalkhill Centre | (13 + 20 for Open Space) Upto 33 | Part of Green Chain, Land Liable to Flooding, Chalkhill O S is Public Open Space where development not permitted | Y&C site is too small on its own and is land liable to flooding. Chalkhill O S is former sewage works so contamination a risk + notifiable gas pipeline goes through the site. | Yes               | Currently, the Chalkhill Youth Centre is being remodelled and substantially refurbished so as to provide new facilities for a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) and a modernised youth and community facility. Should the Executive consider this to be a priority they would need to be satisfied that the site constraints will be overcome and that a new alternative site may be found for the PRU and Youth and Community centre. | Poor(1/2)                   | Reasonably within the area of greatest demand. |                      |



| Site                            | Area (000m2)                            | Status in UDP  | Physical Constraints  | Council Ownership | Affordability* & Availability   | Public Transport & Access** | Location Relating to Demand                   | Other Considerations   |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|-------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Chalkhill Road (Health Centre)  | 14                                      | Public Open Space as part of the masterplan for Chalkhill Estate   | Tight site not able to accommodate a secondary school with quality external space.. Residential properties surrounding three sides of the site. | Yes               | There are a number of legal constraints and prior year agreements would need to be renegotiated.  | 3                           | Reasonably within the area of greatest demand | Council not able to change the use of the site (public open space) without the agreement of New Horizons. School on site is in contravention of existing Conceptual Design Guide and masterplan for Chalkhill. |
| The Palace of Arts and Industry | 56                                      | Opportunity site promoted for development contributing to role as visitor destination (incl. retail & leisure use). Part of Comprehensive Development Area for which masterplan agreed | Proximity to Olympic Way limits options for location of school and school would limit potential of the site to regenerate Wembley               | No                | Unlikely to be affordable. Not available for at least three years and therefore not able to site a school early. Has planning consent for a temporary car park. | Good (4)                    | Within an area of greatest demand             | The site would be adjacent to a venue likely to host major public events.  |
| Gwenneth Rickus Building        | (6 +9 for adjoining open space) Upto 15 | Site Specific proposal where Housing / Community facilities appropriate  | Insufficient play space. Can accommodate either a primary school or a secondary school with off site facilities. It may be                      | Part owned        | Should the Executive consider prioritising this site the Council would need to relocate the Centre for Staff Development. It is considered that the options for | <b>Poor (1)</b>             | On the edge of area of greatest demand.       |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | unsuitable for primary provision given the proximity to two other local primary schools. Potential loss of some open space |  | relocating the CSD are limited The parcel of land not owned by the Council is unlikely to be able to be purchased. |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| Site                    | Area (000m2) | Status in UDP              | Physical Constraints  | Council Ownership | Affordability* & Availability   | Public Transport & Access** | Location Relating to Demand                                | Other Considerations  |
|-------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|---|-------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|---|
| Stonebridge Site Option | TBA          | Schools, Public Open Space | Tight site with two existing primary schools. POS limits opportunity for development unless area master plan is reviewed. | Part ownership.   | Unlikely to be affordable either to the Council, the partner or both. | 4                           | It adjoins an area facing great pressure on school places. | A local primary school is already earmarked for rebuilding (at nil cost to the Council) as part of an overall strategy for land use in the area. Discussions are underway for the rebuilding and expansion to 2FE of another one. |

\*Information on the cost/ range forecast valuation for each of the sites may be available to the Executive as confidential information.

\*\* PT& Access Range of 1 to 6 where 1 is poor and 6 is very good.

### **3.6 Broad Strategic Options For Expanding School Places**

- 3.6.1 The broad strategic options, set out in Table 4 below, will to an extent be shaped by factors such as: the areas where pressure is felt most; opportunities for expanding provision in the context of the size of existing schools (there must be sufficient and useable space to accommodate pupils and staff); a good track record of pupil achievement where possible; and the availability of resources for purchasing sites and building the new schools – both now and in the longer term, the size of sites available when considering new build schools.

#### **Options for Expanding Primary Schools Provision**

##### Expanding Existing Schools

- 3.6.2 The first option is for the increase of capacity of the schools listed in 3.5.5 above thus creating an additional 6FE in the short to medium term, resources allowing. These schools (with one exception) have in the past operated at higher capacity than that under which they operate currently. The exception, Elsley primary has sufficient useable site for expansion. The Council has not allocated resources for these schemes, other than for the expansion of Wembley Primary School by 1FE.

