

**BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL**

**CABINET**

**30<sup>th</sup> April 2009**

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

**Title: New Primary School – Bishopston Ward**

**Ward: Bishopston**

**Officer presenting report: Kate Campion, Service Director:  
Access, Engagement and Skills**

**Contact telephone number: 9037950**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That:

- a) The statutory process to invite proposals for the management of the school ("competition") is commissioned and that the consultation process for the establishment of the new school is commenced.
- b) Approval is given to take the design for the new school forward to detailed design and construction within the Fixed Price quoted by the LEP.
- c) Officers are instructed to re-enter negotiations with the Gloucestershire County Cricket Club to secure arrangements for the playing field by the school or within the Cricket Ground.

### **The significant issues in the report are:**

- There is a need to address primary school capacity shortfalls within Ashley, Redland and Bishopston Wards (paragraph 1, refers);
- Cabinet previously instructed officers to extend the capacity at Sefton Park School (paragraph 3, refers);
- Having considered a range of issues, including time constraints, limitations in the design proposal for Sefton Park and views expressed by local people, the schools and parents, the Interim Director – Children, Young People and Skills has suspended the Sefton Park Project (paragraph 5, refers);
- The LEP has been previously commissioned to undertake the design of a 1 FE school on the Brunel Field site (paragraph 9, refers);
- The part use of the Brunel Field by Gloucestershire County Cricket Club will have implications for the design of the external space for the new school (paragraph 10, refers);
- Other options have been considered for the new school without success (paragraphs 20 to 23.3, refers).

### **Policy**

#### **Council Corporate Plan 2008 – 2011**

#### **Our City: Ambitious Together-**

- **Sharing in our City's prosperity** – The provision of a new primary school in Bishopston Ward will contribute to the prioritisation of actions that tackle the root causes of disadvantage by ensuring there are school places where the need is greatest;
- **Our city: together** – The provision of a new primary school in Bishopston Ward will contribute to the building of strong and positive relationships, bringing together people from different backgrounds and circumstances in schools and within local neighbourhoods;
- **Our green city** – The provision of a new primary school in Bishopston Ward contributes to the quality of life for residents

by undertaking the development of the new school in a sustainable way, and tackling climate change by reducing CO2 emissions from the school.

### **Our City: Making a Difference –**

- o **For efficient, responsive services** – The provision of a new primary school in Bishopston Ward will deliver a quality learning environment (accessible to local people) and provide value for money educational provision;
- o **For children and young people** – The provision of a new primary school in Bishopston Ward will ensure that, with our partners, we will deliver the best possible outcomes for Bristol’s children, young people and families, including:
  - Raising attainment at all key stages
  - Improving attendance and reducing exclusions.

### **Our City: Safer and Healthier –**

- o **Healthy lifestyles: healthy communities** – The provision of a new primary school in Bishopston Ward will contribute to improving the health and wellbeing of the city’s population through investment in a school kitchen that will deliver healthy and nutritious meals; and investment in play and sports facilities, as part of the investment programme.

### **Our City: Better Neighbourhoods**

- o The provision of a new primary school in Bishopston Ward will contribute to ensuring that Bristol residents experience significant change in the physical quality of their neighbourhoods by making a substantial capital investment in primary schools, including external landscaping and ensuring the extended function of these schools meets community needs.

## **Consultation**

Through the primary review process consultation reflected a significant number of parents who would prefer this option

### **External:**

- Gloucestershire County Cricket Club

## **Context**

### **INTRODUCTION**

1. There is a need to address primary school capacity shortfalls within Ashley, Redland and Bishopston Wards. For a number of years the Reception admission applications for school places in Sefton Park Infant School and other neighbouring schools has been significantly greater than the number of places available.

