



**Executive**  
15 February 2010

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

Wards Affected:  
ALL

**Transforming Learning in Brent – Building Schools for the  
Future (BSF) Project Initiation Document (PID)**

Forward Plan Ref: C&F-09/10-007

**1.0 Summary**

- 1.1 Brent Council was accepted by Partnerships for Schools (PfS) onto the BSF programme in December 2009.
- 1.2 Brent Council's BSF programme consists of 23 secondary schools including special schools and Pupil Referral Units (PRU). The plan is to either replace or re-model all 23 schools.
- 1.3 Brent Council's BSF programme would deliver around £300m of capital funding from the Government over three phases. PfS required the Council to establish a first phase of schools that would deliver around £80m of capital funding. The first phase consists of the following schools:
- Alperton Community School
  - Copland Community School
  - Queens Park Community School
  - Cardinal Hinsley Mathematics and Technology College
- 1.4 It is a requirement from PfS that as a condition of joining the BSF programme that the Council develop a Project Initiation Document.

**2.0 Recommendations**

- 2.1 That the Transforming Learning in Brent – BSF Project Initiation Document be approved by the Executive.

---

Meeting  
Date 15.02.09

Version no. 1  
Date 17.12.09

2.2 That the executive note the anticipated funding gap as set out in paragraph 4.4 together with the planned strategy to resolve the gap.

### **3.0 Detail**

3.1 Brent Council's PID brings together in a single document the Council's project plan, governance and management arrangements, terms of reference, risk management strategy, communications plan and budget/resource plan. It is a key planning document that provides the structure and framework for delivery of the project.

3.2 The PID defines the overall purpose and form of the Council's BSF programme and forms the basis for the project's management and assessment, to ensure that:

- the objectives and deliverable outcomes of the project are clearly defined and reflect the key objectives set out in the Council's 'Strategy for Change' (SfC), including the remit agreed with the Department of Children, Schools and Families (DCSF);
- the project reflects the agreement between PfS and the Council in terms of their respective roles and responsibilities, as described in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU);
- the costs and benefits of the overall project are set out in sufficient detail to enable a high degree of confidence in the deliverability of the project and ensure the Project Board understands the key issues that must be addressed before making a major commitment to the project; and
- the appropriate project governance, management processes, and external advisers are in place to ensure the success of the Council's BSF programme.

3.3 The PID acts as the baseline against which the Project Board, Project Sponsor, Project Director and Project Manager and wider stakeholders can assess progress, change management and ongoing viability. It should be treated as a 'live' document that is updated and reviewed regularly.

3.4 PfS advise that the Council should review the PID at each key milestone (i.e. at commencement/completion of Strategy for Change, Outline Business Case, Final Business Case) in the project to ensure that it still reflects the appropriate framework, structure, project management and governance to secure the efficient and value for money delivery of the Council's BSF proposals.

3.5 PfS advise that the PID should be approved at the earliest possible stage in the project's existence, to ensure there is full ownership of the project and its effective delivery, and that the Project Board is given appropriate levels of delegated authority to manage it effectively. The approval of the PID should be sought from the Council's Executive, and the BSF Project Board.

## 4.0 Financial Implications

- 4.1 Following Brent's acceptance onto the BSF national programme the Council will progress its BSF programme according to specific requirements as set out by PfS. During these various stages the precise funding that Brent will receive will continue to be refined with the amount being finalised at the completion of the Final Business Case. PfS have currently provided an indicative funding allocation of £85m for the four schools in phase one.
- 4.2 PfS utilise a formulaic approach to determining BSF funding levels through its Funding Allocation Model. This model utilises pupil numbers and building specifications as set out under Building Bulletin 98 (BB98) to generate funding allocations for each school. The amount provided is also based on the assumption that each school will be 55% rebuilt, 35% remodelled and 15% refurbished.
- 4.3 Once this model calculates a FAM amount for each school the Council will receive the aggregate amount and can then determine how the amount is allocated over individual Phase 1 schools.
- 4.4 The assumption of 55% rebuild, 35% remodel and 15% refurbishment also introduces the potential for a funding gap; which most existing BSF local authorities have experienced. Where projects deviate from this assumption the FAM model will not deliver sufficient funding. In Brent's case our first phase consists of three 100% rebuilds and one remodel. Technical expertise currently commissioned from Turner and Townsend has provided us with an indicative funding gap of around £14m i.e. the Council is likely to receive £14m less than it will need to complete phase 1. Through planned land sales at two of the phase 1 schools and a reprioritising of the current Schools Capital Programme it is expected that the funding gap can be resolved. This would require PfS agreeing to allow the Council to reinvest such educational asset disposals into our BSF programme. The DCSF do have a starting assumption that up to 50% of such asset releases should go back to the DCSF but in all such cases in existing BSF programmes where the funds are reinvested in the local authorities BSF programme the DCSF has waived this right and the funds have been kept by the local authority. This aspect has been clarified with PfS who are aware of our need to reinvest land receipts to bridge our funding gap.
- 4.5 BSF also requires significant investment from the Council to manage the programme. PfS advise that local authorities should expect to spend up to 3% of the capital expenditure value on managing the programme. These costs include dedicated BSF staffing, external advisers, communication and consultation and procurement. An annual revenue budget of £500k has already been established for 2009/10, and with the rapid increase in work now required it is estimated that expenditure of the order of £900k will be required from 2010/11 with a potential to capitalise around £150k of this.

## **5.0 Legal Implications**

5.1 If it is intended to dispose of land at two other schools as referred to in paragraph 4.4 then if the land consists in whole or part of school playing fields then consent from the Secretary of State would be required. If however the land does not constitute playing fields then the Council is required to be notified of any proposed transfer and can object to this. In the event of any dispute the matter is referred to the School's Adjudicator.

## **6.0 Diversity Implications**

6.1 A key part of the Council's BSF programme will be to transform learning and attainment outcomes for all pupils but in particular for underachieving groups.

6.2 Furthermore, using BSF to further develop the extended schools offer allows all local communities to gain better access to a range of diverse services thus putting schools further at the heart of their local communities.

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

7.1 None

### **Background Papers (essential)**

Project Initiation Document

**Contact Officers** Mustafa Salih

**Chesterfield House**, 9 Park Lane, Wembley, Middlesex HA9 7RW.  
Tel: 020 8937 3191. Fax: 020 8937 3023  
Email: Mustafa.salih@brent.gov.uk

**John Christie**  
**Director of Children & Families**