##### Setting Up New Schools

- 3.6.3 The second option is for new build schools to be set up subject to resources being available – negotiations are underway. In this context negotiations for the delivery of a new 2FE school (with a Nursery) in the North East of the Borough (Kingsbury/Colindale) at Oriental City. As recommended, it is possible that an additional 2FE may be delivered via the proposed second Academy if it is sited in a site with sufficient size. This latter option would be cost neutral to the Authority and therefore affordable to the Council. Officers of the Council continue to negotiate with the developer of the site in Kingsbury/Colindale with the view to securing the 2FE primary school at no cost to the Council particularly given the resource constraints the Council faces. Further options need to be explored and where possible to explore the expansion of other primary schools against criteria relating to site size, school size, performance of the schools.

#### **Options for Expanding Secondary Schools Provision.**

##### Expansion of Existing Schools

- 3.6.4 The Executive will have noted that, for the secondary sector, projections point to a shortfall of 5.5FE in September 2009 (assuming no expansion takes place) , rising to 6 FE by 2011 and 16FE by January 2016. The expansion of existing schools (see Table 2 above) would provide a maximum additional 10FE, subject to resources being identified.

### Setting Up New Schools

- 3.6.5 New build, by September 2009 or January 2010, via the Academy route, selecting a site deliverable within the criteria set out above, would yield a 6FE secondary school. For the time scales to be adhered the officers' recommended site option would need to be further developed.
- 3.6.6. It is proposed to refine the catchment area previously reported to Executive for an Academy in Wembley. The net effect is to prioritise intake from the area in and around Wembley. Thus primary age range pupils will be admitted for the immediate vicinity of the proposed Academy in line with the principles used in defining catchment areas for primary schools. For the secondary age range it is proposed to revise the Expression of Interest so as to draw up a catchment area that draws pupils from an area that is experiencing high levels of demand. The proposed revised catchment area (subject to further assessments for transport links) will be enclosed with a slightly revised Expression of Interest, the original version of which has been approved by the Council.

**Table 4: A Summary of the Broad Strategic Options for Expanding School Places**

| EXPANSION<br>(BY 2016)                            | BROAD STRATEGIC OPTIONS  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
|   | A  | B   | C  |
| <p><b>Secondary Sector : Increase by 16FE</b></p> | <p><b>Expansion of Existing Schools</b></p> <p>This option was examined. It is not possible to achieve the necessary growth in the timescales and within resources available. Above all, work on occupied sites are slow by nature and the educational disruption across the Local Authority would be undesirable. In addition existing schools do not offer opportunities for expansion of capacity by 16FE. It is recommended therefore that this option alone be not pursued.</p> | <p><b>All New Academies</b></p> <p>Given that the Academies programme would be the least resource (capital resources) demanding option for the Council, this route would help achieve the desired level of growth if sufficient sites were available in the medium term. The site analysis set out above brings into sharp focus the limited site options available. It is recommended therefore that this option alone be not pursued.</p> | <p><b>Combination of A New Academy and Expansion of Selected Schools</b></p> <p>An analysis of sites available for new schools has been set out. Of those able to be considered, only one proves to be an option as preliminary evidence shows it is both affordable (pending ongoing negotiations on site valuations) and available for development for a new school for 2009. That is the Wembley Park (Bridge Road) site. In addition, a partner would be willing to act as a sponsor for the school on that site if the Council chooses to provide the school via the City Academy programme. A city Academy would provide a 6FE on site. The balance of provision would then be sourced through expansion of existing schools. Schools have been identified which are able to provide an additional 8FE through expansion schemes. It is possible to achieve the balance of 10FE expansion if discussions with two other schools are concluded. This Strategic Option C is the preferred option. The Council does not have the funding for all the expansions needed.</p> |

| EXPANSION<br>(BY 2016)                              | BROAD STRATEGIC OPTIONS  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
|   | A  | B   | C  |
| <p><b>Primary Sector :<br/>Increase by 13FE</b></p> | <p><b>Expansion of Existing Schools</b></p> <p>This option was examined. It is not possible to achieve the necessary growth in the timescales and within resources available. Above all, work on occupied sites are slow by nature and the educational disruption across the Local Authority would be undesirable. In addition existing schools do not offer opportunities for expansion of capacity by 13FE. It is recommended that this option alone be not pursued.</p> | <p><b>All New Build</b></p> <p>There are insufficient sites and resources available to deliver this option.</p> | <p><b>Combination of Newbuild, A New Academy and Expansion of Selected Schools</b></p> <p>Negotiations are advanced for the delivery of a newbuild primary school (2FE with a Nursery) in the Kingsbury/Colindale area. Should an Academy be developed on the site at Wembley Park (Bridge Road) there is an opportunity of an additional 2FE. The officers have identified possible expansion of between six (already identified) to eight (the additional two are under consideration) primary schools by an additional 1FE. This route would deliver an additional 10FE –12FE. Officers are currently reviewing the option of adjusting Public Admissions Limit upwards (to match the physical capacity of those schools) at a number of primary schools. This may yield a number of additional school places, but may be short of 1FE. This Strategic Option C is the preferred option. The Council does not have the funding for all the expansions needed.</p> |