### **HISTORIC CONTEXT - SEFTON PARK SCHOOL**

2. On 9<sup>th</sup> March 2006 Cabinet (CAB102.03/06) approved the formation of a Local Education Partnership (LEP) with PfS, Skanska and the City Council. The LEP has been established to develop and deliver new education capital projects valued in excess of £500k as well as undertaking work on the BSF capital programme.
3. On 10<sup>th</sup> January 2008 (CAB 43.1/08, refers) officers were instructed to commission the Local Education Partnership (LEP) to undertake LEP Stage 0 (RIBA Stage A) and LEP Stage 1 (RIBA Stage B & C) design and development for the extension of the Sefton Park schools.
4. Over the past twelve months there has been a consultation process undertaken with the Sefton Park Schools and local community as the feasibility work has progressed. During the consultation there has been significant adverse reaction from a considerable number of local people and parents to the concept of expanding the school.
5. Having considered a range of actions including: the limited time constraints for the delivery of the additional accommodation, the limitations of the draft proposal for the Sefton Park Schools and views expressed by local people, schools and parents, the Interim Strategic Director – Children, Young People and Skills, (in consultation with the Executive Member for Children and Young People) has decided that the project should be suspended and Cabinet requested to approve the development of a new school on the Brunel Field site.

## THE BRUNEL FIELD PROPOSAL

6. The Brunel Field is a playing field (currently used, in part, as an informal car park by students at the City of Bristol College) and is in the ownership of the City of Bristol College. As part of a Section 106 Agreement, between the City of Bristol College and Westbury Homes, the City Council is able to call upon the transfer of the Brunel Field (0.9615 hectares of land) upon payment of £1. Additionally, the developer is required to make a commitment to undertake improvements to the playing field and has already made a financial contribution of £374,000 towards the development of the new school.
7. The playing field is informally used by the Gloucestershire County Cricket Club for occasional car parking and a 'food village'. This is reflected in the Section 106 Agreement.
8. A 210 place primary school will require between 9,760m<sup>2</sup> and 10,900m<sup>2</sup> of land availability. The Brunel site is 9,615m<sup>2</sup>. This is 145m<sup>2</sup> short of the DfES minimum requirement.
9. The LEP have previously been commissioned to undertake the design of a 1FE school on the Brunel Field site following a decision of Cabinet on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2007 (CAB 85.2/07). This was rescinded by Cabinet on 10<sup>th</sup> January 2008 (CAB 43.1/08). The feasibility work (prior to termination) had identified three possible design options for the delivery of the school on the Brunel site. These include one option for a single storey facility and two options for a two-storey facility (See Appendix 5). The estimated cost for each of these options varies between £3.93m and £4.17m. These estimates do not include additional costs which may result from specific design issues that arise relating to the use of some areas of the Brunel Field as car parking for Gloucestershire County Cricket Club and requirements arising from planning conditions.
10. The part use of the Brunel Field by the Gloucestershire County Cricket Club will have implications for the design of the external space within the new school. These limitations have been mitigated in the designs proposed by the LEP for the school. The feasibility study has produced a design that can accommodate a separate entrance for pupils, staff and visitors. Additionally, there would be a 'bespoke' entrance for staff parking and occasional access for the County Cricket Club to the playing field. The school will have access to an enhanced multi-use-games-area (MUGA) during the 23 days the playing field is required by the County Cricket Club. There will be a permanent and secure separation of the hard play facilities and habitat/social areas from the playing field. Access to the playing field by the school will be through a secure lockable gate.

11. Other opportunities are being explored with the County Cricket Club for 'off-site' playing field provision utilising land within the stadium.

## **STATUTORY SCHOOL ORGANISATION ISSUES**

12. With effect from 25 May 2007 a new statutory framework applies for the establishment of any new maintained school – whether they are to be brand new schools (e.g. to meet population growth) or to replace existing schools (e.g. flowing from a reorganisation). The new provisions apply in all circumstances where it is intended to establish a new school and proposals had not been published before 25<sup>th</sup> May 2007 (as is the case for the school proposed on the Brunel Field site).

13. Where the LA wish to see a new school established they **must** either:

- Invite proposals for the management of the school. The process is generally referred to as a “competition”. This is expected to be the route by which most new schools will be established; or
- Apply to the Secretary of State for consent to publish proposals for a new school, without running a competition, as provided for in Section 10 of EIA 2006;

14. The final decision on competition proposals must be taken by the LA (except where the local authority is a proposer, or if a Foundation school is proposed, the LA is formally part of, or has voting rights (directly or through a nominee) on the Foundation. In this case the proposals will be decided by the schools adjudicator).

15. The Secretary of State's consent is only for the publication of proposals and is not permission to establish the new school. Where the consent is granted, the normal statutory process will apply.

## **CONSULTATION**

16. In 2007, when the new school on the Brunel Field was previously proposed, there had been wide consultation on the proposal. Sefton Park Infant and Junior Schools held a joint governing body meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2007 to discuss the proposal. At that time the Chair of Sefton Park Infant School reported:

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

17. The joint governing body felt that:

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

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

19. The Gloucestershire County Cricket Club expressed their concerns in a letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 2007 to the Director of Children and Young People’s Services which formed appendices to the Cabinet report. The Cricket club’s main concern rested on “...the fact that the building of a school and its grounds [on the Brunel Field] means the loss of an area critical to the Club in providing facilities for spectators, broadcasters and up to 1000 crucial parking spaces on major match days. This poses a major threat to the retention of International matches, development of the Ground and the continued viability of the Club at Neville Road – where it has been in existence for over 150 years”. A copy of their letter is provided in Appendix 1.

## **Proposal**

20. It is proposed that the statutory process to invite proposals for the management of the school (“competition”) is commissioned and that the consultation process for the establishment of the new school in commenced.
21. Approval is given to take the design for the new school forward to detailed design and construction within the Fixed Price quoted by the LEP.
22. Officers are instructed to re-enter negotiations with the Gloucestershire County Cricket Club to secure arrangements for use of the playing field adjacent to the school and/or within the Cricket Ground.

## **Other Options Considered**

## **SEFTON PARK SCHOOLS**

23. The extension of the existing Sefton Park Infant and Junior Schools has been considered previously.

## **SCHOOLS WITHIN 2-MILE RADIUS OF ASHLEY DOWN**

24. Other schools in a 2-mile radius of the Ashley Down site have been previously considered for expansion. Unfortunately, there is no possibility of absorbing any additional pupils into the schools nearest to the Brunel site. Where there are surplus places they are relatively minor and tend to be located too far away for parents to realistically look for, or accept, a school place.
25. With the exception of Millpond, St. Barnabas and Glenfrome Primary Schools other existing school sites are too small to allow for additional accommodation to be provided. Millpond, St. Barnabas and Glenfrome Primary Schools will benefit from investment within the Primary Review in the near future.

## **OTHER OPPORTUNITIES CONSIDERED**

26. Consideration has been given to a number of sites not currently occupied by schools to assess if a 210 or a 420 place primary school could be accommodated. These include:

- Concord Lodge Site;
- Land adjoining Brunel Field (in Persimmon Homes ownership);
- Allen House (in Persimmon Homes ownership)
- Old Fairfield School.

### **a. Concord Lodge**

This is currently a Bristol City Council managed residential home for adults with learning difficulties but is likely to be vacated in the near future. The site was considered in 2007 but was found to be too small to locate a 2FE school to meet DCSF spatial requirements as identified in BB99. The present site at Concorde Lodge is only 2,157 m<sup>2</sup>. The City Council would have to secure ownership of the adjacent private land and include some land at Wellington Hill Playing Field to enable even a 1FE school to be located on this site.