### 3.7 Further Issues to Consider in the Deployment of the Wembley Park (Bridge Road) Site

3.7.1 A review of Attachment 2, and Table 4 above, shows that there is only one site able practically to accommodate a school with both secondary and primary age range provision. With the exception of the site in Wembley Park, the sites present the following obstacles:

- Difficulties relating to planning grounds
- Insufficient Capital Resources required to purchase the sites
- Insufficiency of land to provide high quality facilities
- Access and transportation logistics
- Location within the Borough
- Impact on other Council policy priorities such as housing, maintenance of green and open spaces

3.7.2 Overall the proposed Wembley Park site has an area of 45,000 m<sup>2</sup> . Just for illustrative purposes alone, the Executive will note that it is possible to build on less than a 5,000m<sup>2</sup> – this would assume a 6 storey high secondary school accommodation - footprint thus retaining substantial green space ensuring that the site is not overdeveloped, and that the whole of the facility becomes a resource for local communities with an agreed Community Access Plan guaranteeing user rights for local people and access to the state-of-the-art facility. A three storey building would use only 10,000m<sup>2</sup> or 20% of the site. A proportion of the site (up to c10%) would be dedicated for access and landscaping (subject to a feasibility study and concept design). The site therefore offers potential for ensuring that a School remains a resource for communities;

3.7.3 The site offers a number of benefits including good access by public transport. The potential disadvantages include the potential loss of some Open Space although this is able to be compensated by higher quality external playing facilities, which are well drained and able to be used all year-round.

3.7.4 Members will note that officers have created an opportunity for the Council to purchase this site, for school use.

3.7.5 The Council have assessed the general planning issues relating to the development of part of this site for a school and are satisfied that a school could be accommodated whilst leaving the bulk of the sports ground open for continued open recreational use. Any proposal for a new school would have to show how safe access could be achieved and a traffic impact assessment would be required as part of any planning application. In the event of a planning application being made for a new school, a full consultation will be undertaken with local residents and businesses prior to any decision being made.



- 3.7.6 Part of the frontage of the Wembley Park site (Bridge Road) is already identified in the UDP as having development potential. If a school is not developed, the most likely form of development would be shops/offices with flats above, although a development that comprised wholly of office would be acceptable to the planning service. Failure to secure this site for school use, could therefore enable a different type of development on site.
- 3.7.7 The Wembley Park site therefore provides an immediate and affordable opportunity for a school to be developed on site.

### **The Wembley Park Site: A Hub for Community Facilities**

- 3.7.8 Since first considering the proposals for the second Academy, officers have continuously been developing options for ensuring the Academy is a strong resource for local communities, the proposed catchment area address local and wider need to establish the relevant transportation issues.
- 3.7.9 The site allows for up to 80% of the site to remain available for wider community use, outside school hours and under careful and considered management arrangements during school hours. Attachment 3 illustrates the area relationship between the built footprint [it shows an approximately equivalent size of building footprint (c 3,800 sq metres) and overall site size.
- 3.7.10 A community access plan with an operational agreement with the appropriate and relevant stakeholders can ensure that local people and the students benefit for improved external and internal facilities. This would be a vast improvement against current site usage.
- 3.7.11 The following additional benefits are likely to accrue from a practicable and successful community access plan:
- Pupils' motivation is raised leading to enhanced expectations and achievements;
  - Support for the new educational facility from parents and local community organisations that lead to improving pupils' attainments;
  - Cogent community engagement leading to contributing to combating social exclusion;
  - Improved community safety and security as the site area and the local urban scape becomes more animated – this reduces vandalism in the local and surrounding area;
  - Improved opportunities for linkages for young people at the school with the world of work, community enterprise and higher education.
  - Added stimulus to local re-generation

### 3.8 **Identifying a Site in Other Parts of the Borough**

3.8.1 The demand for school places will be kept under review. Should the forecast demand grow beyond the additional 16FE (for secondary age range pupils) an additional site will be sought, this time in the South of the Borough.

### 3.9 **Strategic Project Board**

3.9.1 The Development Strategy will have the twin aim of enabling a focus on the development of provision in the short to medium term whilst at the same time packaging affordable options for the medium to long term onto 2016.