### **b. Land adjoining Brunel Field (Persimmon Homes)**

Officers have been in consultation with Persimmon Homes to ascertain if an area of 8,250m<sup>2</sup> adjoining the Brunel Field would be available for the location of an enlarged, 2 FE school. Persimmon Homes have indicated that the land is not available. Sales are meeting their expected forecasts. The housing land would be needed by Persimmon Homes from 2010 onwards.

**c. Allen House (Persimmon Homes)**

Officers have been in consultation with Persimmon Homes to ascertain the viability of developing a 1FE and 2 FE school within the Allen House complex. A draft feasibility study has indicated that the fixed layout of space within Allen House would not be conducive for the design of a modern school. Additionally, insufficient external play space would be available. This would result in non-compliance for external spatial requirements identified in BB99.

**d. Old Fairfield School**

Officers have undertaken feasibility on the proposal to utilise the former Secondary School site as a 2FE Primary School. Although it is estimated that this proposal could be achieved for approximately £3m plus fees and abnormal costs it would not provide a solution to the shortage of places in the geographical area to the north of Ashley Ward. The school would more likely attract admissions from the adjacent locality and south of the site. This option is still available.

**Consequences of not building the school at Bishopston**

27.If the school were not be provided at the Brunel site there would continue to be an oversubscription of school places within the area, with the result that some children will be forced to attend schools outside their community.

**Timescale**

28.The current proposed programme for the scheme shows the completion of the building by June 2010 (subject to Planning Approval) ready for the school to open for term 1 in September 2010.

**Legal and Resource Implications**

**Legal**

Section 13 Education Act 1996 places the Local Authority under a duty to secure that efficient primary and secondary education is available to meet the needs of the population in its area. This means that the Local Authority is under a duty to ensure that there are sufficient school places in its area and must also ensure that there are sufficient schools in its area and promote diversity and increase parental choice. School organisation proposals must follow the statutory framework set out in the Education and Inspections Act 2006 and accompanying Regulations and statutory guidance. Any such proposals will require ongoing close liaison with Legal Services to ensure that the requirements are met.

Paragraphs 11 - 14 summarises the process which must be followed to establish a new school.

*Genny Seneque, Senior Solicitor,*

## **Financial**

### **Revenue**

The initial budget allocation for the new school will be based on the numbers on roll. However, for a new school with one year group this will not be sufficient to fund the minimum staffing infrastructure required. Therefore it will be necessary to provide 'top-up' funding to the school until all year groups have been admitted. CYPs Finance will work with School Improvement to set a viable budget in order to calculate the 'top-up' required. The Schools Forum must be consulted because provision of 'top-up' funding lies outside the agreed Schools Funding Formula.

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

### **Capital**

The LEP have indicated that their Stage 1 submission dated 6<sup>th</sup> September 2007 is still valid and will be a Fixed Price cost:

- Outturn Cost £4,979,205
- Abnormal costs (outside brief) £105,000
- **TOTAL £5,084,205**

The abnormal costs are for additional items that were not part of the original client brief but may be required to meet planning obligations and design difficulties (such as moving statutory services). Following Stage 2 of the LEP design process the need for the abnormal items will have been investigated fully and the final figure revised prior to a final report to cabinet at the end of stage 2.

The abnormal costs include:

- Rainwater harvesting;
- Stone cladding to the building (to meet planning obligations);
- Moving power cable that crosses under proposed building footprint;
- New sub-station;

There will be a need to fund ICT Hardware/Software costs within this project. A provisional allocation of £150,000 will be required to fund this resource.

There is currently £6,920,000 available for the project. It is proposed that £5,234,205 is allocated to the new school project and the remainder £1,685,795 re-assigned to the CYPS Primary Capital Programme for future allocation.

## **Land**

The land forms part of a Section 106 Agreement and will fall within the City Council's ownership upon payment of £1.

## **Personnel**

As the recommendation is to seek approval to consult on proposals to establish a new school, there are no personnel implications.

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

## **Risk Assessment**

A Risk Assessment has been completed and is included as Appendix 2.

## **Equalities Impact Assessment**

The Equalities Impact Assessments for the three schools are detailed in Appendix 3

## **Environmental Impact Assessment**

The Environmental Impact Assessment is detailed in Appendix 4

- **The significant impacts of this proposal are**

There will be short-term increases in environmental impacts caused by the consumption of fossil fuels and raw materials in constructing the new school. Longer term, there will be on-going consumption of energy for heat and power, production of waste and staff and pupil travel to school.

Potential exists for both positive and negative net effects from the development of the school project, for example on biodiversity or energy use.

**The proposals include the following measures to mitigate the impacts:**

- All new buildings and refurbishments will meet the BREEAM Very Good standard and will be reduce energy use by 60% compared to current levels.
- The transport impacts will be assessed for each school as part of a School Travel Plan Assessment.
- All planning applications will be accompanied by a statement of the environmental impacts of the proposals and the mitigation measures proposed.

**The net effects of the proposals are:**

The long term effect of the strategy will be a net increase in Carbon Dioxide emissions from school and associated travel.

**The proposals include the following measures to mitigate the impacts:**

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

The temporary accommodation will include energy efficiency measures that reduce energy required for:

- Heating (and cooling);
- Lighting.

### **Appendices:**

Appendix 1 – Letter from Gloucestershire County Cricket Club, 19<sup>th</sup> November 2007

Appendix 2 – Primary Capital Programme Risk Assessment

Appendix 3 – Primary Review Equalities Impact Assessment

Appendix 4 - The Environmental Impact Assessment

### **ACCESS TO INFORMATION**

#### **Background Papers**

- Primary Review Draft Recommendations May 2008
- Towards a Primary Strategy for Bristol, October 2007

19<sup>th</sup> November 2007

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

Dear Ms Tomlinson

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

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

**Tom Richardson**  
**Chief Executive**

Enclosure:

1. Submission to Bristol City Council.

Copy to:

Mr Michael Branaghan – by email

**Submission to: Bristol City Council**  
**From: Gloucestershire County Cricket Club**

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

While Gloucestershire County Cricket Club (GCCC) fully recognises the need to increase primary school capacity in this part of the proposed East Central 1 area, we would like to make the following representations to summarise the Club's point of view, which we hope will be of value to you in formulating policy.

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

#### **Current use of the proposed school site by GCCC**

On match days from April to October the hard standing area of the proposed site is used for

spectator parking. The hard standing also has to be used by all the Outside Broadcast vehicles and equipment whenever matches are televised.

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

## **Implications of building a school on the College site**

### **1. International Matches:**

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

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

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

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

### **2. Ground Capacity:**

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

### **3. The impact on the local community:**

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

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

parking.

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

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

#### **4. Potential loss of revenue:**

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

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

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

#### **5. Possible problems for the school itself:**

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

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

#### **6. Ground Development:**

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

### ***Conclusion***

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

## Risk Assessment Brunel Field - Bishopston

No.	RISK Threat to achievement of key objectives of the report	RISK CONTROL MEASURES			ASSESSMENT OF RESIDUAL RISK	
		Impact	Probability	Mitigation (ie controls) and Evaluation (ie effectiveness of mitigation)	Impact	Probability
	<b>POLITICAL RISK</b>					
P1	Changes in Leadership after project started reverse new decision on developing the school on the Brunel Field site. This could add delays and costs to the scheme.	High	High	Ensure project management keeps costs and timescales under control, Report any deviation to Primary Project Board and the Executive	High	Low
P2	The projects are not completed on target in terms of budget and timescale. This would be an embarrassment to members.	High	High	LEP procured project.	High	Low