3.9.2 It is therefore proposed to set up a Strategic Project Board, chaired by the Lead Member with representation from Members, officers and Schools. A lower level partnership group (including a number of key stakeholders) would act as a reference group. The Board would drive forward the Strategy and report to Executive on progress and resource implications. This body would be supported by a core project team of officers and consultants.

## 4.0 **Financial Implications**

4.1 The report sets out a number of options for providing additional school places in the Borough. As always, the overall Council finances are constrained, and in order to deliver this major priority, the long-term capital strategy must be reviewed with other priorities to ensure the optimum mix between desired outcomes and affordability. This will form a major part of the consideration of the Capital Programme within the budget process.

4.2 This section of the report sets out the main sources available to finance the capital expenditure needed to meet the rising rolls detailed above.

#### (i) Borrowing

This is undertaken using the Prudential system, introduced under the 2003 Local Government Act. The Code linked to the regime, requires Members to consider the affordability of decisions on investment in Council assets. The revenue costs incurred for the borrowing can be classified into two main categories:

##### (a) Supported Borrowing

This borrowing is notionally funded through government grant in the Local Government Finance settlement. An element of this grant is distributed to cover meeting the revenue costs of an assumed level of

Schools Capital spending. However, because Brent is at the floor for grant purposes, any increases in grant payable relating to these financing charges are not necessarily received.

(b) Unsupported Borrowing

These are debt charges generated by borrowing for schemes which have no specific revenue support. The costs have to be met at the expense of other priorities in the revenue budget, or through a higher Council Tax. Brent has normally borrowed in excess of its supported borrowing for Education schemes, and this remains the case in the Capital Programme agreed up to 2009/2010

Members have been alerted in previous reports that the current levels of investment in the Capital Programme funded through borrowing are not affordable in the Medium Term. As such alternative methods of funding are required. Each £1m borrowed will add around £100k to the revenue account in a full year.

(ii) Capital Receipts

These are sale proceeds from Council assets which can be utilised to fund capital expenditure. The Council has however, few declared surplus assets, and is only projecting £18m of receipts in the 4 year period from 2006/07 to 2009/10. These resources are all currently committed to fund the current capital programme

(iii) Section 106

Currently just under £4.1m is available to fund school expansion of which c£1.2m of this has been committed within the currently agreed Capital Programme.

(iv) Revenue

Revenue funds could be utilised directly to finance Capital expenditure. However, the Medium Term Financial Strategy makes no allowances for such usage, and no surplus funding is available.

(v) Building Schools for the Future

Brent is in Waves 7-10 for the receipt of funding under the Central Government's programme of Building Schools for the Future, aimed at renewing the secondary school estate. This means funding will not be released prior to 2010/2011

(vi) Primary Capital Programme

This is a Central Government initiative, rolling out from 2008/09, which will provide an opportunity to bid for resources for the expansion of primary

school places. However, the overall level of resources are limited, and we do not therefore know how much funding will be available.

(vii) Targeted Capital Funding

This is funding made available by the Government for specific projects, through a bidding regime.

(viii) Devolved Formula Capital

These are resources made directly available to schools to fund improvements of infrastructure

4.3 Full Council agreed a capital programme for 2006/07 to 2009/10 as part of the overall budget on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2006. The report highlighted many differing capital spending pressures on the Council. Officers also alerted Members that high levels of borrowing through the Prudential Regime was not affordable in the medium term if it remained at the levels utilised in previous years. As a result of this and other resource losses the general fund total expenditure programme was reduced for the following three years. This is set out in the table below:

| Year    | Total Programme<br>£M | C&F<br>£M | C & F PROGRAMME             |                    |              |                          |       | Devolved Formula Capital (DFC)<br>£000 |
|---------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------------------|-------|--|
|         |                       |           | Development Schemes<br>£000 | SEN Review<br>£000 | AMPs<br>£000 | Non Schools + CC<br>£000 |       |  |
| 2007/08 | 43.9                  | 22.9      | 13,956                      | 1,062              | 2,000        | 2,351                    | 3,458 |  |
| 2008/09 | 35.1                  | 14.5      | 4,900                       | 950                | 5,153        | 0                        | 3,460 |  |
| 2009/10 | 33.6                  | 13.1      | 5,190                       | 4,440              | 0            | 0                        | 3,460 |  |

4.4 The largest items among the development schemes are the new build at Wembley Primary, Copland School 1FE expansion, Preston Manor 1FE expansion, purchase of land for the John Kelly Schools rebuild, Preston Park (replacement of early years block) and other smaller schemes.