No.	RISK	Impact	Probability	Mitigation	Impact	Probability
	<b>ECONOMIC RISKS</b>					
E1	Due to delays in exploring the Sefton Park proposal the original estimated cost of the Brunel Option exceeds current capital allocation. The impact of the increased costs will be cause slippage on other areas of the Primary Review.	High	Medium	Ensure project management keeps costs and timescales under control, Report any deviation to Primary Project Board and the Executive	High	Medium
E2	Value for Money is not achieved on the project.	High	High	Ensure that the Project Board is advised of compliance with KPI's . The LEP have to demonstrate VFM and Continuous Improvement before the LEP is awarded additional work.	High	Low
E3	Contractors working on behalf of the LEP (or the LEP itself) go into liquidation during the project which results in project failure.	High	High	It is essential that the financial performance of key Contractors within the Partnership is monitored on a half yearly basis. Data collected by the LEP on contractor financial performance is shared with the Council so that the council can decide on procurement options.	High	Low
	<b>SOCIAL RISKS</b>					
S1	The proposal to develop a new school/expanded school on the Brunel Field will mean that the Scouts/Guides will not have new facilities adjoining Sefton Park School. This may impact on the future quality of Youth Provision in the area.	High	High	Work with Youth Service to identify other opportunities for funding	High	Medium

No.	RISK	Impact	Probability	Mitigation	Impact	Probability
S2	The new school development could impact on college parking for students. This could create environmental problems for local residents.	High	High	Work with the college to identify possible solutions – links in with possible planning objections that may be received.	High	Medium
<b>TECHNICAL RISKS</b>						
T1	The scope of the project has changes which results in delays to the delivery of the project and higher capital costs.	High	High	Ensure correct project management principles are adhered to and refer major changes to the Primary Projects Board.	Medium	Medium
T2	Major changes are made to the specification that results in delays to the project and increased capital costs.	High	High	Ensure that those who instruct changes to the specification have the appropriate authority and funding to authorise the changes.	High	Low
T3	Planning approval is delayed (including agreement on Section 106 issues) which result in delays delivering the project to target and within budget.	High	High	The development of the school is a major project in planning terms. Ensure LEP work closely with planning.	Low	Low
T4	The volume of works exceeds LEP capacity. This could result in slippage within the Academies Programme	High	High	Ensure that communications with the LEP are maintained at a strategic level.	High	Low

T5	Volume of work exceeds CYPS officer capacity. This would potentially mean that schemes are not appropriately project managed. The implications are that appropriate financial and contractual monitoring is not achieved in accordance with Financial Regulations.	High	High	Commission additional consultancy assistance and charge the fees to the capital project	High	Medium
<b>No.</b>	<b>RISK</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Probability</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Probability</b>
T6	Abnormal items are found on commencement of major schemes resulting in unforeseen costs accruing to the scheme to remediate findings.	High	High	Ensure surveys contain appropriate warranty	Low	Low
T7	Major technology/design failures occur after completion of the project resulting in high maintenance costs and operational failures.	High	Medium	Engage Independent Certifier to audit design.	High	Low
T8	The cost of installing Sprinklers in accordance with City Council design policy is prohibitively expensive.	High	High	Ensure the brief has the sprinklers in the specification from feasibility. Ensure appropriate budget is allowed. Report budget anomalies to the Primary Projects Board	Low	Low
T9	The final scheme does not meet the needs of the service.	High	High	Ensure Educationalist input at an early stage in the design review and implementation.	Low	Low

T10	Project management formal processes are not implemented which results in failure of the project due to confusion over project management roles and responsibilities.	High	High	Ensure that appropriate project management techniques are in place for the scheme in line with Prince 2 methodology. This will ensure that at each stage the Business Case is reviewed to ensure that the original objectives of the project are being met.  Ensure that people responsible for Project Management are appropriately trained.	High	Low
<b>No.</b>	<b>RISK</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Probability</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Probability</b>
	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS</b>					
E1	Issues relating to Cricket Club access to the Playing Field are not appropriately resolved creating Health and Safety Risks for children and visitors.	High	High	The original design brief made a specific point of ensuring the design mitigated against safety breaches.	Low	Low
	<b>LEGAL RISKS</b>					
L1	Title issues and Section 106 land ownership issues cause a delay in terms of securing agreement on the final scheme. This could result in the project not being completed to time or budget.	High	High	Ensure that legal colleagues identify all the key risks to securing legal agreements on property matters. Ensure all parties communicate effectively and appropriately.	High	Medium

L2	Issue concerning rights of access for the Cricket Club are not resolved.	High	High	Ensure that legal colleagues are commissioned to identify and resolve all the key issues in relation to the Section 106 and property matters. Ensure all parties communicate effectively and appropriately.	High	Medium
----	--	------	------	---	------	--------

## APPENDIX 3

### The Initial Impact Assessment of a policy or function

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

<p>Name of policy or function to be assessed:  <b>Bishopston Primary School Development</b></p>	<p><b>Name of manager responsible for assessment:</b>  <i>Michael Branaghan Strategy Leader - Capital, Assets &amp; Schools Organisation</i></p>
<p><b>Step 3</b>  Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on different racial groups?  Yes  What evidence do you have for this?  Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination?  If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p>No differential impact on different racial groups because:  i) <i>The number of places available will be increased, not reduced.</i>  ii) <i>The places will be allocated in accordance with the existing criteria for identifying Children in Need which are based on the needs of the child, irrespective of ethnicity.</i></p>
<p>Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on boys/girls or men/women?  If Yes  What evidence do you have for this?  Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination?  No  If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p><i>No. The provision and operation of a new primary school will follow the DfES policies and guidance.</i></p>
<p>Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on Disabled than on non-disabled children or adults? Yes  What evidence do you have for this?  Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination? No  If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p><i>No.</i>  <i>Any new building will be fully accessible.</i>  <i>Children who are disabled or are deemed to be Children in Need have priority, under the Local Authority's school admissions policy, for education places. This will be unchanged if the proposal is implemented.</i>  <i>A new primary school would comply with DfES code of practice on admissions, SEN and with current guidance on exclusions.</i></p>

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

Name of policy or function to be assessed: <b>Bishopston Primary School Development</b>	<b>Name of manager responsible for assessment:</b> <i>Michael Branaghan Strategy Leader - Capital, Assets &amp; Schools Organisation</i>
Signed (completing officer): Job Title :	

**Environment Impact Checklist**

<b>Title of report:</b> New Primary School – Bishopston Ward				
<b>Report author:</b> Mick Branaghan				
<b>Anticipated date of key decision:</b> 30 <sup>th</sup> April 2009				
<b>Summary of proposals:</b> The provision of a new primary school in Bishopston Ward.				
Will the proposal impact on.....	Yes/No	+ive or -ive	If yes.....	
			Briefly describe impact	Briefly describe mitigation measures
Emission of Climate Changing Gases?	Yes	-ve	<p>In the short-term, secondary emissions of climate changing gases arise through the use of energy and materials during the construction works. In the longer term, there will be additional emissions of climate changing gases through the consumption of fossil fuels necessary to heat and power the building.</p> <p>We do not currently have benchmarking data for primary schools and so are unable estimate the likely additional CO2 emissions arising from the school's energy consumption.</p> <p>By building the school closer to the area of demand for it, it is likely that emissions from transport will be reduced, as the pupils will live closer to the school.</p>	<p>The Government expect all local authorities to apply energy efficient and renewable energy measures, to meet the 60% reduction in carbon emissions, to all new school buildings. New schools will include energy efficiency measures that reduce energy required for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heating (and cooling);</li> <li>• Lighting;</li> </ul> <p>Low or Zero Carbon (LZC) energy generation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renewable and LZC sources for heating;</li> <li>• Renewable sources for hot water;</li> <li>• Renewable sources for electricity;</li> </ul>