If the recommendation to provide an Academy on the Wembley Park/Bridge Road site were not to be agreed by Members, or subsequently fails to succeed, the ability of the Council to extremely find the £25m on offer to build the school from its own resources, as highlighted above, is unlikely. Unless one or more of the development schemes are suspended from the Children and Families Investment Plan. It would therefore need a mixture of drastic reductions in the programme elsewhere, and the scope for this is very limited, plus high levels of borrowing (£25m would generate annual financing costs of around £2.5m per annum) to be found from the revenue budget. This level of unsupported borrowing is not appear to be affordable given the current budget position.

- 4.5 If the principle of the Academy is agreed by Members, but an alternative location to Wembley Park (Bridge Road) is proposed, there are a number of financial disadvantages. This takes no consideration of the relative suitabilities of these sites for an Academy
- (i) Site acquisition is likely to take longer, and for most options add significantly to the cost, for which no funding is available.
  - (ii) Other sites will require DfES approval, and even if this were forthcoming, would result in delay to the project, leading to a likely increase in construction costs. This may not be met by the DfES.
  - (iii) The site may not be suitable for a Primary School, although the places are required in the Borough. These forms of entry will therefore have to be funded. The source has currently not been identified.
- 4.6 The capital construction costs of the Academy for both the primary and secondary elements, will be provided by the DfES. The Council is required to provide the site. The Wembley Park site will need to be acquired from Transport for London. A joint valuation is being obtained, but it is expected that the purchase will be funded from existing Section 106 resources and provision of £1m within the current Capital Programme.
- 4.7 The revenue costs of running the Academy, excluding financing charges, will be met directly by Central Government.
- 4.8 The report proposes that £500k from the current Children and Families is allocated to fund a feasibility study, and a business case to expand the provision of school places and help maximise future government funding allocations.

## **5.0 Legal Implications**

5.1 Section 14 of the 1996 Act states:-

*“(1) A local education authority shall secure that sufficient schools for providing-*

*(a) primary education, and*

*(b) education that is secondary education by virtue of section 2(2)(a), are available for their area.*

*(2) The schools available for an area shall not be regarded as sufficient for the purposes of subsection (1) unless they are sufficient in number, character and equipment to provide for all pupils the opportunity of appropriate education.”*

5.2 This is generally held to be a target duty and thus not enforceable by an individual parent or child (at least, not unless an individual claimant can show damage).

- 5.3 Officers are recommending that Members pursue the option of a second Academy for Brent. In making their decision Members should take into account all relevant considerations and discount all irrelevant considerations.
- 5.4 The Children and Young Peoples Plan (page 17) includes, as indicator 3e), the number of children 11-16 seeking a school place. The target for 2008/9 was to develop a new academy to provide over 1000 new places. This plan was adopted by the Council (and published in April 2006) and the Executive is required to act in accordance with that plan and not to do anything which would conflict with that plan.

## **6.0 Diversity Implications**

- 6.1 The Borough is now established as a local authority area with the most diverse community in respect of race and ethnic composition. Many of those communities have suffered disadvantage, including socio-economic disadvantage.
- 6.2 In Brent there is differential underachievement between children of different ethnic origins. This Strategy, as it develops, will help narrow gaps in performance. Access to a good quality school place in every local area of the Borough is central to raising education standards and achievement thus helping address inequality and socio-economic disadvantage and deprivation.
- 6.3 The Strategy for the Development of Schools will take the Authority further forward to providing greater access to good quality schools in every local area. It will therefore have a positive impact across all sectors of the local communities. Choice will be further promoted and opportunities for social inclusion, further enhanced.
- 6.4 There are no other implications for the immediate purpose of this report other than those reported to the Executive on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2005.

## **7.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications (if appropriate)**

- 7.1 There are none for the immediate purpose of this report.

### **Background Papers**

- i) DfES Guidance on Establishment of Academy
- ii) Executive Report dated 14<sup>th</sup> November 2005

### **Contact Officers**

John Christie, Director of Children and Families, Chesterfield House, 9 Park Lane, Wembley Middlesex HA9 7RW. Tel: 020 8937 3130 Fax: 020 8937 3023  
Email: [john.christie@brent.gov.uk](mailto:john.christie@brent.gov.uk)  
Or

Nitin Parshotam, Head of Asset Management Service, Chesterfield House, 9 Park Lane, Wembley Middlesex HA9 7RW. Tel: 020 8937 3080 Fax: 020 8937 3073. Email: [nitin.parshotam@brent.gov.uk](mailto:nitin.parshotam@brent.gov.uk)

John Christie  
Director of Children & Families