				<p>The school will be constructed to a minimum of BREEAM “Very Good” which exceeds minimum building standards for energy efficiency, and also encourages the use of more sustainable construction materials.</p> <p>A School travel plan will be required.</p>
Bristol’s vulnerability to the effects of climate change?	No Yes	-ve	<p>New buildings: May be at risk of flooding. May increase the area of impermeable surfaces May not be robust enough to cope with extreme temperature variations, or violent storms Consume water</p>	<p>This proposal will be screened by Planning Officers to determine whether it needs an Environmental Impact Assessment, and identify the appropriate mitigation in relation to the impacts identified. Examples may include:</p> <p><b>Rainwater harvesting</b> Sustainable drainage techniques Passive building design</p> <p>This particular proposal includes rainwater harvesting, which mitigates storm water run-off and reduces demand for mains-supplied water. Construction to BREEAM “very good” improves resilience to extremes of temperature.</p>

Consumption of non-renewable resources?	Yes/ No	+/-	<p>In the short-term, there is the consumption of fossil fuels and other non-renewable materials products arising through the use of energy and materials during the construction works.</p> <p>In the long-term, there will be consumption of fossil fuels for heating and power, and also for travel to and from the sites</p> <p>By building the school closer to the area of demand for it, it is likely that emissions from transport will be reduced, as the pupils will live closer to the school.</p>	<p>The proposal will consider the feasibility of installing biomass heating.</p> <p>Architects will be expected to consider opportunities for the use of renewable construction materials where feasible, and to consider how the quantities of materials required can be minimised.</p> <p>A School travel plan will be required.</p>
Production, recycling or disposal of waste	Yes	+	<p>Waste will arise from construction works</p> <p>Waste will arise from the normal operation of the school</p>	<p>Construction contractors will be legally obliged to prepare site waste management plans, which detail how waste will be minimised, and recycling promoted.</p> <p>The school will be required to provide recycling facilities – in particular, paper, glass, cardboard and food.</p>
The appearance of the city?	Yes	+	The new build will alter the appearance of the city	The suitability of the building's appearance will be considered as part of the planning application
Pollution to land, water or air?	Yes	+	There is a risk of hazardous materials (e.g. fuels or paints) being spilled during construction works.	<p>The Pollution Control team will advise as part of the planning application</p> <p>The construction contractor will be subject to site inspection to ensure that hazardous materials are adequately controlled</p>
Wildlife and habitats?	Yes	+	<p>It is possible that the site for the new school will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact upon protected species or habitats</li> <li>• Reduce green spaces/ corridors</li> </ul> <p>This particular proposal is for construction on a playing field, so the probability of significant ecological damage is low.</p>	The Natural Environment team in Parks will be consulted as part of the Planning process.

**Consulted with:**

**Internal:** - Planning and Central Support Services – to identify growth points and community issues.

**External** - Not at this stage.

**Summary of impacts and mitigation – to go into the Cabinet/Council Report**

The significant impacts of this proposal are....

**Short-term increase in environmental impacts through the consumption of fossil fuels and raw materials in constructing the new school. Longer term, there will be on-going consumption of energy for heat and power, production of waste and staff and pupil travel to school.**

The proposals include the following measures to mitigate the impacts....

**The new school buildings will meet the BREEAM Very Good standard and will be reduce energy use by 60% compared to current levels.**

**The transport impacts will be assessed for each school as part of a Home to School Transport Assessment.**

**The planning application will be accompanied by a statement of the environmental impacts of the proposals and the mitigation measures proposed. Significant potential exists for mitigation of negative net effects from the school project, for example on energy use.**

The net effects of the proposals are....

**The long term effect of the proposal will be a net increase in Carbon Dioxide emissions from school and associated travel.**

**Checklist completed by:**

Name:	Michael Branaghan, Strategy Leader, Capital Assets and School Organisation
Dept.:	Children and Young People's Services
Extension:	23384
Date:	March 2009
Verified by Environment and Sustainability Unit	Alex Minshull